The place of archaeology in integrated cultural landscape management.

A case study comparing landscapes with Iron Age *oppida* in England, France and Spain

Tom Moore, Vincent Guichard and Jesús Álvarez Sanchís

Abstract

Across Europe, landscape is recognised as a frame through which societal values are defined and embedded. The European Landscape convention and wider research has drawn attention to the need for integrating a diverse range of stakeholders to ensure landscape sustainability. Archaeology is increasingly recognised as having an important place in integrated landscape management but often remains relatively peripheral. This paper examines the place of archaeology in specific European regions and the potential ways of integrating archaeological heritage in landscape management. Emerging from a project funded by the Joint Programme Initiative on Cultural Heritage (*Resituating Europe's FIrst Towns (REFIT): A case study in enhancing knowledge transfer and developing sustainable management of cultural landscapes*), we explore the place of a set of common European heritage assets, Iron Age *oppida*, in the management of the landscape they are a part of and how they might be used better to engage and connect stakeholders. Using four case studies, we review the present integration of archaeology within landscape management and how this operates at a local level. From this we explore what challenges these case-studies present and outline ways in which the REFIT project has sought to develop strategies to respond to these in order to enhance and promote co-productive management of these *oppida* landscapes.

Introduction

Across Europe, landscape is recognised as a frame through which societal values are defined and embedded (Waterton 2005; Taylor and Lennon 2012). The concept of cultural landscape as defined by UNESCO (1992) emerged from wider European traditions[1] on the need to emphasise the interconnections between natural and cultural factors in creating landscape character. More recently, the European Landscape convention (ELC) (CoE 2000) has drawn more attention to the perceptive

---

[1] Including concepts of cultural landscape emerging in early 20th century America (Sauer 1923) and concepts of 'kulturlandschaft' in Germany (Thomas Meier pers. comm)

nature of landscape and the need for integrating a diverse range of stakeholders and values to ensure landscape sustainability. Archaeology as a discipline increasingly recognises that it should be integral to such approaches, not just as evidence from the past, but contributing to current and future environments (Fairclough and Rippon 2002; Kolen and Renes 2015; Hølleland et al 2017). As national and European agendas advocate integration (DEFRA 2018; García Martín et al 2016), detailed assessments of the current place of archaeological heritage at a local level are increasingly necessary if archaeology is to be embedded in holistic landscape management (Turner 2012, 139).

Developing from these concerns, this paper examines the place of archaeology in specific European environments and the potential ways of integrating archaeological heritage in landscape management. In this paper we consider 'Landscape' in similar terms to that in the ELC, recognising that 'cultural landscape', as it has been defined by UNESCO (Fowler 2003), has tended to somewhat under-estimate the perceptive aspect of landscapes as developed more recently (e.g. Luginbühl 2012, 93-120). Emerging from a project funded by the Joint Programme Initiative on Cultural Heritage (*REsituating Europe's FIrst Towns: A case study in enhancing knowledge transfer and developing sustainable management of cultural landscapes:* www.refitproject.com), we explore the place of a set of common European heritage assets, Iron Age *oppida* located in France, England[1] and Spain, in the management of the landscape they belong to and how they might be better used to engage and connect stakeholders.

Using four case studies, this paper reviews the present integration of archaeology within landscape management and how this operates at a local level. This is followed by an exploration of the specific challenges faced in integrating these monuments and how this has influenced us to take a coproductive approach, developing strategies to enhance archaeology as a lever to promote integrated landscape management.

Integrated cultural landscape management

Whilst 'cultural landscapes' (Roberts 1994) were relatively tightly defined by UNESCO (1992; Fowler 2003; Mitchell et al 2009), the ELC took a broader approach, emphasising that all landscapes are a product of human and natural interaction (CoE 2000, article 1) and emerge as much from the perception and perspective of human agents as from their materiality (Luginbuhl 2012). The ELC also recognised that crucial to their value is in the improved quality of life they bring (Luginbühl 2004), coinciding with increasing recognition of heritage as a social benefit (e.g. CoE 2005, article 1). These developments emerged alongside recognising the need to include communities in decision making. This 'principle of participation' (UN 1992, principle 10), reinforced by the 1998 Aarhus Convention (UNECE n.d.), and echoed in the right to heritage under the Faro Convention (CoE 2005) emphasised that diverse stakeholders should be integral to landscape and heritage management. In our approach to landscape we seek to go somewhat further than the ELC, drawing on concepts of 'Natural Capital' (Helm 2015), 'public goods' (Jones et al 2015), and ideas of landscape as 'commons' (Ostrom 1990; Spek 2017), which have attempted to build ecosystems services (Hernández-Morcillo et al. 2013) into assessments of landscape value. As part of this broader interpretation of landscape, the importance of cultural ecosystems services (Braive and Thibault 2009; Fluck and Holyoak 2017: Hølleland et al 2017) are perceived not as separate elements but integral to landscape biographies (Kolen and Renes 2015; Spek 2017). Many such approaches recognise, as we do, the intangibility of 'landscape' in which the perceptions, memories and identities of all its actors are engrained as part of those landscape biographies (cf. Stewart and Strathern 2003; Ingold 2000; Kolen and Renes 2015).

These perspectives on landscape have emerged at a time when European territories face a variety of pressures, ranging from the impacts of climate change, rural depopulation, declining rural economies and changing farming practices.[2] At the same time, in a contested, globalised world, landscape is a frame of reference for local, regional and national identities (Taylor and Lennon 2012). Landscape, and the archaeology within it, have significant potential as, what has been recently defined in debates in the UK as a 'public good' (Jones et al 2015), in other words contributing to broadly defined aspects of community well-being (cultural, physical, mental and social). Requiring collective definition and understanding of the factors that influence their character, landscape can form an arena that engages inhabitants in public life. In so doing, it can embed stakeholders in a transversal approach to public action, including engagement with agriculture, tourism, energy, transport and heritage. In many cases, archaeology has untapped potential to act as a lever to facilitate such engagement.

Recognition of the importance of stakeholder participation means that integrated management and landscape sustainability are increasingly regarded as mutually dependent (Reed 2008; Guichard 2012, 1). Definitions of integration vary, however. Integrating academics and policy makers has been a focus of European agendas (e.g. Bloemers 2010, 12) but engagement with more diverse stakeholders[3] has not always been widespread (CoE 2006, 173-178; Jones 2011, 14). A paradigm shift is occurring, however, with realisation of the need to incorporate all stakeholders within landscape management (e.g. García Martín et al 2016). Stakeholders can be defined very broadly, including farmers, business, ecologists and residents, but also all those who feel an attachment with a landscape (tourists, heritage professionals and the wider public) to whom, for example, it might relate to their identity.

Integration requires participation and coproduction, emphasising a share of power in decision making (Reed et al. 2017). Landscapes can be contentious (Turner and Fairclough 2007, 122) and coproduction need not impose unanimity but allows exploration of 'trade-offs' between stakeholder values. In this approach, sustainability is not a contrast between preservation and exploitation but emphasises landscape dynamism, allowing stakeholder participation in defining landscape character and direction (Mitchell et al 2009, 99). Although cultural heritage is increasingly an aspect of integrated management (García Martín et al 2016, fig. 3), archaeology has not always been fundamental to such processes. For European *oppida*, the REFIT project recognised an opportunity to explore whether that place could be enhanced, alongside other interests and values, to underpin these particular landscapes' sustainability.

Oppida, a pan-European case study in cultural landscape management

The large Iron Age monuments known as *oppida*, found across western and central Europe (**Fig.1**),[4] represent a particular challenge for heritage management. Their scale, often covering 100s of hectares, means that, archaeologically, *oppida* have to be considered as man-made territories (Moore 2017). Whilst recognising (above) that all heritage is an integral element of landscape, *oppida* are unusual in forcing archaeologists (and other stakeholders) to engage with heritage as integral to the landscape, not as 'sites' divorced from it.

From different motivations (Álvarez Sanchís and Moore as researchers, Guichard as director of a research centre, tourist site and museum) we recognised that managing these monuments requires a landscape perspective. The often relatively non-spectacular archaeological remains and their scale means *oppida* are frequently working areas with few able to be preserved only as heritage monuments (**Fig 2;** Daval 2009; Guichard 2012; Álvarez Sanchís and Rodríguez Hernández 2016). In addition, despite their significance for Europe's cultural heritage (arguably representing temperate Europe's

first urbanism: Fichtl 2005; Moore 2017) *oppida* are poorly recognised as significant heritage assets (Pierrevelcin and Guichard 2009) and underdeveloped as foci for cultural and economic sustainability (Daval 2009). This means that even when they receive high-level protection they continue to balance the needs of heritage management with other landscape requirements (Guichard 2012). Landscapes with *oppida* within them are, therefore, a useful focus with which to compare current approaches and the practicalities of integrated approaches. As a pan-European phenomenon, *oppida* also represent a heritage asset which has a (largely untapped) potential act as focus for trans-national comparison and cooperation. To undertake assessment of landscapes in which *oppida* are integral , four examples were chosen, two in England (Salmonsbury and Bagendon, Gloucestershire), one in France (Bibracte, Burgundy) and one in Spain (Ulaca, Ávila) (**Fig. 1)**. These reflect the diversity of *oppida* whilst emphasising the range of pressures on them. The project aimed to work less on disseminating archaeological knowledge, although this was an aspect, but more to explore methods of knowledge exchange between stakeholders. As part of the project we undertook analysis of stakeholder perceptions (e.g. Moore and Tully 2018; Tully et al. 2019) and developed methodologies to engage stakeholders, which are discussed in more detail elsewhere (e.g. Álvarez Sanchís and Rodríguez-Hernández 2016; Tully and Allen 2018). Underpinning these is our assessment of the current state of integration of landscape management at our case studies and the challenges these present.

