

Chapter 6

Cultural landscapes and planning in Spain

MARÍA DEL CARMEN CAÑIZARES RUIZ

University of Castilla-La Mancha

SUMMARY: I. THE RELEVANCE OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES. 1. *Cultural landscapes in the context of UNESCO*. 2. *The scarce attention paid to Cultural Landscapes in Spain*. II. THE NATIONAL PLAN FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES. 1. *Objectives, Categories and Methodological Aspects*. 2. *Implementation and most relevant Interventions*. III. CONCLUSIONS. IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY. *Web resources*.

I. THE RELEVANCE OF CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

All landscapes are, by definition, cultural as they are «accumulators of heritage that fixes the process that forms them: they are both products and examples of their history» (Martínez de Pisón, 2007: 330). As territorial heritage, they are the result of the appropriation of space by the society that has modelled them and with which they are identified (Fernández & Silva, 2015: 256). From this heritage conception of the landscape, they all include a set of inherited resources that are the reflection of the values, beliefs and traditions in continuous evolution, together with aspects of the environment that appear through the interaction over time between the people and the space (CE, 2009).

In order to correctly understand this, it is necessary to know the complementarity offered by the concepts of territory and heritage (Cañizares, 2009: p94 & ff.), as cultural landscapes appear through the hybridisation of these two concepts (Alonso, 2014: 221). The first concept, territory, is currently understood not only as the physical support of our activities, but also as «the most important heritage component of a human collective» (Fernández, 2005: 29). A «non-renewable, essential and limited asset», «a complex and fragile reality»

that «contains ecological, cultural and heritage values that cannot be reduced to the value of the land» (AA.VV., 2006). The interest lies in the material reality of its organisation and geographical structures, but also in the interpretation that the culture makes of this medium, that is, of the landscape (Cruz & Español, 2009: 40). If the territory is broken down into landscapes, it is easy to understand their cultural nature, since they are «the mark or sign that imprints character on each territory» (Mata, 2008: 158). The second concept, heritage, is the indispensable reference in the concept of heritage or legacy for future generations. It has undergone a paradigmatic metamorphosis centred on the displacement of attention concerning heritage from the object (or heritage asset) to the subject (or agent of heritage status) (Silva & Fernández, 2017: 131), stressing the value attributed by the population (identity) and the institutions. Today, heritage is object, action, product and process, including not only the assets received as legacies, but also the processes that allow us to understand them, place them in their context, perceive them, manage them, and even modify or destroy them (Fairclough, 2009: p31 & ff.; Mata, 2016: 547).

Over the last few years, the landscape has drawn closer to the heritage paradigm (Fernández & Silva, 2015) and it is clear that today «it is an element of identity and thus of heritage scope», a mirror of any society in which their achievements and aspirations are reflected, but also their defeats and paradoxes (Hernández, 2009; Fernández & Silva, 2016: 179). As social constructions, landscapes can thus «be interpreted as a social product, as the result of the collective transformation of nature and as the cultural projection of a society in a particular space» (Nogué, 2007b: 11-12). In this way, the heritage status of a landscape is the logical consequence of the discovery of its value by the population that inhabits and lives within it in varying ways; even, on occasion, for all humanity (Sanz, 2012: 700).

According to J. Nogué (2011: 139), the landscape is culture and, precisely because of this, it is also alive, dynamic and in continuous transformation, capable of integrating and assimilating, over time, elements that respond to important territorial modifications; provided that these modifications are not sudden, violent, or too fast or striking. All this demonstrates the clear tendency towards the convergence and complementarity of heritage and landscape, which takes place on a territorial scale (Mata, 2016: 546). Three dimensions allow us to appreciate the cultural essence of landscapes: the «spatial», the true quality of the landscape, arises from the superposition of territorial structures on different scales; the «temporal» reveals the dynamic

quality of the processes of which it is made up, or in other words, its evolution, in which some processes have been dominant; and finally, the dimension derived from the «perception», related to the experience and understanding that the individual has of the landscape through emotions, knowledge, identity, etc. (Cruz, 2015b: 13-16).

