

Cultural landscapes: Discourse since UNESCO 1992

Edwin O. K'oyoo

Department of Architecture & Design, University of Rwanda

*Corresponding author: edwinkoyoo@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.62049/jkncu.v5i1.448>

Abstract

Cultural landscapes (CLs) is a recognized concept within urban and rural landscapes since introduction by UNESCO in 1992. CLs are valued for the landscape characters and heritage values attached to them. Memories due to history that shape identities are also important contribution by CLs. Studies on CLs in Africa as part of the Global South are scanty despite the importance of these landscapes. The study involved content analysis of open access articles on “cultural landscape” and related term of “cultural heritage landscapes”. Findings reveal three categories of various CL typologies and scales by UNESCO with several inscribed-on world heritage list so far. Apart from the culture and nature as the main ingredients in CLs, studies among scholars have been carried to assess and document various sub dimensions that vary from place to place depending on landscape characteristics and aspects of culture. Areas of concern in the discourse include threats from land uses due to urbanization, agriculture. There is need for public participation in preparation of inventories through identification and assessment, need for policies to guide their conservations at different levels. The study recommends enacting of local policies at the national and lower levels to protect, conserve and manage the CLs that have already been recognized for protection after inventorying.

Keywords: Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Heritage Landscapes, Cultural Heritage Sites, Conservation, Urban Heritage, Landscape Approach, UNESCO

Introduction

There has been increasing attention placed on cultural landscapes since UNESCO 1992 introduced it under the world heritage categories. According to UNESCO (2002) CLs have become a hot topic in the past years in the world's heritage work due to the man and nature combined aspect that they represent. The inclusion of CLs under World Heritage Convention should help to promote greater awareness of landscape issues in general everywhere (UNESCO, 2002). According to UNESCO (2009:19) cultural landscapes “are regions of the world that express along and intimate relationship between peoples and their natural environments, reflecting specific techniques of sustainable land use, the characteristics and limits of the cultural environment they established in a specific spiritual relation with nature” (UNESCO, 2009). In 1992, the World Heritage Committee agreed that CLs could meet the criteria of “outstanding universal value”. Section 37 defines CLs as “diversity of manifestations of the interactions between humankind and its natural environment”. Vernacular landscapes are found in both UNESCO and IUCN provisions protected landscape approach. According to ICOMOS (2008) a cultural landscape is defined as “a combination of nature and man-made works that emphasizes the structural and harmonious interactions between man and their environments”. Assessments of CLs have been carried out by both International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in conjunction with support of UNESCO. The importance and recognition of CLs across the world is being championed by these three international bodies among others.

Toma and Buisson (2022); Jelen et al., 2021 ; Viami et al. (2017); Cuerrier et al. (2015); Nezhad et al. (2015), Taylor and Lennon (2011); Mitchell and Buggery (2000) support the consideration of cultural landscapes as landscapes that are a reflection of interactions between the people and environments over a long period of time. Toma and Buisson (2022) however posit that in terms of geography, the current research is strongly based in Europe and North America (Toma & Buisson, 2022). Cuerrier et al. (2015) introduce the term cultural key places (CKP) within the discourse of cultural landscapes. These authors opine that CKP is a way that portrays places that exhibit strong cultural attachments and that they need to be considered in any proposed development activities. CKPs according to these authors are critically important to a people's life and identity and as such need effective protection from biocultural perspective in addition to special conservations and preservations because they are vital to cultural groups. The salience of such places is due to the historical ties, sense of identity in addition to cultural practices, features within the geographical locale. The role of the people within it in shaping them up is also of importance as this happens in a dynamic manner (Cuerrier et al., 2015).