Fig 1 - here

Fig 2 - here

Current integration of archaeology in landscape management

The place of archaeology in local landscape management can only be understood in its juridical context. All three of our partner countries are signatories to the European Landscape convention (CoE 2000)[5] and Valletta convention (CoE 1992)[6]. These acts as the basis from which most European countries are aligning their approaches to managing landscape (De Montis 2014). Similarly, although none of our countries are yet signatories to the Faro Convention (CoE 2005), they acknowledge the value and potential of cultural heritage as a resource for sustainable development and quality of life. Commitment by all countries to the Aarhus convention (1998: UNECE n.d.)[7] also includes a need for public participation within environmental matters. Despite these underpinnings, the reality of how archaeology is connected to landscape management varies considerably (Guichard 2012, 1). Also significant is the varied impact of the development of national approaches to landscape and heritage (e.g. Trow and Grenville 2012; Chouquer 2002; Guichard 2018).

The English framework

The ELC informs England's approaches to landscape management (Roe 2013) although archaeology's integration is more complex (Trow and Grenville 2012). The core mechanism for managing the quality of rural territories is through Natural England which oversees agri-environment subsidy schemes (Countryside Stewardship), which provide options for management of the environment, including the historic environment, on behalf of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). Management of heritage and archaeology is covered by two core areas of legislation. The Ancient Monuments Areas Act (1979), enforced by a government agency (Historic England), legally protects 'Scheduled Ancient monuments' requiring permission for actions such as archaeological investigation or changes in land use. This covers only a fraction of archaeological heritage (approximately 20,000 sites).

The majority of archaeological remains are managed under the auspices of planning legislation, embodied in the Town and Country Planning Act (1990). Planning is undertaken at the regional authority level using guidance from central government via the National Planning Policy Framework (2012). This is built on an underlying 'polluter pays' principle with developers using consultants to evaluate archaeology prior to development with local authorities developing mitigation strategies. These are informed by regional development plans[8] which outline priorities and highlight the current resource through Historic Environment Records. Many local authorities have developed Historic Landscape Character assessments to provide a framework on the nature and value of the landscape (Turner and Fairclough 2007). Much of agricultural land-use is situated outside planning regulations, however, which means that the vast majority of archaeology not under development threat is subject to little management oversight.

Areas of the landscape designated as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are provided statutory guidance (CRoW Act 2000) on landscape management priorities, informed by Landscape Character Assessments (Swanwick 2002). Via Neighbourhood plans and Local Landscape Character Assessments (Tudor 2014), the Localism Act (2011) aimed to situate local communities more directly in defining management priorities. The impact of these schemes appears to have been limited, however (Eagle et al 2017). There is relatively little incentive for the main practitioners of archaeology (developer-funded consultants) to undertake significant dialogue with other stakeholders, beyond those commissioning them. This means that the vast majority of archaeology is divorced from wider discourse (Moore 2006).[9]

Both Natural and Historic England aim to work together to ensure the historic environment is part of landscape management (DCMS 2017, 8). Government infrastructure continues to foster divisions between the 'natural' and 'cultural', however, seen in the splitting of landscape concerns across the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), Department for Environment, Farming and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and Ministry of Housing, Community and Local Government (MHCLG). Disjuncture also exists in academia, with archaeology departments often more closely linked to history or classics than environmental studies or geography, with limited research cooperation (Trow and Grenville 2012).

The English cases studies: Bagendon and Salmonsbury

Two landscapes were chosen to represent the diversity of British *oppida*. Bagendon and Salmonsbury, Gloucestershire, although both located in the Cotswolds, are quite different in terms of their landscape character (Cotswold AONB 2002) as well as the pressures that face them. These include development, the decline of rural economies and changing population dynamics. Both are located in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which provides guidance on landscape priorities (Cotswold AONB 2013).

Situated on the interface between the Cotswold Hills and Thames Valley, the 'polyfocal *oppidum*' at Bagendon has around 4km of earthworks encompassing around 200ha. Its heyday was in the Late Iron Age (1st century BC-1st century AD) but most of the Iron Age remains are relatively ephemeral (Moore 2014). Only a small element is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (**Fig. 3a**). Central to the complex is Bagendon village with elements thought characteristic of Cotswold villages (vernacular architecture; drystone walls). The surrounding land comprises privately owned pasture and arable fields along with some woodland. Despite the significance of its archaeological heritage as the precursor to the regional

Roman '*civitas*' capital (which became modern-day Cirencester), and one of the largest archaeological monuments in western England, its relative invisibility means there are few visitors.

Salmonsbury, c. 24 km to the northeast, presents a different landscape. In a low-lying position close to the confluence of the Dikler and Windrush rivers, Salmonsbury is typical of 'enclosed *oppida*'. Iron Age earthworks enclose an area of around 29ha (**Fig 3b**). The area includes evidence from a variety of other periods, including a Neolithic causewayed camp and Early Medieval 'hundred' (meeting place). The *oppidum* lies on the edge of the small town of Bourton-on-the-Water, famous for its vernacular architecture, which overshadows the earlier history of the area. The town has a population of over 3,000 and is a major tourist attraction with around 700,000 visitors per annum. The urban area encroaches on Salmonsbury which, since 2003, as part of Greystones Farm, has been under the management of the Gloucester Wildlife Trust (GWT), an environmental charity. This organisation has 3 staff at Greystones who co-ordinate landscape activities. As well as the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Salmonsbury, the area includes a Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and an organic dairy farm. As at Bagendon, the archaeology is difficult to visualise and, in contrast to the number of tourists who visit Bourton-on-the-Water, Salmonsbury is relatively unvisited.

Challenges for Bagendon and Salmonsbury

Our case study landscapes reflect many of the successes and challenges within integrated landscape management in England. One of the most obvious aspects of integrated management is through Natural England 'Countryside stewardship'. A significant proportion of the area around both Bagendon and Salmonsbury, including much of the *oppida*, is under some form of stewardship agreement, although only at Salmonsbury does this have a specific historic environment option (**Fig 3a, 3b;** Moore and Tully 2018).

Fig. 3 - Here

Of the two, greater integration in management can be seen around Salmonsbury where the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust has created a unified management plan, incorporating farming, public access, wildlife and history. This reflects the national picture, where exemplars of integrated management which include archaeology a rare and restricted to organisations such as National Parks (e.g. Selman 2004). Even around Salmonsbury, however, it is still the environmental significance which acts as the draw for local engagement (Moore and Tully 2018).

In contrast, there is no unified approach to the Bagendon landscape and no forum through which values can be shared. The links which exist between different stakeholders, such as archaeologists and environmental groups, relate to personal connections, although some are facilitated by national agencies. The one facet of integrated management around Bagendon, Countryside stewardship, is focused on individual farms with no wider landscape agreements. To address this, recent integrated approaches have been trialled in the region (e.g. Short et al 2014) but heritage has so far not been incorporated within these. With land entirely in private ownership, Bagendon lacks a landscape co-ordinator, beyond government agencies, meaning the needs of individual landowners often has primacy.

For the REFIT project this contrast in existing management has significant implications. At Salmonsbury, an existing organisation (GWT) exists as a potential co-ordinator to facilitate strategies to enhance awareness of archaeology within presentation and management strategies. At Bagendon the challenge is to explore how to develop knowledge exchange between stakeholders in a landscape without such organisations. For both landscapes, however, common issues exist, including a need to

enhance awareness of the dynamism of landscapes, in order to contextualise modern landscape choices, and develop ways to engage all stakeholders. At present, despite the national significance of the archaeological remains, they do not act as a focus around which integrated management coalesces.

The Spanish framework

Spain's approach to cultural landscapes varies. A system of devolved legislation on heritage and landscape ensures different approaches exist across the country. Cultural heritage management is regulated by national law (i.e. Law 16/1985) and regional legislation. This law is based on the concept of Asset of Cultural Interest (*Bien de Interés Cultural*: BIC), which includes non-movable heritage, movable heritage and intangible cultural heritage (Almagro Gorbea and Mederos 2013: 68-70). It provides decentralization of the management of cultural heritage to autonomous regions (*Comunidades Autónomas*) under the guidance of the State. This ensures a fragmented approach with autonomous regions having developed their own legislation (ibid. 70). National law covers three levels of heritage protection: (1) property with historical heritage status, (2) the General Inventory of Moveable Property and (3) the General Register of Property of Cultural Interest (moveable and immoveable). The Autonomous Communities have established additional levels of protection introducing special categories, concerning intangible heritage for instance. Regional laws on archaeological heritage govern BIC, which include archaeological sites, informing expropriation of the lands necessary for excavations and permission for archaeological investigation. They also govern programmes of conservation for archaeological sites and their environs.

Recently, preventive archaeology has emerged (Martínez and Castillo 2007), rationalizing archaeological investigation and allowing for the designing of research models prior to development (Querol and Castillo 2012). Despite significant discussion on the role of preventive archaeology in Spain, there is currently a lack of data on its extent with each region displaying its own particular circumstances. These variations are due to different legal frameworks and the development of different management mechanisms (Martínez and Castillo 2007: 189). Despite the existence of elaborate statutory systems of planning and heritage management this does not, therefore, always guarantee effective landscape management (Van der Valk 2010: 379). In general, the current practice in Spanish cultural heritage management is characterized by outstanding research and theoretical approaches contrasted with an often poor presence of these concepts within territorial strategies (Ruiz del Árbol and Orejas 2010).