1. CULTURAL LANDSCAPES IN THE CONTEXT OF UNESCO

One of the institutions that have paid most attention to cultural landscapes, though sometimes under debatable criteria, is UNESCO (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). Initially, the *Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites* (1962) dealt with the preservation and, whenever possible, the restoration of the aspect of natural, rural and urban landscapes and sites. Later, the *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage* (1972) distinguished between assets linked to the natural heritage (natural monuments, geological and physiographic formations that make up threatened habitats, as well as natural sites or areas with strict boundaries) and those linked to the cultural heritage (monuments, ensembles and sites), which would be included as such in the World Heritage List. A new category, that of cultural landscape, was institutionalised in 1992 through the updating of the Practical Guidelines for the implementation of the Convention, in which *Cultural Landscapes* were defined as the «joint work of man and nature», places that combine the work of nature and that of man, and which are illustrative of the evolution of human society and the use of space over time. This all happens under the influence of physical limitations and/or opportunities presented by the natural environment and the successive social, economic and cultural forces (Fernández & Silva, 2015: 262). Thus began the international legal protection of cultural landscapes, cataloguing as such those that possessed «an exceptional universal value» and those that complied with one or more of the criteria established by UNESCO and submitted to periodic review (Cañizares, 2014: 154 & ff.). This gave them the «highest heritage recognition» (Fernández & Silva, 2015: 253), incorporating the territorial variable as a further element to be protected (Calderón & García, 2016: 77). Later, the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Convention* would classify cultural landscapes in three categories (UNESCO, 2008: 85 & ff.): 1: A landscape clearly defined, conceived and intentionally created by man; 2: An organically evolved landscape (relict or fossil, if its evolution ended at some point

in the past, and living if it still maintains an active social role); and 3: An associative cultural landscape.

Today, after some years, the deficiencies in conceptualisation are appearing, as well as some other problems concerning the typologies and a classification that has become obsolete; added to which we have the need to incorporate such elements as heritage perception, vectors and matrices (Fernández & Silva, 2016: 182 and following). Nevertheless, it is still a reference of undoubted importance, as it provides a «brand» image which is especially profitable in territorial marketing. In Spain, 45 assets are included in the World Heritage List, but only 3 are catalogued as cultural landscapes: the *Pyrenees Cross-Border Mountain Landscape of Monte Perdido* (Lost Mountain – Spain/France), registered in 1997; the *Cultural Landscape of Aranjuez* (Madrid), in 2001, characterised by the Baroque gardens around the Royal Palace of Aranjuez; and the *Cultural Landscape of the Sierra de la Tramontana* in Mallorca (Balearic Islands), in 2011, where the traditional cultivation on terraces (as can be seen in the image of Figure 1 below) stand out. Given the existing wealth of landscapes, there could be many more recognised heritage landscapes (cultural landscapes in the terminology of the UNESCO), as has been analysed by V. Fernández Salinas & R. Silva (2015: 276), who identified 38 landscapes susceptible to being incorporated into the UNESCO's World Heritage List.

Figure 1. **Cultural Landscape of the Sierra de la Tramontana (Mallorca, Spain)**



Source: M. Carmen Cañizares (2013)

2. THE SCARCE ATTENTION PAID TO CULTURAL LANDSCAPES IN SPAIN

Through the end of the last and the beginnings of this century in the scientific-academic sphere the landscape has become an element of special interest, encouraged by institutional contributions of an international and European nature. As part of a multidisciplinary vision benefitting from the protagonism of the territory, «Geography is recuperating the landscape, which had been studied as the physical manifestation of the actions of humanity on the natural medium, that is, as territorial heritage, in the sense of a spatial legacy received from our ancestors» (Molinero, 2016: 19). In this context, in order to consolidate a theoretical and methodological corpus around the landscape, the contributions of such Spanish geographers as E. Martínez de Pisón (2007, 2012), F. Zoido (2012), R. Mata (2003, 2008, 2015, 2016), C. Sanz (2003, 2012), J. Nogué (2007a, 2007b, 2011), V. Fernández Salinas (2005, 2015, 2016), R. Silva (2015, 2016, 2017), etc., have been fundamental. Also of great importance were the contributions of authors from other disciplines, such as J. Maderuelo (2005) and F. Sabaté (2015), together with the work of some research centres, such as the *Observatori del Paisatge* (Landscape Observatory) in Catalonia and the *Centro de Estudios Territorio y Paisaje* (Landscape & Territory Study Centre) in Andalusia.

This contrasts with the scarce institutional preoccupation there has been in Spain about the conservation of the landscape and its enhancement. The Ministry of Education, Culture & Sport only began to pay attention to this question following the *European Convention on Landscape* (Florence, 2000) and its official definition as «any part of the territory as perceived by the population, whose character is the result of the action of and interaction between natural and/or human factors». It was only then that state planning included some of them as cultural landscapes or as heritage elements. At the same time, the *Atlas of the Landscapes of Spain* (Mata & Sanz, 2003) was created and the progressive incorporation of the landscape into legislation was encouraged with the following Laws: Law 42/2007 on Natural Heritage and Biodiversity, Law 45/2007 on the Sustainable Development of Rural Areas, and Law 8/2007 on Land. To be more precise, the category of «cultural landscape» is only recognised in regional legislation by three regions: La Rioja (Law 7/2004 on Cultural, Historical and Artistic Heritage), Navarre (Law 14/2005 on Cultural Heritage), and Murcia (Law 4/2007 on Cultural Heritage) (Cañizares, 2014: 162-163).