Landscape is taken into account by references to it in nature conservation laws, urban regulations and other provisions such as legislation on road development. Integrated policies on landscapes are, however, scarce (Ruiz del Árbol and Orejas 2008: 233-242). Protective strategies for listed heritage monuments focus largely on preservation while at the same time there is little protection for heritage susceptible to development. This approach often results in rigid protective regimes causing landowners and other stakeholders to oppose preservation regarding it as in danger of leaving the region vulnerable to economic stagnation.

Landscape management is considered in various areas. Central government deals primarily with protected property belonging to the state and manages public authorities and delegated bodies, while the Autonomous Communities focus on private property within their region. Most regions maintain a distinction between heritage and environmental protection, downplaying the integrated approach to landscape called for by the European Landscape Convention. This reflects a general division in Spain

between heritage and the natural environment. Cultural heritage is legally conceived as a set of tangible and intangible assets which are considered worth protecting (Querol 2003, 2010: 24-25; Ruiz del Árbol and Orejas 2010). Natural heritage is defined as environmental assets which have not been altered by humanity. This creates two different concepts, two sets of legislation, two different governing administrations, two forms of education and information and two completely different degrees of impact, strong for natural heritage but weak for cultural heritage. Natural and cultural heritage do not share a common approach, but there are some points in existing legislation that enable the historic environment to be incorporated within landscape planning (Ruiz del Árbol and Orejas 2010: 482-483). The categories established by environmental laws such as national parks, natural parks and nature reserves have in recent years been emulated by cultural laws as cultural parks, cultural areas and archaeological parks. Here the convergence of concepts offers the potential to co-ordinate environmental and cultural management (Ruiz del Árbol and Orejas 2008, 238-240).

In recent years working groups have been set up to develop action plans to comply with the conventions entered into at an international level (see De Montis 2014). This is leading to change (Elorria and Sánchez-Aguilera 2011, 107), with a recent law of historical heritage in Andalucía including a category termed Cultural Landscape (Querol 2010: 170-171, 447-448). In addition, the Institute of Cultural Heritage of Spain has developed a project titled the National Plan of Cultural Landscapes (2012). A number of research projects also exist within Spain which have sought to take a more integrated approach to landscapes (Castro et al. 2002) involving local stakeholders and a variety of agencies in management strategies (e.g. Martín Civantos and Bonet García 2015).

The Spanish case study: Ulaca

The situation at Ulaca reflects the relatively divided situation within Spanish approaches to landscape. Located in the province of Ávila, the *oppidum* Ulaca, encompassing approximately 70ha, was occupied in Late Iron Age (ca. 300-50 BC) by people known as the *Vettones* who often erected stone statues ('*verracos*') (Ruiz Zapatero and Álvarez Sanchís 2011). After the Roman conquest it was abandoned with the foundation of the town of Ávila, which became a World Heritage site in 1985.

In some ways, Ulaca is an excellent example of a cultural landscape in which archaeological-historical and environmental elements are united on the basis of their protection and development. It was declared an Historic-Artistic Site in 1931 and protected as a BIC (Asset of Cultural Interest) in 1986. The archaeological zone of Ulaca (450ha; **fig. 4**) was delimited and protected by the Law of Spanish Historical Heritage, leaving any restoration subject to the dictates of the Territorial Committee of Cultural Heritage. It is fenced and protected by an on-site guardian paid for by the regional government and receives around 4,000 visitors per annum. It is part of the protected natural space (ENP) called "Sierra de la Paramera y Serrota", within the network of natural areas of the Autonomous Community of Castilla y León, under the auspices of law 42/2007 on Natural Heritage and Biodiversity. Due to its rough terrain its main use is for extensive cattle grazing, organised by the local community.

Despite this combination of designations, the role of integrated management is less clear. Decisions about accessibility, building of infrastructure, land-use and the provision of funds for heritage presentation can encounter problems due to the lack of co-ordination mechanisms between levels of administration. This creates gaps between how policy makers, researchers, stakeholders and the community perceive what Ulaca heritage is and what measures are taken to manage it.

There is, however, growing exploration of Ulaca's archaeological heritage as the focus for landscape integration. In the 1990s different reconstruction programs were created in the province of Ávila,

thanks to a demand for 'cultural tourism'. Consequently, the region has witnessed major archaeological excavations as part of an increasing awareness among the local population of the significance of local heritage as a cultural resource. This, in part, led to an exhibition *Celtas y Vettones* hosted by the council of Ávila which saw around 100,000 visitors. The European project Interreg III-A, led by the Regional Government of Ávila (*Diputación Provincial*), was decisive in recognition and dissemination of the archaeological heritage of the Iron Age *oppidum* through new excavations, restoration programs, and publications aimed at the general public, as well as the creation of a permanent exhibition in Ávila: *Vettonia*. A desire by heritage stakeholders to enhance local communities' engagement with the resource of Ulaca is closely linked to the need for economic development in the region. The rationale is that visitors to cultural attractions tend to stay longer and spend more, meaning that increased visitors to Ulaca might allow for a diversification of the local economy and contribute to the preservation of the community's heritage.

Despite these developments, a decline in local customs in agrarian communities, such as those around Ulaca, has led to a declining sense of identity in the face of globalization (Fewster 2007). The receptivity of people to better understand the past, which was previously often ignored, and the strategy of cultural tourism which places the *oppida* as the historical roots of the region, has created a kind of popular 'vettonism' (Ruiz Zapatero and Salas 2008). Implicit in this is the notion that there is a sense of shared concern and belonging expressed as a common value system. This has led to the development of a highly successful local festival (the Luna festival: **Fig. 10**), which attracts around 3,000 visitors each summer to Ulaca, organised primarily by the local mayor. Until recently this festival had little official endorsement and there remains something of a tension that it has been created outside of archaeological authorities' guidance. There are concerns, for example, over the impact of large numbers of visitors on the archaeological remains. This is a clear example of the 'trade-offs' heritage managers need to explore if Ulaca is to become foci for cultural landscape sustainability.

Challenges for Ulaca

The moderate success of local residents and authorities in increasing the value of Ulaca as a resource for tourism and as a source of local identity is something which might be enhanced. A landscape co-ordinator has emerged, in the form of the local mayor of Solosancho, but this is reliant on a dynamic individual and their relationship with authorities, residents and academics, rather than embedded in systems or practice. The challenge is for greater dialogue between stakeholders to consider management plans without governmental frameworks. The lack of engagement with natural environment authorities is particularly stark whilst the integration of other stakeholders has been limited. At present both the approaches by regional authorities and local people are almost entirely focused around the archaeological heritage but the potential to explore how heritage management might connect to aspects of managing the natural environment exists. Opportunities to make clear connections between contemporary agricultural practices, foodways, heritage and the natural environment abound (Álvarez Sanchís and Rodríguez-Hernández 2016) but have, as yet, seen little development.

The French framework

In France, too, archaeological heritage and landscape issues are covered by legislation that depends on several ministries (Négri 2015; Terrasson 2016). Local authorities have little regulatory powers in this field but can support the State to enhance the value of heritage, as part of regional planning and tourism policies (for an overview on French heritage policies, see: Di Gioia and Chaumier 2008, for

archaeological policies: Frier 2004, Cornu and Négri 2012, all describe a situation that has been modified by law 2016-925).

The most significant elements of archaeological heritage benefit from a 1913 law which allows two levels of protection, as classified historical monuments (14,100 in 2015) or listed historical monuments (29,500) with work on or around these monuments strictly supervised. An amendment to the Heritage Code in 2016 defines 'remarkable heritage sites' (*sites patrimoniaux remarquables*) that include several older features: "towns, villages or districts whose conservation, restoration, rehabilitation or enhancement is in the public interest from the historical, architectural, archaeological, artistic or landscape point of view". These sites (800 in 2016) are the subject of safeguarding or enhancement plans. Communities with remarkable heritage sites are organised into a national association (*Sites & Cités remarquables de France*) which allows exchange of experience and lobbying.

Archaeological heritage has benefited, since 1941, from specific legislation. These provisions include the need for State authorization to carry out excavations. Recently, monitoring of archaeological activity has been strengthened by the establishment of scientific advisory commissions at national and inter-regional levels. These have greatly contributed to improving the quality of archaeological research and field practice, as well as the publication of results. The pressure on archaeological heritage from development has also led to the establishment of a legislative framework for rescue archaeology, based on the polluter pays principle. This dictates that the State (via the Ministry of Culture) decides on the advisability of interventions likely to damage archaeological heritage and exercises scientific control. The conduct of archaeological work may be entrusted to approved operators, in practice usually the National Institute for Preventive Archaeological Research (INRAP), units belonging to local authorities or independent firms.

Landscapes are taken into account in environmental and urban planning legislation. Their protection mainly results from a 1930 law which allows two levels of protection, classification or inscription, for "natural monuments and sites whose conservation or preservation is of general artistic, historical, scientific, legendary or picturesque interest". Today, there are about 6,700 classified or listed sites, covering c. 4% of France. Over the years, there has been a tendency to increase the size of the protected areas, usually motivated by recognition of the landscape's cultural and environmental quality.

The 1993 law about 'the protection and enhancement of landscapes' aims to protect more extensively the landscapes, whatever their importance and their type. The law, later updated to include the define landscape in the same terms as the European Landscape Convention, provides for a wide variety of measures to protect space for reasons of landscape quality or their biodiversity importance. These measures most often take the form of contractual incentive schemes, such as 'regional natural parks' (*parcs naturels régionaux*), or special provisions in documents guiding land management by local authorities. The policy of the *Grands Sites de France*, initiated in 2002, encourages local authorities to take charge of the sustainable management of landscape areas of high value and to experiment with methods of integrated management (Pára and Vourc'h 2012). This policy is an example of the reflections taking place within the Ministry of the Environment regarding the notion of landscape as a lever to develop sustainable regional projects, both to mobilize all stakeholders through their interest in their lived environment, and to develop territorial projects through the transversality that reflection on the future of landscape requires (e.g. the *Paysages Territoires Transitions* research-action in which Bibracte is involved).

Archaeological heritage may benefit from measures designed to protect areas for their landscape quality or biodiversity, even if heritage is rarely explained as the grounds for protection. In this respect,

the primacy of archaeology as the reason for protection of Mont Beuvray (Bibracte) according to the 1930 law is exceptional. Similarly, local urban plans, which are an obligation of local authorities, must incorporate consideration of the preservation of cultural heritage but, in practice, they rarely take into account buried archaeological heritage. Finally, there is no provisions specifically concerned with the risks that agricultural work poses for buried archaeological heritage, although it is a major factor in destruction of archaeological remains.

In summary, France has been concerned with moving from an archaeology of rescue to a genuine policy which preserves archaeological heritage. It has been most successful in establishing an effective framework for studying remains threatened by development, but archaeological heritage remains insufficiently integrated in management and there remains considerable scope for taking archaeological heritage into account when developing landscape projects. In the same manner, decisions to allow the destruction of archaeological sites after their scientific recording are still fully in the hands of experts and never shared with the wider community.

The French case study: Bibracte

Amongst our case studies, Bibracte is already the most integrated in terms of management. The *oppidum* of Bibracte is situated on Mont Beuvray, Burgundy, situated within the *Parc naturel régional du Morvan* (c. 173,000ha), an upland region with low population density and an economy based on cattle breeding, forestry and, to a much lesser extent, tourism. Bibracte dates to the late 2nd to 1st century BC, with 12km of fortifications and is spread over 200 hectares. Its excellent preservation and historical significance, as a place where Julius Caesar wrote his Commentaries on the Gallic War, mean that it has a focal place in French national identity (Dietler 1998). In addition, because of its location within former President François Mitterrand's (1916-1996) original constituency, in 1984 an archaeological research programme was initiated and the site was included on the list of *Grands Travaux de l'Etat* in 1989. A management structure was established, bringing together state and local organisations to implement a significant programme of investments, establishing a public property of 950 hectares, and creating facilities which were inaugurated by Mitterrand in 1995. The site roles within the landscape: as a natural and historic site, a research centre, and an archaeological museum are managed by one public body – an *établissement public de coopération culturelle* (EPCC) (Guichard 2012, 2014). This type of public organisation was established by legislation in 2001 to allow significant cultural facilities, such as museums, to be run as partnerships. Under this system, the facility is managed by an independent organisation, with policy and financing arranged by a governing board which includes representatives from the founding bodies. This type of management structure has advantages in combining the policies and resources of all the different bodies involved, and in creating a management structure where roles and responsibilities are clearly distributed between the elected representatives (who define overall strategy) and the director (who has responsibility for its operational running).

As well as its archaeological significance, Mont Beuvray has significant environmental value, rich in beech forests and panoramic viewpoints which open onto protected landscapes. Today Bibracte is encompassed by a variety of heritage and natural environmental protection (**Fig. 5**). It is a classified *Monument Historique* (encompassing 135 ha) and classified according to the 1930 Act because of its historic and picturesque significance (covering 1478 ha). Since 2014, it has also been a designated Natura 2000 area, covering c. 1004 ha. Since 2008, Bibracte has been a *Grand Site de France*. This does not offer specific protection but aims to ensure an integrated and sustainable management

programme the classified site and its landscaped setting (buffer zone) which extends across the territory of ten villages (including ca. 25,000 ha and 2,500 inhabitants).

Bibracte functions as a place of fieldwork for researchers, from a dozen or so countries, and as an archaeological park. It endeavours to operate as an experimental site for archaeological work, including museography and research methodology, as well for integrated heritage management with the hosting of training courses and international workshops. The Bibracte museum exhibits the results of archaeological research on the site placing it in wider context. The museum and *Centre archéologique européen* host a diverse set of visitors including researchers, students and heritage professionals participating in scientific programmes. They include several hundred individuals and complete around 8,000 working days at Bibracte per year. The museum has c. 44,000 visitors per year. School trips account for a significant proportion with 8,000 children spending at least one day at Bibracte. The remaining visitors comprises 40% from the local area, 30% from other regions of France, and the rest from other countries, primarily the Netherlands and Belgium.

Fig 5 - Here

Challenges for Bibracte

The existence at Bibracte of a clear landscape co-ordinator which already integrates aspects of national and local government, academic researchers, tourism specialists and environmental experts means it is far-and-away the most integrated of our case studies. Bibracte still faces significant challenges, however. Bibracte is located in an upland area which has suffered from significant depopulation since the late-nineteenth century and has seen major agricultural decline, with pine plantations replacing pasture, drastically transforming the landscape. This is due to a combination of extensive low value-added agro-pastoral production mobilising little labour and drastic changes in forest physiognomy due to widespread highly mechanized production systems that favour exogenous resinous species over hardwoods.

Within this context, Bibracte exists in the role of a cultural centre for a local population with very few other cultural opportunities. A concerted effort is, therefore, being made to produce non-archaeologically related events related to artistic creation or contemporary issues, welcome artists in residence and hosting multi-disciplinary festivals. Despite this integration of management, only recently has Bibracte's management begun to explore the views and values of non-specialist stakeholders (the methods for doing which are explored below). In the 1980s Bibracte had an essentially scientific ambition, driven largely by the State in the form the Ministry of Culture. The 1990s saw the rise of cultural ambitions (including opening the museum) and the involvement of local authorities. In the 2000s, management recognised the importance of a landscape approach to highlight and make understandable the archaeological site which is largely perceived by its visitors as a vast "natural" space (Guichard and Chazelle 2007). In particular, the award of the *Grand Site de France* label in 2007 (and renewal in 2013), has been part of a growing dialogue with the Ministry of the Environment. In the spirit of the European Landscape Convention, the ambition is presently to build from Mont Beuvray a sustainable territorial project based on a harmonious development of its economic activities (agriculture, forestry and amenity economy) with the involvement of local stakeholders, using the mobilising and integrative capacity of the notion of landscape. This project is being carried out in close partnership with the *Parc naturel régional du Morvan*, and involvement of a multidisciplinary consortium of researchers which role is to assess the effectiveness of the process, especially the possibility of creating a heritage community around a shared vision of the evolution of the shape of the territory (Darroux et al forthcoming; Darroux forthcoming). As such, Bibracte has now entered a new stage in its history based on a paradigm shift (Guichard 2017a).

Through an integrated approach Bibracte is exploring the trade-offs necessary to manage its landscape. Recognising, for example, that the beech forest on Mont Beuvray is an integral aspect of its landscape character, the management plan recognises a need to ensure its sustainability whilst using woodland clearance to make the archaeology more visible to a public audience (Guichard 2012). Working with a landscape architect this integrates archaeological preservation, display whilst enhancing the natural environment. These guidelines led to the establishment of a long-term forestry project with the aim of opening up the topography of the Iron Age monument and creating a set of development scenarios. Such an approach moves away from simply privileging heritage, recognising it as just part of the cultural landscape over which dynamic choices need to be made.

Overview: comparative challenges

Our case studies provide a snap shot of particular ways *oppida* are managed in different settings. Reflection on the current situation highlights the diverse ways in which *oppida* are integrated into management and the ways in which stakeholders experience them. This relates both to fundamental differences in national and regional government policies and to the extent to which these embrace the concepts of the ELC. It also relates to local factors such as levels of engagement between stakeholders and role of management actors. Despite the variation, a number of common themes and challenges emerge. These represent challenges and opportunities for REFIT to develop strategies to integrate *oppida* heritage within a landscape perspective.

Disconnection and structural division

A common factor across our case studies is the current lack of awareness by many stakeholders of existing frameworks for landscape management. Despite all four case studies being situated in rural areas there is a surprisingly limited awareness of the juridical or management basis for current management. From all our case-studies, surveys of stakeholders revealed a surprising commonality in how few could identify key management organisations or the mechanisms by which the land was managed (**Fig. 6**). In England, the extent to which Stewardship was used to manage the surrounding territory was poorly understood, even by landowning stakeholders (Moore and Tully 2018; cf. Roe 2013). Even around the most actively engaged manager, Bibracte, only around 25% of local stakeholders surveyed (n=420) were aware of how it was managed and its legal protections.

This lack of awareness appears to relate largely to how the landscape is presented, dividing information on heritage, geology, ecology and agronomy, ensuring relatively little knowledge transfer between stakeholders. Our assessment of the current situation at all four case studies emphasises that whilst information for some aspects of these landscapes exists (**Fig. 7**), this tends to be restricted to specific spheres (such as solely ecological) with little easily accessible information on current land-use or the biography of landscape character. At some case studies, such as Bibracte, discussion with regional, elected representatives reveal this disconnect is leading to limited investment of communities in land strategy issues. This encourages municipalities to have a fatalistic attitude towards changes in land ownership, for example, which can lead to major changes in land management.