These were, then, the first steps towards the knowledge, valuation and integration of development strategies, even though it was some time after other European countries. This delay can be explained by the *lack of territorial culture*, understood as «the individual and collective capacity to appreciate the peculiarities of each place and landscape, to establish similarities and differences between the various spaces, to contribute to the preservation of their qualities and to use them rationally; and also, where appropriate, to improve their potential so as to be able to transmit them to future generations» (Caravaca & Fernández, 2005: 5). In order to advance towards a consideration of the value of the landscape as heritage, it is essential to conserve and protect them, but also to manage them correctly in their condition as cultural and economic resources. It is a legacy in which human actions have a place if done «carefully and intelligently, so as not to deteriorate it and to shape it to the needs and aspirations of society today» (Sanz, 2012: 699). In this context, the geographer's work is particularly valid when «certain landscapes are subjected to very intense, brusque and fast transformations, which leads to an evident degradation and trivialisation, particularly in terms of a loss of symbolic, traditional and heritage values» (Nogué, 2007a: 373; Cañizares, 2016: 150). Yet it is also a question of the analysis of the landscape as a living element in continuous transformation. Heritage landscapes which, «due to their identity, exceptionality and/or representativity, require safeguarding and tutelage by the administration», that is, any landscape that can be protected for its natural and/or cultural values, following V. Fernández Salinas & R. Silva (2015: 274), who opt for this concept for general use, leaving cultural landscapes for those catalogued by UNESCO.

II. THE NATIONAL PLAN FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Within the framework of the state planning tools coordinated by the Institute for the Cultural Heritage of Spain (Ministry of Education, Culture & Sport), we find the *National Plan for Cultural Landscapes*. This is just one of 14 thematic National Plans whose creation was begun at the end of the 1980s. They are instruments for managing heritage, shared by the diverse administrations and with the participation of other public or private entities. The aim of these instruments is to develop criteria and methods, as well as a coordinated programme of activities that include interventions that promote protection, conservation, restoration, research, documentation, formation and

diffusion¹. All of these offer «an integrated view of heritage» with a spatial character, while also showing the relationships between the economic, social and political variables and the ethnographic, cultural and environmental characteristics of each space over time, through a holistic vision (Calderón & García, 2016: 84).

As with the others, this National Plan for Cultural Landscapes is a multidisciplinary instrument for integral management that foment knowledge and programmes interventions to protect the cultural assets and allow access to them, so that the people can enjoy them, through the following objectives: Active protection of cultural assets; Promoting knowledge through research; Preventive conservation; Programming of interventions; Coordination of the interventions; Encouraging citizen access; and Information and diffusion. A commission made up of technicians from the General Administration of the State, the Autonomous Regions and independent experts has been given the task of drafting it and it will then be approved by the Historic Heritage Council.

Faced with the complexity that cultural landscape entails, this Plan aims to work as a referee in the appropriate mechanisms of identification, protection and management on a national scale. The initial project is from 2002 (Base Document), together with the Cultural Landscapes Programme which, in 2004, started up several interventions² (Figure 2). It was finally approved by the Historic Heritage Council on October 4th 2012, mainly on the basis of the Spanish Constitution of 1978 (articles 46 and 149.2) and the *Law 16/1985, of June 25th, on Spain's Historic Heritage*. This law states that «the Administration of the State will adopt the necessary measures to facilitate collaboration with and between other public powers, as well as to gather and provide the necessary information». In addition, the

-
1. National Plans: 1. Cathedrals; 2. Abbeys, monasteries and convents; 3. Defensive Architecture; 4. Industrial Heritage; 5. Conservation of the Cultural Heritage of the 20th century; 6. Traditional Architecture; 7. Safeguarding the Immaterial Cultural Heritage; 8. Research into the Conservation of the Cultural Heritage; 9. Preventive Conservation; 10. Conservation of the Photographic Heritage; 11. Education and Heritage; 12. Emergencies and Risk Management in Cultural Heritage; y 13. Protection of the Archaeological Submarine Heritage (<http://www.mecd.gob.es/planes-nacionales/planes-nacionales.html>).
 2. Sub-project "Guiding Studies and Plans on Cultural Landscapes": Navapalos (Soria), El Paular (Madrid), Valle de Ricote (Murcia) and La Vera (Cáceres); Industrial Landscape of Ojos Negros (Teruel); Methodological bases for the creation of the Atlas of Vine Growing and its singular landscapes; Guiding Plans of the Mining Mountains of Cartagena-La Unión (Murcia) and of the Industrial Complex of the Royal Factory of Riópar (Albacete); and the Project for the Adaptation of the Landscape in the Bay of Bolonia (Cádiz).

Historic Heritage Council of Spain will facilitate «communication and the exchange of intervention programmes and information concerning Spain's Historic Heritage» (article 2). The said plans are specified as National Information Plans on Spain's Historic Heritage (article 35). Later, the *Royal Decree 565/1985 of April 24th*, which establishes the organic structure of the Ministry of Culture and its organisms, includes the figure of Conservation and Restoration Plans under the Institute of Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Assets (today the Institute of the Cultural Heritage of Spain). The current National Plans were born from these two figures: the Information Plans and the Conservation and Restoration Plans (SGT, 2015: 21).