One of the potential reasons for stakeholder disconnect from landscape management, witnessed in all three countries, is how approaches to landscapes continue to foster division between the 'natural environment' and cultural heritage. Despite the ELC's emphasis on integration, in practice there

remains significant disconnection. There are signs of change, for example in the cross-disciplinary approach espoused by the *Grands Sites de France* policy (Thibault 2009), of which Bibracte is a part; attempts to enhance historic environment within countryside stewardship in England and regional approaches to cultural landscape in Spain. However, the impact of structural separation should not be under-estimated in creating both conceptual and information barriers within and between stakeholders. A variety of approaches across Europe are challenging such division (Soli 2000, 93-98; De Montis 2014; Hercules 2017) with increasing numbers of integrated landscape initiatives emerging from the 'bottom-up' (García Martín et al 2016; Dunford 2016) but archaeology as integral to these remains rare. More encouragingly, despite these divisions and a general unfamiliarity with the concept of 'cultural landscape' amongst our stakeholders (Moore and Tully 2018; Tully et al 2019), interviews with stakeholders revealed, that once explained the majority regard it as reflecting their own appreciation of the integrated nature of landscapes. It thus has the potential to act as a frame of reference which non-specialists can 'buy into'.

Fig. 7. - Here

Landscape coordination and integration

Transcending structural divisions to enhance integration appears best achieved through the existence of 'landscape coordinators'. In our case studies the nature of these varies. From its earlier focus on heritage, Bibracte EPPC has developed as a space with which to connect national and regional agencies, academics and political actors. Elsewhere, coordination exists at Salmonsbury in the form of the Wildlife Trust, and at Ulaca, more nascent, in the form of the mayor. We termed these 'leaders' or co-ordinators, but they might just as well be identified as landscape actors (or stakeholders) who have the ability to act as 'connectors' or hubs around which others can coalesce or interact. The expertise or existing role of these stakeholders is less important than in being one to which many other stakeholders are connected, or has the capacity to connect. At Bibracte, the driving force in this regard coincides with the heritage stakeholder which has recognised the challenge to broaden its remit to the wider cultural landscape. Within those areas where no major museum or heritage stakeholder is present, at Ulaca and Salmonsbury, the potential comes from working with other, more permanently established stakeholders (the Wildlife Trust and local community). Identifying such leaders provides the potential for those working on Iron Age *oppida* to work co-productively to facilitate engagement with other stakeholders. Building on existing stakeholder networks we can engage stakeholders in the archaeological heritage, which need not focus on the Iron Age archaeology of *oppida* but use this as lens to explore broader issues on landscape. The one landscape where no coordinator exists, Bagendon, is the landscape with the most limited integration at present and challenges us to consider how to create a space for dialogue. Our interviews (Moore and Tully 2018) suggest one possibility is using the social capital of individual landowners. The importance of individuals' social capital in connecting stakeholders is being recognised (García Martín et al 2016, 51) but the potential for archaeology to act as a lever in developing such capital has only begun to be explored (e.g. Martín Civantos and Bonet García 2015). The high value placed on cultural heritage in these landscapes (Tully et al. 2019) suggests, however, it has the potential to be used to engage and enable stakeholders. The visibility and social resonance of the *oppida* at Bibracte, Salmonsbury and Ulaca in particular have the potential to act as levers for engagement in wider landscapes discourse.

Landscape visions and landscape dynamism

A trend across our case studies is a limited appreciation by most stakeholders of the ways in which landscapes have emerged in the past and the nature of choices over landscape change in the present (Moore and Tully 2018; Tully et al 2019). In some areas, such as the Cotswolds there is a perception of a static landscape. At Bibracte, by contrast, there is recognition of current transformations but a lack of appreciation on how to influence these changes. Bibracte is an example of the paradoxical nature of engagement in landscape dynamism; most stakeholders are aware of the changes that the Morvan has undergone since the beginning of the 20th century and these are a source of anxiety for many inhabitants. At the same time, projects to explore alternative evolutions of the landscape, which have largely been carried out by work at Bibracte, remain barely recognised by local stakeholders, even though the subject is included in the permanent exhibition at the museum and is addressed by the visitor guides to the site. This gap between perceptions of short-term and long-term change coincides with a distinction in stakeholders' perception of the landscape, distinguishing between the heritage of Mont-Beuvray, which enjoys national recognition, distinct from their own daily environment, which they find difficult to consider as also of heritage value. The challenge for a sustainable territorial project around Bibracte is to ensure that these two perspectives on landscape, one imposed "from above" (by the state and the experts) and one experienced "from below" by the local stakeholders, coincide.

Review of our case studies revealed that none had yet explored stakeholder views of the landscapes and integrated this into management. In those where it had been taken into account (e.g. Cotswolds) this was through generalised regional or national surveys (e.g. NE 2009; Powell and Clark 2003). Deeper understanding of the motivations and values of all stakeholders is important in underpinning any integrated approach. For REFIT, we embarked on surveys and interviews to explore stakeholders' perceptions of landscape (Moore and Tully 2018; Tully et al 2019). Recognising the importance of exploring the landscape through visual means (Michelin et al. 2011) this also involved mind maps to explore the extent and nature of the perceived landscape. There are, of course, a range of scales at which landscapes need to be understood and managed (Forman 1995; Butler and Berglund 2014) but our engagement is finding that most stakeholders engage with it at a relatively localised scale (Moore and Tully 2018). It is at this scale, around landscapes that feel familiar and comfortable, whilst also focused around our heritage assets, the *oppida*, that engaging stakeholder communities is likely to be most effective in acting as forums to discuss larger issues.

Fig. 8 - Here

To facilitate greater engagement in landscape choices we have developed various strategies. Bibracte has sought to engage local stakeholders on landscape issues through interviews and collective workshops, both indoors and through landscape reading workshops in the field (**Fig. 8**; Darroux 2017; Darroux et al forthcoming). These sessions have made it possible to coproduce a diagnosis of what characterises this unique landscape and identify the risks of landscape degradation (Chazelle 2017); a scheme now validated by the local authorities.

Despite these successes these were insufficient in ensuring that the region's stakeholders became fully engaged in determining landscape issues. To address this, as part of the REFIT project, two interrelated avenues have been explored with promising preliminary results. These recognise that new aspects of the landscape might need to be identified with which to harness the engagement of local stakeholders. Field workshops conducted at the community level revealed a strong interest by local people in the territory's network of dense and ancient trackways (Darroux 2017). Examination of 19th century cadastral maps revealed that this network has changed little over the last two centuries. It was discovered that these trackways could act as a lever for engagement, representing a shared interest amongst diverse stakeholders and provide a structuring role in reflections on the future of

the landscape. The trackways have the advantage of representing a concrete manifestation that embodies more abstract notions of landscape and experience. This approach reflects projects elsewhere which are recognising that relatively overlooked aspect of landscape heritage, especially those that have long structured a region as a proper common service, whether trackways (e.g. Le Dû-Blayo et al 2015), irrigation networks or waterways (e.g. Martín Civantos 2015; Bertens 2018) have the potential to unify stakeholder interests.

In the other case studies different approaches have been taken to engage stakeholders focusing on understanding landscape biographies. Around Bagendon and Salmonsbury, where farmers had limited engagement with wider perspective on landscape change and many residents revealed perceptions of landscapes as largely static, different engagement approaches were developed. These included participatory augering events (**Fig. 9**; Tully and Allen 2018) with local farmers, residents and volunteers from the wildlife trust. Building on farmers' and wildlife group members' existing interests in how soils are formed and what species are used to identify past landscapes, these explored how archaeologists understand landscape change, explore past anthropogenic impact, and relate this to modern choices in landuse. Many participants have emphasised how these events transformed their understanding of the changing nature of these landscapes:

> "*I thought I had a long view of the landscape but I realise it was just a short one… what we have been shown today is what an effect previous generations have had on the landscape*" farmer, Bagendon.

> "*this has informed us how the landscape has been formed by natural and human activity over many generations and informs us how that links to what we are doing today*" landowner, Bagendon

At Ulaca, by contrast, the existing Luna festival (**Fig. 10**) was used, through workshop sessions and presentations, organised by REFIT, as a focus for engaging local stakeholders in discussion on choices in managing the landscape. In different ways, our work on *oppida* is thus seeking to focus less on disseminating knowledge from heritage stakeholders but to facilitate the possibility of developing new "bottom-up" approaches in these landscapes based on the highlighting their singularities. All of these approaches use the presence of the *oppida* to create forums, acting as hubs of discussion, but recognising the need to engage stakeholders through media that resonate with them and via forms of heritage that connects multiple stakeholders allowing the exploration of wider landscape concerns. Previously, in all our case studies, the relationship between the history of the territory and modern land use were not explicitly explained to non-specialist stakeholders. By taking a biographical approach to landscape we sought to mobilise the past to engage local communities in appreciating their place in longer landscape biographies ensuring more informed choices about managing existing and future landscapes (cf. Baas et al 2011, 51; Kolen and Renes 2015; Kolen et al 2015). Working coproductively with landscape co-ordinators, archaeology has the potential to demonstrate the dynamic nature of landscape biographies and the interaction of social, economic, ecological and aesthetic forces in creating landscape character.

Fig 9. - Here

Coproduction of landscape visions

Recognition of the need to connect *oppida* heritage to wider discourse on landscape means coproductively working with other stakeholders to incorporate information on archaeological heritage as part of its presentation to a wide set of stakeholders. Through the engagement events discussed above local stakeholders (farmers, residents, ecologists etc) could be accessed, but to ensure a greater reach to residents and other communities our analysis suggested other engagement tools were required. This included larger engagement events, for example at Salmonsbury, open-days were held (called 'Love your Landscape') which included participatory augering workshops to explain how archaeology can understand landscape change. These were coproduced with the Wildlife Trust, ensuring that heritage, ecology and agronomy were not seen as distinct aspects but integral to the landscape. To reach more diverse audiences and ensure sustainability videos of these events were created to enable greater numbers of stakeholders to engage with these landscapes remotely, as well as physically. Around Bibracte, open days held at local farms ('*La recherche est dans le pré*') brought researchers from different disciplines (archaeology; agronomy; ecology; anthropology) together to explain their work to local people. This engaged local residents and farmers in their own environment, rather than in the research centre context, through presentations that did not isolate heritage from other landscape aspects.

To foster greater awareness of the integrated nature of these landscapes we implemented the creation of downloadable landscape guides for all case studies. Coproduced with stakeholder organisations (the Wildlife Trust in the UK; *Parc naturel régional du Morvan* in France) these guides combine information on archaeology, ecology and modern land-use, incorporating perspectives (in the form of quotes) from relevant stakeholders (**Fig. 11**). These are formed around designated pathways with set information points (often at particular viewpoints) extemporising on different aspects of the landscape. The intention is that these will act as walking guides and sources of information which engender greater reflection on landscapes than subject-specific information. In addition, Bibracte has developed longer booklets (in multiple languages) outlining how the archaeological heritage is connected to the wider landscape (Tabary and Maillier 2015). This also includes excerpts from stakeholders reflecting on their engagement with Bibracte and the landscape. To ensure wider reach of these resources, digital interactive guides have also been produced for each landscape. These include videos providing perspectives from a variety of stakeholders, as well more in-depth information on archaeology, ecology and current landuse. Through dissemination of these resources via other stakeholders (the AONB and Wildlife Trust in the UK) we are likely to ensure greater use of these resources and cut across engagement with non-heritage stakeholder communities

Fig. 10 - Here

All of our engagement approaches emerge from recognising that only by working coproductively with other landscape stakeholders are we likely to embed archaeology in landscape biographies. The engagement approaches undertaken at Bibracte, in particular, reveal that for coproduction to be successful, they can be inspired by reflection on historical approaches to land management. In this, we have been inspired by reigniting and operationalising notions of landscapes as 'commons', a concept largely forgotten in France since the revolution (Goudiard 2017), in its potential to engage stakeholders as policy actors (Le Roy 2016; Spek 2017). This concept emphasises how landscapes are co-created, rather than ascribed, and that local stakeholders are integral to their character.

Fig. 11 - Here

Conclusions

Our assessment of the situation of integrated landscape management in our case studies emphasises the need to embed heritage and archaeology within broader approaches to landscape whilst engaging with a broad spectrum of stakeholders. Through assessing the current levels of integration we have recognised that there is significant, largely untapped potential for archaeology and specific heritage assets, like *oppida*, to be not just integrated but act as levers for consideration of the changing nature of landscape. REFIT is attempting to develop this through novel engagement events and creating spaces within the landscape to integrate stakeholders in landscape decisions. This process is an ongoing one with many of our activities part of longer term strategies, for example at Salmonsbury and Bibracte (Parry 2017; Guichard 2017a), and is already leading to a more integrated presentation of our landscapes. *Oppida*, whilst typifying many landscape issues, represent just one case study in how archaeological assets can act as foci in coalescing stakeholders on landscape issues. Other heritage elements of landscape are likely to face similar issues and have similar potential to be explored as levers in enhancing integrated landscape management.

REFIT emphasises that through coproduction with existing landscape coordinators there are pathways for ensuring archaeology is not perceived as a marginal 'cultural ecosystems service' but an integral aspect of the landscape. This is partly about raising the profile of frequently overlooked archaeological heritage, such as the *oppida*, but more crucially situating such monuments as part of a discourse on landscape biographies. Archaeology has the potential to act as lever to understand past landscapes, anticipate future changes and codefine the desirable future for landscapes of which all stakeholders are inheritors and contemporary participants. To do so, we need to act coproductively with other stakeholders to ensure that archaeologists do not leave landscapes to other disciplines (Fairclough 2002, 4).

Figures

1. Approximate distribution of monuments known as '*oppida*' across Europe with the location of the case study landscapes (drawn by Tom Moore)
2. Nature of landuse within the area encompassed by *oppida*, from a sample of 152 sites mainly in France (106), Germany (25) and Britain (11) (after Daval 2009)
3. Landscape designation (including forms of stewardship agreement) around (a) Bagendon and (b) Salmonsbury (drawn by Tom Moore)
4. Plan of Ulaca oppidum in its wider landscape.
5. Designations of the landscape around Bibracte

6. Proportion of stakeholders surveyed using questionnaires who were unable to identify any law or designation used to manage the landscapes of the 4 case study *oppida*.
7. Photo of information panel at Salmonsbury displaying only ecological information
8. Photo of landscape workshop in the Bibracte landscape
9. Photo of participatory augering event in the Bagendon landscape
10. Image of the Luna festival at Ulaca.
11. Image of interactive guide for Bagendon and downloadable guide to Salmonsbury (Greystones)

References

AFD (Agence française de Développement) 2017: *Opportunités et défis d'une approche par les communs de la terre et des ressources qu'elle porte*, Paris: ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères.

Almagro Gorbea, M./A. Mederos 2013: Archaeological Cultural Heritage in Spain,in V. Karageorghis and Ch. Bakirtzis (eds.) *Protecting the Cultural and Archaeological Heritage of the Mediterranean Region. Legal issues*, Nicosia: Foundation Anastasios Levantis, 65-76.

Álvarez Sanchís, J./J.Rodríguez Hernández 2016: Engagement strategies for Late Iron Age *oppida* in North-Central Spain. *Complutum*, 27 (2), 401-415.

Baas, H./B. Groenewoudt/E. Raap., 2011. The Dutch Approach. In M. Jones/M. Stenseke (eds.) *The European Landscape Convention. Challenges of Participation,* Dordrecht: Springer, 45-66

Benková, I./V. Guichard, (eds) 2009: *Gestion et présentation des oppida: un panorama européen*, Glux-en-Glenne: Bibracte 15.

Bertens, L. (2018) The EuWatHer project: optimizing the interplay between database and narrative. http://waterwaysexplorer.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/EUWATHER_Scientific-Report_122017.pdf

Bloemers, J.H.F, 2010: The Cultural Landscape and Heritage Paradox Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension, in J.H.F Bloemers/H. Kars/A. van der Valk/M. Wijnen (eds.), *The Cultural Landscape and Heritage Paradox: Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 3-16

Braive, P./J.P. Thibault, (eds) 2009: *Petit traité des Grands Sites: réfléchir et agir sur les hauts lieux de notre patrimoine*. Arles: Actes sud / ICOMOS -France.

Butler, A./U. Berglund, 2014: Landscape Character Assessment as an Approach to Understanding Public Interests within the European Landscape Convention, *Landscape Research*, 39 (3), 219-236

Castro, P.V./W. Chapman/T. Escoriza/S. Gili/V. Lull/R. Mico/C. Rihuete Herrada/R. Risch/M. E. Sanahuja Yll/P. Verhagen, 2002: Archaeology in the south east of the Iberian Peninsula: a bridge between past and future social spaces. In G. Fairclough/S. Rippon (eds.) *Europe's cultural landscape: Archaeologists and the management of change*, Brussels: Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, 133-142.

Chazelle, Cl., 2017: *Bibracte Mont-Beuvray. Gestion du Grand Site et de ses territoires. Elements de diagnostic paysager*, Clermont-Ferrand: Atelier Claude Chazelle. www.bibracte.fr/media/bibracte/163210-2017_chazelle_diagnostic_paysager.pdf

Chouquer, G., 2002: Patrimoine et paysages culturels. Actes du colloque international de Saint-Émilion (30 mai-1er juin 2001). Éditions Confluences, 2001, *Études rurales*, 163-164.

CoE (Council of Europe), 1992: *European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage* (Revised) (Valletta) (avialable at: https://rm.coe.int/168007bd25)

CoE (Council of Europe), 2000: *European Landscape Convention* (available at: https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016802f80c6)

CoE (Council of Europe) 2005: *Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (Faro). (available at: https://rm.coe.int/1680083746)

CoE (Council of Europe), 2006: *Landscape and Sustainable development. Challenges for the European Landscape convention*. Council of Europe publishing. Strasbourg.

Cornu, M./ Négri, V. 2012: *Code du patrimoine et autres textes relatifs aux biens culturels*. Paris: LexisNexis (Codes bleus).

Cotswold AONB, 2002: Landscape Character Assessment (available at: http://www.cotswoldsaonb.org.uk/landscape_character_assessment/introduction.htm)

Cotswold AONB, 2013: *Management Plan 2013-2018.* Cotswold AONB, Gloucestershire.

CRoW Act 2000: Countryside and Rights of Way Act (available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/contents)

Daval, C., 2009: Protection et accessibilité des *oppida*. Une approche statistique. In I. Benková/V.Guichard (eds.), *Gestion et présentation des oppida: un panorama européen*, Glux-en-Glenne: Bibracte 15, 27-32.

Darroux, C., 2017: Journée participative: paysage et patrimoine à Glux en Glenne – 11 juillet 2017. https://reflaction.hypotheses.org/386

Darroux, C. forthcoming : L'expérience politique du paysage : bricolages et singularités au cœur d'un renouvellement de label Grand Site de France (Bibracte-Morvan), *Développement durable et territoires*.

Darroux, C./V. Guichard/O. Thiébaut/Cl. Janin, forthcoming: La recherche-action participative dans le Grand Site de France de Bibracte - Mont Beuvray, un laboratoire de la fabrique territoriale par la médiation du paysage dans le Parc naturel régional du Morvan, in : *La montagne, territoire d'innovation*, colloque international, Grenoble, 11-13 janvier 2017.