Figure 2. Cultural Landscape of the Bay of Bolonia (Cadiz, Spain)



Source: M. Carmen Cañizares (2014).

In addition, it responds to the *European Territorial Strategy* (1999) in its interest in the «creative management of cultural landscapes» as one of the tenets of land management and, in particular, to the *European Convention on Landscape* (2000) in its demand for a commitment from the public administrations to create adequate management tools. In fact, it sets out an active policy on landscape that can contribute to the following factors: 1. A better consideration of the natural, ecological, environmental, cultural and economic values of Spain's landscapes, identifying the cultural landscapes and their relationship with the territorial uses. 2. The recognition of the legal character of the landscape (rights and obligations) as the basis for involving the administration,

activity sectors and social groups in the valuation, maintenance and improvement of the cultural landscapes on various different levels. 3. The introduction of cultural landscapes into the education and formation of experts and technicians. 4. Raising awareness among the population and public participation in collective territorial values, the cultural landscape and social and economic consensus. 5. Administrative consensus. 6. The incorporation and treatment of cultural landscapes in sectorial policies. 7. European and international cooperation on matters involving the landscape (SGT, 2015: 20).

Following R. Mata (2016: 546), it falls within the framework of «the semantic and political extension of the notion of heritage, of the “new heritage” that is mostly advocated in the Framework Agreement on the value of cultural heritage for society», signed in Faro in 2005, and in which heritage is democratised through public participation. This is based on several factors, such as the diversity of the many cultural values accommodated within Spain’s landscapes, the rising social demand for landscapes of quality, and the growing incorporation of landscape heritage in the touristic and territorial development strategies; all of this together with the very complex nature of landscape management itself and the vulnerability and threats to which some landscapes are subject (SGT, 2015: 7). It is a context in which there is an ever growing process of commercialisation of the common good (Calderón & García, 2016: 81) that is not always free from criticism.

Its sphere of application is national and it sees the *cultural landscape* asset as the object of the heritage policy and, therefore, incorporates heritage values and management on a territorial scale. This propitiates, from the cultural point of view, coordination and cooperation with other administrations (regional and local), as well as with other sectorial policies with a high incidence in the state and dynamics of the landscape (SGT, 2015: 7). Under this premise, cultural landscapes are the product of modifications that have taken place in a particular territory, as a consequence of the, fundamentally economic, policies applied, without forgetting the symbolic or ideological aspects (Cruz, 2005b: 228). This latter is why planning recognises landscape as a dynamic reality, as the result of processes that have happened over time. Planning also recognises landscape as complex, due to the quantity of natural and cultural, material and immaterial, components that intervene in the said processes, making their management even more difficult. Without doubt, all this subjects the landscapes selected for a heritage status process to a «top to bottom» legitimisation, offering them «an institutional recognition that generally transcends the local and assigns

values of a regional, national or international scope» (Silva & Fernández, 2017: 137). However, this sometimes comes up against the possibilities of assuming some proposals for the use and management of vulnerable landscapes and the scarcity of any specific legislation on landscape in Spain, especially of a regional nature (Calderón & García, 2016: 83).

1. OBJECTIVES, CATEGORIES AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Following the update document of the Plan (SGT, 2015: 23 & ff.), the main aim is the «safeguarding of landscapes of cultural interest», that is, the creation of measures to guarantee the viability of cultural landscapes, including such actions as identification and characterisation, documentation, investigation, protection, improvement, or revitalisation. To these, the necessary aspects of definition, delimitation, component analysis and management, were all added from a sustainable development perspective. Furthermore, this tool should contribute to achieving, among others, the following specific goals:

- The *identification, characterisation and safeguarding* of landscapes of particular cultural interest based on agreed guidelines. To elaborate a proposal for landscapes of particular cultural interest that also includes their valuation. To establish objectives, directives and specific lines of action to safeguard these landscapes, measures that will boost their character and values, but which are compatible with their evolution and development, as well as favouring their interpretation and the enjoyment of the public.

- *Social awareness and political recognition* through the impulse of social recognition and the awareness of public administrations and citizens concerning the dimensions and cultural values of the landscape. This should contribute to the incorporation of criteria for safeguarding these values in the form of policies, plans and sectorial interventions with an impact on the territory.

- *International, national and regional cooperation* through policies and networks of cultural landscapes on a European scale, especially for landscapes with cross-border characteristics. To promote cooperation between the different ministerial departments and between autonomous regions, as well as between the latter and the General State Administration, in particular to deal with interventions in cultural landscapes shared by more than one Autonomous Region. It should

also generate documentary knowledge and valuation databases for the inclusion of Cultural Landscapes in the UNESCO World Heritage List.