DCMS (Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport), 2017: *Heritage Statement 2017*. (available at: www.gov.uk/dcms)

De Montis, A. 2014: Impacts of the European Landscape Convention on national planning systems: A comparative investigation of six case studies, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 124, 53-65.

DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), 2018: *A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment.* HM Government (available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Dietler, M. 1998: A Tale of Three Sites: The Monumentalization of Celtic *Oppida* and the Politics of Collective Memory and Identity, *World Archaeology* 30 (1), 72-89.

Di Gioia, L./ Chaumier, S. 2008: *Actualité du patrimoine. Dispositifs et réglementations en matière de patrimoine en France*, Dijon: Editions universitaires de Dijon.

Dunford, B. 2016: *The Burren Life programme*, Research series paper no. 9. National Economic and Social Council, Ireland.

Eagle, R./A. Jones/A. Greig, 2017: Localism and the environment: A critical review of UK Government localism strategy 2010–2015, *Local Economy* 32(1), 55–72.

Eloritta, B./ D. Sánchez Aguilera, 2011: Landscape regulation in regional territorial planning: a view from Spain. In Jones, M. and Stenseke, M. (eds.) *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 99-120.

Fairclough, G. 2002: Europe's landscape: archaeology, sustainability and agriculture. In G. Fairclough/ S. Rippon (eds.), *Europe's cultural landscape: Archaeologists and the management of change*, Brussels : Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, 1-12

Fairclough, G./ S. Rippon 2002: Conclusion: archaeological management of Europe's cultural landscape. Fairclough, G. and Rippon, S. (eds.), *Europe's cultural landscape: Archaeologists and the management of change*. Brussels : Europae Archaeologiae Consilium, 201-206.

Fewster, K. J., 2007: The Role of Agency and Material Culture in Remembering and Forgetting: An Ethnoarchaeological Case Study from Central Spain, *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology*, 20 (1), 89-114.

Fichtl, S. 2005. *La ville Celtique. Les oppida de 150 av. J.-C. à 15 ap. J.-C.*, Paris: Editions Errance.

Fluck, H./ V. Holyoak 2017: *Ecosystems Services, Natural Capital and the Historic Environment.* Research Report Series 19/2017. Historic England (available at https://www.historicengland.org.uk/research/research-results/research-reports/)

Forman, R. 1995: *Land Mosaics: The Ecology of Landscapes and Regions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fowler, P.J. 2003: *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes 1992 – 2002*, Paris: UNESCO. (World Heritage Papers; 6). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000133121

Frier, P.-L. (ed) 2004: *Le nouveau droit de l'archéologie preventive*, Paris: L'Harmattan.

García Martín, M./ C. Bieling/A. Hart/T. Plieninger 2016: Integrated landscape initiatives in Europe: Multi-sector collaboration in multi-functional landscapes, *Land Use Policy* 58, 43–53.

Goudiard, R. 2017: *12e Entretiens de Bibracte, La terre en partage, modes de propriété et de faire valoir, expériences et perspectives du Moye-Âge au XXIe siècle, libre retour écrit*, Glux-en-Glenne. http://www.bibracte.fr/media/bibracte/163210-2017_entretiens_bibracte_synthese.pdf

Guichard, V. 2012: An example of integrated management of a heritage site: Bibracte-Mont Beuvray (Burgundy, France) in C. Gambardella (ed.), *Less More Architecture Design Landscape. Le Vie dei Mercanti. X forum Internazionale di Studi*, Napoli : La sucuola di Pitagora (Fabbrica della Conoscenza; 16).

Guichard, V. 2014: 150 years of research at Bibracte - a national vs. European perspective, in Cl. von Carnap-Bornheim (ed.), *Quo vadis ? Status and future perspectives of long-term excavations in Europe. Papers presented at a workshop organized by the Archaeological State Museum (ALM) and the Centre for Baltic and Scandinavian Archaeology (ZBSA) on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the Archaeological State Museum, Schleswig, October 26th to 28th, 2011*, Neumünster / Hamburg: Wachholtz (Schriften des archäologischen Landesmuseums (Schleswig-Holstein), Ergänzungsreihe 10, 117-136.

Guichard, V. 2017a : Bibracte : le paysage au cœur du projet de site / Bibracte : Die Landschaft im Zentrum des Projekts der archäologischen Stätte, in C. Dunning/E. Dunning (eds.), *Paysages entre archéologie et tourisme / Landschaften zwischen Archäologie und Tourismus*, Bienne: ArchaeoTourism, 102-113.

Guichard, V. 2017b : Les *oppida*, une parenthèse dans l'histoire de l'Europe tempérée, *Pallas* 105, 159-171.

Guichard, V. 2018 : Raconter la construction des territoires: une nouvelle mission pour les musées d'archéologie, in J.-P. Demoule/D. Garcia/A. Schnapp (eds), *Une histoire des civilisations. Les révolutions de l'archéologie contemporaine*, Paris: La Découverte / Dominique Carré, 579-583.

Guichard, V./Cl. Chazelle 2007: Mettre en valeur l'invisible : réflexions sur le site archéologique de Bibracte (Nièvre, France), in M.-É Bellet/Cl.-A. Chazelles (eds.), *De la restitution en archéologie / Archaeological restitution*, Actes du colloque de Béziers 2004. Paris : Éditions du patrimoine (Idées et débats), 263-272.

Helm, D. 2015: *Natural Capital. Valuing our planet*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hercules 2017. http://www.hercules-landscapes.eu/resources.php?publications

Hernandez-Morcillo M/T. Plieninger/C. Bieling 2013: *An empirical review of cultural ecosystem service indicators*, London: Elsevier.

Hølleland, H./J. Skrede/S. B. Holmgaard 2017: Cultural Heritage and Ecosystem Services: A Literature Review, *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 19 (3), 210-237.

Ingold, T. 2000: *The Perception of the Environment : Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*, London: Taylor & Francis.

Jones, M. 2011: European landscape and participation: rhetoric or reality?, in M. Jones/M. Stenseke (eds), *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 27-44.

Jones, J./P. Silcock/T. Uetake 2015: *Public Goods and Externalities: Agri-environmental Policy Measures in the United Kingdom*, Paris: OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers 83.

Kolen, J./ H. Renes 2015: Landscape biographies: Key issues, In. J. Kolen/H. Renes/R. Hermans (eds.) *Landscape biographies. Geographical, historical and archaeological perspectives on the production and transmission of landscapes*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 21-48.

Kolen, J./C. Crumley/G.J. Burgers/K. von Hackwitz/P. Howard/K. Karro/M. de Kleijn/D. Löwenborg/N. van Manen/H. Palang/A. Printsmann/H. Renes/H. Scholten/P. Sinclair/M. Veld/P. Verhagen 2015: HERCULES: Studying long-term changes in Europe's landscapes, *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia* 45, 209-219.

Le Dû-Blayo, L./ V. Van Tilbeurgh/C. Thenail/D. Le Coeur 2015: Paths that Trace a Territorial Thought Through the Landscape, in Y.Luginbühl/P. Howard/D. Terrasson (eds), *Landscape and Sustainable Development: the French Perspective*, London: Routledge, 47-61.

Le Roy, E. 2016 : Des communs "à double révolution", *Droit et Société* 94, 603-624.

Luginbühl, Y. 2004 : *Convention européenne du Paysage. Bien-être individuel et social et paysage. Rapport sur le Thème 2 des Ateliers 2003. Document du Secrétariat Général de la Division de l'aménagement du territoire et du paysage*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.

Luginbühl, Y. 2012: *La mise en scène du monde. Construction du paysage européen*, Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Martín Civantos, J. M./ M.T. Bonet García 2015: MEMOLA project. Mediterranean Mountainous Landscapes: an historical approach to cultural heritage based on traditional agrosystems, *European Journal of Post-Classical Archaeologies* 5, 347-356.

Martínez, B./A. Castillo 2007: Preventive Archaeology in Spain, in K. Bozóky Ernyey (ed.), *European Preventive Archaeology. Papers of the EPAC Meeting, Vilnius-2004*, Hungary: National Office of Cultural Heritage, 187-208.

Michelin, Y./ T. Joliveau/C. Planchat-Héry 2011: Landscapes in participatory processes: tools for stimulating debate on landscape issues? A conceptual and methodological reflection from research action projects in France, in M. Jones/M. Stenseke (eds), *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 145-174.

Mitchell, N./M. Rössler/P-M. Tricaud (eds.) 2009: *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. A handbook for conservation and management*, Paris: UNESCO.

Moore, T., 2006: *Following the digger: the impact of developer-funded archaeology on academic and public perceptions of cultural landscapes.* 10th International Seminar of Forum UNESCO University and Heritage: Cultural Landscapes in the 21st century, International Centre for Cultural Heritage Studies (ICCHS), University of Newcastle, UK.

Moore, T., 2014: The birth of a capital? Bagendon 'Oppidum' and the impact of Rome on the British countryside. In D. Breeze (ed.) *The Impact of Rome on the British Countryside: a conference organised by the RAI, Chester, 11-13 October 2013,* London: The Royal Archaeological Institute, 26-30.

Moore, T., 2017: Alternatives to urbanism? Reconsidering *oppida* and the urban question in Late Iron Age Europe, *Journal of World Prehistory* 30 (3), 281-300.

Moore, T./G. Tully 2018: Connecting landscapes: examining and enhancing the relationship between stakeholder values and cultural landscape management in England, *Landscape Research* 43, 769-783.

NE (Natural England) 2009: *Experiencing Landscapes: Capturing the 'cultural services' and 'experiential qualities' of landscape (Study Report) Natural England Commissioned Report NECR024,* Sheffield: Natural England.

Négri, V. (ed.) 2015 : *Le patrimoine archéologique et son droit. Questions juridiques, éthiques et culturelles. Actes du colloque international, 9 et 10 octobre 2012, Musée du quai Branly (Paris)*, Bruxelles: Bruylant.

Ostrom, E. 1990: *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pára, L./A. Vourc'h 2012: Heritage Sites and Sustainable Tourism as Leverage for Local Development: the Grand Site de France Network Experience, P3T, *Journal of public policies and Territories* 1 (3), 17-29.

Parry, G. 2017. *Rural placemaking. Presentation to REFIT workshop 'Working across boundaries: Integrating different stakeholder approaches to Cultural Landscapes (Cirencester) 17-19 September 2017'* available at https://www.refitproject.com/refit-workshop-3-cirencester-sept-2

Pierrevelcin, G./V. Guichard, 2009. Protection et accessibilité des oppida. Bilan de la visite de quelques sites. In Benková, I./V. Guichard, (eds) 2009: *Gestion et présentation des oppida: un panorama européen*, Glux-en-Glenne: Bibracte 15, 15-26.

Powell, J. R./M. Clark 2003: *Cotswold AONB Survey 2002: Your Ideas, Concerns and Aspirations. Project Report.* Cheltenham: Cotswolds Conservation Board.

Querol, M. A./ A. Castillo 2012: Arqueología Preventiva y Patrimonio Mundial. El ejemplo español como base para el cambio en el ejercicio de la gestión arqueológica. in A. Castillo (ed.) *Actas del Primer Congreso Internacional de Buenas Prácticas en Patrimonio Mundial: Arqueología - Proceedings of the First International Conference on Best Practices in World Heritage Archaeology*, Editora Complutense, Mahón, 51-65.

Querol, M. A. 2003: Patrimonio Cultural y Patrimonio Natural. Una relación con futuro., in A. Moure (ed.) *Patrimonio Cultural y Patrimonio Natural. Una reserva de futuro*, Cantabria, 31-45.

Querol, M. A. 2010: *Manual de Gestión del Patrimonio Cultural*, Madrid: Akal.

Reed, M.S. et al. 2017: A theory of participation: what makes stakeholder and public engagement in environmental management work? *Restoration Ecology* (early view)

Reed, M.S., 2008: Stakeholder participation for environmental management: a literature review, *Biological conservation* 141 (10), 2417-2431.

Roberts, G. 1994. The cultural landscape, *Landscape Research* 19(3), 133-136

Roe, M.H. 2013: Policy Change and ELC Implementation: Establishment of a Baseline for Understanding the Impact on UK National Policy of the European Landscape Convention, *Landscape Research* 38 (6), 768-798.

Roger, A. (ed) 2009: *La théorie du paysage en France (1974-1994)*, Paris: Champ Vallon.

Ruiz del Arbol, M./A. Orejas 2008: Spain, in G. J. Fairclough/P. Grau Moller (eds.). *Landscape as Heritage. The management and Protection of Landscape in Europe, a summary by the COST A27 project* "LANDMARKS", Bern: Geographica Bernensia 79, 229-248.

Ruiz del Árbol, M./A. Orejas 2010: Protection and Management of Spanish Archaeological-historical landscapes. Possibilities and perspectives for the application of a protective and developemental approach, in J.H.F Bloemers/H. Kars/A. van der Valk/M. Wijnen (eds.), *The Cultural Landscape and Heritage Paradox: Protection and Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 477-491.

Ruiz Zapatero, G./J. Álvarez-Sanchís (eds.) 2011: *Castros y verracos. Las gentes de la Edad del Hierro en el occidente de Iberia*. Institución Gran Duque de Alba, Diputación de Ávila

Ruiz Zapatero, G./N. Salas 2008: Los vettones hoy: arqueología, identidad moderna y divulgación, in J. R. Álvarez Sanchís (ed.) *Arqueología Vettona. La Meseta Occidental en la Edad del Hierro. Zona Arqueológica, 12,* Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Regional, 408-423.

Sauer, C. O. 1925. The Morphology of Landscape. *University of California Publications in Geography* 2 (2), 19-53.

Selman, P., 2004. Community participation in the planning and management of cultural landscapes. *Journal of environmental planning and management*, 47(3), 365-392.

Short, C./J. Phelps J/D. Henehan/C. Staddon/S. Wells/J. Turvill 2014: *Cotswold Catchment Payments for Ecosystems Services Pilot: Catchment Based Approach Collaborative Project Demonstrating the Integrated Local Delivery Framework*, *Defra Project Report NE0144,Defra funded Round 2 PES pilot.* Gloucester: CCRI.

Soli, B. 2000: Protection of the environment and the role of archaeology, in F.McManamon/ A. Hatton (eds.). *Cultural Resource Management in Contemporary Society*, London: Routledge, 93-98.

Spencer, N. 2011. Participation within the landscape of the river Dart catchment, Devon, England, in M. Jones/M. Stenseke (eds), *The European Landscape Convention: Challenges of Participation*, Dordrecht: Springer, 239-260.

Spek, T. 2017: The Future of the Past. In C. Bieling & T. Plieninger (eds.), *The Science and Practice of Landscape Stewardship*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 148-163.

Stewart, P.J./ A. Strathern. 2003: *Landscape, memory and history. An anthropological perspective*, London: Pluto Press.

Swanwick, C., 2002: *Landscape character assessment: guidance for England and Scotland*. Wetherby: The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage.

Tabary, D./A. Maillier 2015 : *Bibracte - Mont Beuvray : Grand Site de France*, Paris: Les Nouvelles Éditions de l'Université.

Taylor, K./J. Lennon 2012: Introduction. Leaping the fence. In K. Taylor/J. Lennon (eds.), *Managing cultural landscapes*, London: Routledge, 1-17.

Terrasson, D. 2016: Introduction, in Y. Luginbühl/P.Howard/D. Terrasson (eds) *Landscape and Sustainable Development: the French Perspective*, London and New York: Routledge, 5-7.

Thibault, J.-P. (ed.) 2009: *Petit traité des Grands Sites. Réfléchir et agir sur les hauts lieux de notre patrimoine*, Arles: Actes Sud.

Trow, S./J. Grenville 2012: Agriculture, environmental conservation and archaeological curation in historic landscapes, in R. Skeates/C. McDavid/J. Carman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tudor, C. 2014. *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment*, Sheffield: Natural England.

Tully, G./M. Allen 2018: Participatory Augering: A methodology for challenging perceptions of archaeology and landscape change, *Public Archaeology*

Tully, G./C. Piai/J. Rodríguez Hernández/E. Delhommeau. 2019: Understanding Perceptions of Cultural Landscapes in Europe: A Comparative Analysis Using 'Oppida' Landscapes, *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice*, 10(2), 198-223

Tully, G./T. Moore. 2018. *Stakeholder Engagement in Cultural Landscape management in England: a case study from the Cotswolds. Enhancing sustainable management practice through mapping stakeholder networks and promoting knowledge exchange*. (report to Historic England)

Turner, S./G. Fairclough 2007: Common culture: the archaeology of landscape character in Europe. In D. Hicks/ L.McAtackney/G. Fairclough *Envisioning Landscape: situations and standpoints in Archaeology and Heritage*, Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press,120-145.

Turner, S. 2012. Landscape archaeology, in P. Howard/I. Thompson/E. Waterton (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*, London: Routledge, 131-142.

UN 1992. The Rio declaration on environment and development (available at http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/RIO_E.PDF)

UNECE (n.d) http://www.unece.org/env/pp/introduction.html

Van der Valk, A. 2010: Introduction: sharing knowledge – stories, maps and design, in J.H.F Bloemers/H. Kars/A. van der Valk/M. Wijnen (eds.)*, The Cultural Landscape and Heritage Paradox: Protection and*

Development of the Dutch Archaeological-Historical Landscape and its European Dimension, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 365-385.

Waterton, E. 2005. Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: cultural landscapes in England, *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11 (4), 309–325.

---

[1] We refer specifically to England, rather than the UK, because the agencies involved in landscape largely operate at national level (e.g. *Natural England*).

[2] Whilst 'European Landscape' has been a frame of reference for the ELC, we recognise that it does not constitute any sense of unity. Here we consider however that landscapes within Europe face a range of sometimes similar challenges for which cross-comparative studies of theoretical perspectives, methodologies and dialogue may be useful.

[3] For the purposes of this project, stakeholders were defined as those who can affect, or are affected by, decisions associated with these landscapes (Spencer 2011, 243). This may be directly, in the case of residents, or indirectly, in the case of government organisations.

[4] The term '*oppidum*' (sing.; '*oppida*' plural) derives from a Latin term used by classical writers such as Julius Caesar to describe pre-Roman settlements in Iron Age temperate Europe. The term has been applied by archaeologists to a variety of sites dating from the 4th century BC to 1st century AD which, although highly varied, have in common that they represent major social changes toward the end of the 1st millennium BC (Guichard 2017b; Moore 2017)

[5] France and the UK ratified the convention in 2006, Spain in 2007.

[6] France ratified the convention in 1995, the UK in 2000, and Spain in 2011.

[7] France ratified the convention in 2002, Spain in 2004 and the UK in 2005.

[8] For the Cotswolds: http://www.cotswold.gov.uk/residents/planning-building/planning-policy/local-plan-2001-2011/

[9] There are exceptions and examples of good practice (for example Cotswold Archaeology http://cotswoldarchaeology.co.uk/community/) but there is little compunction to do this aside from ensuring charitable status.