Cultural Landscape is defined as «the result of the interaction over time between people and the natural environment, whose expression is a territory perceived and valued for its cultural qualities, the product of a process and the basis of the community's identity» (SGT, 2015: 25). Thus, a new focus is adopted, in that it is not restricted to landscapes of exceptional value, following the European Landscape Convention (Mata, 2016: 553). It faces a «dynamic and complex» reality, which is «difficult to manage» and which must also contemplate its holistic nature, the multidisciplinary character, the many scales of landscape as a territorial fact, the agents involved, the vulnerability of the character of the landscape, the conflicts of ownership and use, the scarce development in specific landscape legislation and the mainly private ownership of the land. It also establishes the following *landscape categories* (Table 1) derived from the activities that a greater shaping power has had, depending on the historic perspective.

Table 1. Landscape Categories included in the National Plan for Cultural Landscapes

Categories
<i>Agricultural, farming and forestry, either independently or associated (historical agricultural-silvo-pastoral systems), marine, fluvial and hunting activities. Artisan activities connected with the above</i>
<i>Industrial activities: mining, large industry, energy, etc.</i>
<i>Exchange and commercial activities, associated especially with the coastal and/or fluvial environments</i>
<i>Activities related with social events of a leisure, symbolic, religious or artistic nature...</i>
<i>Offensive-defensive activities, such as defensive installations, battlefields...</i>
<i>Urban systems or historic settlements with protagonism in the construction of certain landscapes over time (*)</i>
<i>Large communication, transport and hydraulic infrastructures, as the main agents of images of the historical construction of the landscape</i>
<i>Scenarios associated with historical events</i>
<i>Itineraries and routes that generate cultural landscapes</i>

(*) Considered in a specific way, when they have a major role in the model and historical image of certain landscapes.

Source: (SGT, 2015: 27).

From the methodological point of view, the progressive complexity and dispersion in the territory of all the entities that are currently considered to be cultural assets, whether material or immaterial, as well as their spatial, functional and historical connections, must all be taken into account in identifying and selecting landscapes. For this reason, the procedure used starts with the analysis of the cultural values of the landscape as a whole, not only of those considered to be singular or of cultural interest, as well as of their contextualisation within the framework of complex territorial heritage systems which provide the necessary heritage coherence. The three main aspects are identification, selection and classification; yet the fact that it is necessary «to attend in most cases to dominances or processes that predominate in the historical construction, in the functioning and in the image and perception of a particular landscape» (SGT, 2015: 30) must also be taken into account. The *valuation criteria* are of three types: *Intrinsic values*: typological representativity, exemplarity, territorial significance, authenticity, integrity and singularity; *Heritage values*: the historical, social, environmental and procedural significance (productive activities, rituals, popular manifestations, etc.); and *Potential values and viability*: the legal situation that allows their safeguarding and management, fragility and vulnerability, and their viability and social profitability. On the other hand, the *instruments of the plan* are set out in the *Inventory or Registry*, which allows landscapes of cultural interest to be identified prior to any selection procedure; *Studies* (integral and specific) which provide the necessary knowledge about a particular landscape, as well as a diagnosis of its values, problems and dynamics, on the basis of which it is possible to establish the criteria for safeguarding and viability; and *Resources*, such as toponymy, cartography, old and current aerial photography, historic photography of the land, documentary, bibliographic and oral sources, remote-sensing and georeferencing.

Three specific types of document are also considered within the Plan: 1. the *Master Plans* to know a landscape in depth; 2. The specific *Concrete intervention projects* to evaluate the objectives of landscape quality; and 3. the *Management plans* to establish the interventions and programmes, adequacy of uses, strategies and objectives of landscape quality coordinated by a managing body. Once approved, it is the Technical Monitoring Commission of the Plan, which has a multidisciplinary nature, which is responsible for evaluating the theoretical aspects and proposing lines of action, criteria, methodology and possible interventions.

2. IMPLEMENTATION AND MOST RELEVANT INTERVENTIONS

For implementation, preventive conservation is considered to be relevant, as it includes the characterisation of a concrete territorial environment, the identification of the values that define its character and the desire of society to integrate them into their daily life and to perpetuate them for future generations. It also includes the participation of people alongside rights and responsibilities towards the landscape and access to it. For some years now, the Plan has been carrying out several interventions aimed at enhancing some of the most relevant cultural landscapes in Spain (Table 2).

Table 2. **Interventions carried out within the framework of the National Plan on Cultural Landscapes**

Intervention	Location
Methodological bases of the Atlas of Vine Cultivation (2008)	Various regions
Thematic Comparative Study: The Landscapes of the Olive in Spain (2012)	Various regions
100 Cultural Landscapes of Spain (2015)	Various regions
The Landscape of the High Lozoya Valley or the Valley of El Paular. Allotments and Gardens of the Monastery of Santa María of El Paular (2002-2014)	Rascafría (Madrid)
Restoration of the Moorish cemetery around the Tower of Hercules (2005-2007)	La Coruña (Galicia)
Study of the cultural landscape of the district of La Vera (2006)	Caceres (Extremadura)
Study of the cultural landscape of the valley of Ricote (2007)	Ricote (Murcia)
Study of the historic garden of Abadía (2007)	Abadía (Extremadura)
Restoration of the Muslim cemetery and the garden wall n.º 1 of the Generalife (2008 & 2012-2013)	Granada (Andalusia)
Ethnographic Documentation of the Wine Growing Area (2009-2010)	Madrid
Ethnographic Documentation of the Wine Growing Area (2009-2011)	Álava (Basque Country)

Intervention	Location
Study of the Ethnographic Documentation of the Wine Growing Area (2009-2010)	Cangas de Narcea (Asturias)
Study of the Ethnographic Documentation of the Wine Growing Areas (2009-2010 & 2010-2011)	Toro & Valdevimbre-Los Oteros (Castile & León)
Study of the Ethnographic Documentation of the Wine Growing Areas (2010-2011)	Mondéjar & Mérida (Castile La Mancha)
Landscape intervention in the Bay of Bolonia (2010-2013)	Cadiz (Andalucía)
Methodology for registering Landscapes of Cultural Interest in Andalusia (2013-2014)	Almeria, Cadiz, Cordoba, Huelva, Jaen & Malaga
Quality Plan of the Urban Landscape of Lorca (2015)	Lorca (Murcia)

Source: National Plan on Cultural Landscape (<http://www.mecd.gob.es/planes-nacionales/actuaciones/paisaje-cultural.html>).

Interventions, studies, inventories and other results of the developed activity are included³, either for the Spanish regions as a whole, indicated in the first place, or for concrete spaces, on occasion not without a certain amount of opportunism. There is a certain protagonism of interventions in particular landscapes with agricultural activities, for instance, those connected with vineyards and their designations of origin, essential for creating the *Atlas of the traditional cultivation of the vine and its singular landscapes* published in 2016. For its importance, we should mention the representative Catalogue of the *100 Cultural Landscapes of Spain* (Cruz, 2015a), as a first approximation to the documental registry of landscapes of cultural interest, selected by each Autonomous Region. Elaborated on the basis of a previously established methodology, it allows a first identification and documentation of landscapes of cultural interest in the form of an indicative list of those that are part of the National Plan on Cultural Landscape. It includes landscapes chosen for their representativeness,

3. To these we should add the Research Projects LANDMARKS Action COST A27, Understanding pre-industrial structures in rural and mining landscapes (2005-2007), and Cultural 2000 with the Ministry of the Environment, EUCALAND "European Agricultural Landscapes" (2008-2009).

typology and geographical diversity based on a classification in four large thematic landscape groups: Agricultural, farming and forestry; Industrial, infrastructure and commercial activity; Urban, historic and defensive; and finally symbolic. The following image (Figure 3) shows one of them, the old salt mines of the Valley of Añana in Álava, which has recently presented its candidature for inclusion in the UNESCO World Heritage List as a cultural landscape.

Figure 3. **Cultural Landscape of the Salado de Añana Valley (Álava, Spain)**



Source: M. Carmen Cañizares (2016)

Landscapes «breathe the culture and soul of the human beings who have lived in them, who have passed through them and who have left their mark on them» (Déjeant-Pons, 2015: 12). In some cases, those that already clearly enjoy deserved recognition have not been included, in order to favour other lesser known landscapes that nevertheless have great cultural value, but have suffered from unfair characterisation. Similarly, some landscapes threatened by loss of activity because of a change in the legal situation or through building pressure have

also been stressed (Mata, 2016: 558). They are landscapes which have mostly been turned into heritage, as has happened in other cases, once they have been perceived, lived, characterised and transformed by their populations (Gómez, 2013: 16) and which now have their value recognised through planning.

Finally, it should be pointed out that there is also an important quantity of graphic documentation collected in the Media Library, associated with each National Plan, with mainly complementary information from documentaries by Spain's public television. In this case in particular, there are videos with the conclusions of the Seminars celebrated on Cultural Landscapes and World Heritage, as well as several other documentaries («Spain at ground level», etc.).

III. CONCLUSIONS

If, as stated in the *European Landscape Convention*, this is a «fundamental component of European natural and cultural heritage that contributes to the wellbeing of human beings and to the consolidation of the European identity», the institutional attention through state planning for cultural landscapes in Spain is a relevant fact. The National Plan on Cultural Heritage, within the framework of State planning coordinated by the Institute for the Cultural Heritage of Spain, although it has taken some time to become consolidated, does provide the basis for dealing with «management adapted to the present time that avoids fossilisation and contributes to local development» (SGT, 2015: 4), as resources capable of generating new development models (Fernández & Silva, 2016: 180). This aspect is outstanding because, due to its living and evolutionary character, the challenge for cultural landscapes lies more in the management of the transformations than in the pure protective tutelage (Mata, 2015: 38). It is also worth pointing out that this Plan is important due to its being a place of multidisciplinary encounter and reflection on landscape, as well as for its leadership role on «involving all the administrations in implementing protection policies for the landscape within the sphere of their competences» (Calderón & García, 2016: 84). Neither should we forget the detected shortcomings with respect to a still notable distance between the theoretical bases (objectives, criteria, instruments, etc.) and their practical application at the time of really protecting landscapes of cultural interest, as well as the scarce correlation between their approaches with a weak legislation on landscapes in Spain on different scales.

It has been said that it provides «a formidable vision of contemporary Spain, in favour of the integration of the landscape dimension in Spanish policies» (Déjeant-Pons, 2016: 11), and this should be understood in relation to the changes that have happened around the concepts of territory and heritage, and even landscape, within the framework of the institutional processes leading to heritage status that assign them alternative values to those the population that uses them may give them. To quote Rafael Mata, geographer and member of the Commission for Monitoring the Plan: «there is still much to be done, but it seems to us that the path ahead is clear» (Mata, 2016: 560).

To conclude, it should be pointed out that, from the perspective offered by Spanish Geography, «the landscape is in fashion» and academic reflection has contributed to the heritage status of certain landscapes (Silva, 2016: 56 & 60). It is a driven interest, because these landscapes allow us to discover different material (buildings, etc.) and immaterial (culture, traditions, etc.) elements that make up identities which are enormously valuable for geographers to be able to understand how a territory and its population has evolved, unravelling the relations between man and nature (Cañizares, 2016: 437). In other words, how man has adapted to the environment and been able to survive in it. Furthermore, it is often an interest related with territorial development strategies, which are vital for some territories in times of crisis, and which are generally related with tourism.

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALONSO, P.: «La transición al post-productivismo: parques patrimoniales, parques culturales y ordenación territorial», *EURE* vol. 40, n. 119, 2014, pp. 217-238.
- CALDERÓN, B. AND GARCÍA CUESTA, J.L.: «Patrimonio y Territorio en España: fundamentos y estrategias para la gestión de la cultura territorial», In MANERO, F. AND GARCÍA CUESTA, J.L. (Coords.): *Patrimonio Cultural y Desarrollo Territorial*. Pamplona, Thomson Reuters Aranzadi, 2016, pp. 51-105.
- CAÑIZARES, M.C.: «Cultura y patrimonio en clave territorial: las aportaciones del geógrafo», In FERIA, J.M.; GARCÍA, A. AND OJEDA, J.F. (Coords.): *Territorios, sociedades y políticas*. Sevilla, Universidad Pablo de Olavide y AGE, 2009, pp. 93-105.
- «Paisajes culturales, ordenación del territorio y reflexiones desde la Geografía en España», *Polígonos. Revista de Geografía*, n. 26, 2014, pp. 147-180.

- «Paisajes culturales e iniciativas de recuperación del patrimonio industrial minero en España», In SÁNCHEZ, F.J. (Coord.): *Nuevas estrategias en la gestión del patrimonio industrial. I Congreso Internacional de Patrimonio Industrial y de la Obra Pública*. Sevilla, Fundación del Patrimonio Industrial de Andalucía, 2016, pp. 435-452.
- CARAVACA, I. Y FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V. (Coords.): *Jornadas de Patrimonio y Territorio*. Sevilla, Junta de Andalucía, 2005.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE (CE) (ED): *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg, 2009.
- CRUZ, L.: «Plan Nacional de Paisaje Cultural», In AGUILÓ, M. (Ed.): *Jornadas sobre Paisajes Culturales*. Madrid, Cyan, Proyectos y Producciones Editoriales, 2005, pp. 223-231.
- (Coord.): *100 Paisajes Culturales en España*. Madrid, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Secretaría General Técnica, 2015 (a).
- «El Paisaje Cultural», In CRUZ, L. (Coord.): *100 Paisajes Culturales en España*. Madrid, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Secretaría General Técnica, 2015 (b), pp. 13-16.
- CRUZ, L. AND ESPAÑOL, I.: *El paisaje: de la percepción a la gestión*. Madrid, Liteam, 2009.
- DEJEANT-PONS, M.: «El Plan Nacional de Paisaje Cultural y el Convenio Europeo del Paisaje», In CRUZ, L. (Coord.): *100 Paisajes Culturales en España*. Madrid, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Secretaría General Técnica, 2015, pp. 11-12.
- FAIRCLOUGH, G.: «New heritage frontiers», In COUNCIL OF EUROPE: *Heritage and Beyond*. Strasbourg, 2009, pp. 29-41.
- FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V.: «Patrimonio o Desarrollo ¿realidad o deseo?», In CARAVACA, I. AND FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V. (Coords.): *Jornadas de Patrimonio y Territorio*. Sevilla, Junta de Andalucía, 2005, pp. 29-61.
- FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V. AND SILVA, R.: «Criterios para la identificación y selección de paisajes españoles susceptibles de ser incluidos en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial de Unesco», *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, n. 68, 2015, pp. 253-278.
- «Deconstruyendo los paisajes culturales de la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial de la Unesco», *Cuadernos Geográficos*, n. 55(1), 2016, pp. 176-197.
- GÓMEZ MENDOZA, J.: «Del patrimonio paisaje a los paisajes patrimonio», *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, vol. 59/1, 2013, pp. 2-20.
- HERNÁNDEZ, M.: «El paisaje como seña de identidad territorial», *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles*, n. 49, 2009, pp. 169-183.
- MADERUELO, J.: *El paisaje. Génesis de un concepto*. Madrid, Abada, 2005.

- MARTÍNEZ DE PISÓN, E.: «Paisaje, cultura y territorio», In NOGUÉ, J. (Ed): *La construcción social del paisaje*. Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva, 2007, pp. 325-337.
- «Sobre la idea y enseñanza del paisaje», *Nimbus* n. 29-30, 2012, pp. 373-380.
- MATA, R.: «El paisaje, patrimonio y recurso para el desarrollo territorial sostenible. Conocimiento y acción pública», *Arbor*, vol. CLXXXIV, n.º 729 (enero-febrero), 2008, pp. 155-172.
- «Paisajes culturales de las actividades agrícolas, ganaderas y forestales», In CRUZ, L. (Coord.): *100 Paisajes Culturales en España*. Madrid, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, Secretaría General Técnica, 2015, pp. 26-39.
 - «El Plan Nacional de Paisaje Cultural. Una iniciativa para el conocimiento, la cooperación y la salvaguarda de paisajes de alto interés cultural», In FUNDICOT (Ed.): *Nuevos tiempos, nuevos objetivos*. Fuerteventura, Gobierno de Canarias y Otros, 2016, pp. 545-560.
- MATA, R. AND SANZ, C.: *Atlas de los Paisajes de España*. Madrid, Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, 2003.
- MOLINERO, F.: «Los paisajes patrimoniales en el desarrollo rural», In LECO, F. (Ed.): *Territorio y Desarrollo Rural: aportaciones desde el ámbito investigador*. Cáceres, Junta de Extremadura y Otros, 2016, pp. 15-38.
- NOGUÉ, J.: «Territorios sin discurso, paisajes sin imaginario. Retos y dilemas», *Ería. Revista de Geografía*, n. 73-74, 2007 (a), pp. 373-382.
- «El paisaje como construcción social», In NOGUÉ, J. (ed): *La construcción social del paisaje*. Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva, 2007 (b), pp. 11-24.
 - «Paisaje, Identidad y globalización», *Fabrikart*, n. 7, 2011, pp. 136-145.
- SABATÉ, J.: «De la preservación del patrimonio a la ordenación del paisaje», *Urbano*, vol. 7, n. 10, 2015, pp. 42-49.
- SANZ, C.: «Paisaje y Patrimonio Natural y Cultural: historia y retos actuales», *Nimbus*, n. 29-30, 2012, pp. 687-700.
- SGT (SECRETARÍA GENERAL TÉCNICA) (ED.): *Plan Nacional de Paisaje Cultural*. Madrid, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2015 (Edición Actualizada). On line <http://www.mecd.gob.es/planes-nacionales/dms/microsites/cultura/patrimonio/planes-nacionales/textos-planes-nacionales/05-maquetado-paisaje-cultural.pdf>.
- SILVA, R.: «Paisaje, patrimonio y territorio. Algunos apuntes desde la perspectiva geográfica española», In COMITÉ ESPAÑOL DE LA UGI:

Crisis, globalización y desequilibrios sociales y territoriales en España. Madrid, AGE y Otros, 2016, pp. 56-64.

SILVA, R. AND FERNÁNDEZ SALINAS, V.: "El nuevo paradigma del patrimonio y su consideración con los paisajes: conceptos, métodos y perspectivas", *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, vol. 63/1, 2017, pp. 129-151.

UNESCO: *Operational Guidelines on Implementation of the World Heritage List.* WHC. 08/01, January 2008. On line <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide08-en.pdf#annex3>.

VV.AA.: *Manifiesto por una Nueva Cultura del Territorio.* 2006. On line <http://www.geografos.org/images/stories/interes/nuevacultura/manifiesto-por-una-nueva-cultura-del-territorio-d5.pdf>.

ZOIDO, F. "El Paisaje, un concepto útil para relacionar ética, estética y política", *Scripta Nova* vol. XVI, N. 407, 10 de julio de 2012. On line <http://www.ub.edu/geocrit/sn/sn-407.htm>

WEB RESOURCES

<http://www.mecd.gob.es/planes-nacionales/planes-nacionales.html> Planes Nacionales. Instituto del Patrimonio Cultural Español.

<http://ipce.mcu.es/pdfs/convencion-florenca.pdf> Convenio Europeo del Paisaje.

http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=45692&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html Lista del Patrimonio Mundial. UNESCO.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/> UNESCO. Paisajes Culturales.