Jelen et al. (2021) present the term heritage landscapes and defines it to mean landscapes that are as a result of historical cultural landscape elements that possess religious meanings. They are especially observed landscapes that are specific and highly individual (Jelen et al., 2021). Capelo et al. (2011) state that many CLs represent high heritage values and as such should be classified as heritage landscapes. This is supported by Taylor and Lennon (2011) who describe CLs as historic landscapes with heritage values. Schulp et al. (2019) state that CLs are valued for character and heritage values within their landscapes despite threats from urbanization and agricultural activities that result from land use changes on CLs. Mitchell and Buggery (2000) supported by Scazzosi (2004) present a perspective that recognizes the continuity between the past and the people within a given CL. The people concerned could be living or working on the CL land today. Pillars of importance for such CLs should include concepts of sense of place, connections to past life

experiences in addition to cultural identity. All these aspects should act to deepen and broaden the relevance of CLs in terms of conservation. These authors posit that the major concern for CLs has been on aspects of human history, cultural traditions in terms of continuity and lastly the ecological values and other values associated with social life and aspirations. (Mitchell & Buggey, 2000).

Research Methods

The study employed content research design in investigating the cultural landscapes concept. The review covers relevant secondary data from peer-reviewed journal articles among other online sources. Relevant sources picked for this study were mainly from open access platforms like Google and Google Scholar that are free. The search for the review materials was by using the main term “cultural landscapes”. Allied concepts of “cultural heritage landscapes”, “cultural heritage sites” were also included in the study. Each source was analyzed according to its contents for any inclusion of the cultural landscape concept within the title, abstract and key words. The review included articles and book chapters in English language. All the relevant sources that were relevant to the study topic were included from all regions. This review provides a discourse on cultural landscapes as a common concept since introduction by UNESCO 1992 under the world heritage categories. The review attempts to give a nuanced understanding of this important aspect of both the urban and rural landscapes alike.

Theory

Scales and Typologies of CLs

UNESCO (1992) recognized cultural landscapes under three categories. These include landscapes of universal value that are worth listing under heritage listing. The categories include: “Clearly defined landscapes that are designed and intentionally created by man, the second category are “organically evolved landscapes in two categories first as relict or fossil landscape in which an evolutionary process has come to an end but where its distinguishing features are still visible, second is the continuing landscape which retains an active social role in contemporary society associated with a traditional way of life and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress and where it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time. The third and last category comprises “associative cultural landscapes, the inclusion of such landscapes is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than the material cultural evidence” (UNESCO, 1992). According to UNESCO (2009:36) many vernacular and associative landscapes are places of living heritage with intangible values, they are often shaped by traditional land use practices which are influenced by developments within a larger economic environment. The policies under these provisions act to promote the protection, management, planning and governance of the vernacular landscapes as part of the cultural landscapes.

Sirisrisak and Akagawa (2007), Munarriz (2010) state that CLs have different characteristics in each region that depends on the cultural backgrounds and geographical conditions. According to UNESCO (2002) the committee on CLs seems to have given little thought to the urban landscapes. This is despite the fact that several CLs contain whole or significant extents of urban settlements. Towns are indeed a marked characteristic of world heritage CLs in practice. This points out that urban landscapes can be excellent CLs (UNESCO, 2002). CLs have been studied by various authors in various contexts and scales. Burgi et al. (2017b) inquires if CLs also include everyday landscapes that are not necessarily of aesthetic appeal or valuable historically but have also been shaped by activities of humans. Cuerrier et al. (2015) state that

there are different ranges of different types of sites that are culturally significant and the scales at which they may be identified. These authors opine that what may be profoundly significant to particular individuals or a family of people may as well be considered at a broad scale in terms of assessment at a broader scale to be cultural landscapes.

IUCN (2005) describes CL as a meeting point between nature and the people, between the present and the past and between the values that are considered as intangibles and the tangible. According to IUCN (2013) the International Union for Conservation of Nature has an interest in CLs in terms of advice on natural aspects. Its activities has convergence of interest with UNESCO’s world heritage committee because of two reasons: First, some of the places are of value both as protected areas and as world heritage CLs and second because the same ideas have been at work in both IUCN’s view of protected areas and within the world heritage community (IUCN, 2013). IUCN (2013) and UNESCO (2012) have identified several natural heritage qualities of CLs. These include conservation of biodiversity in the wild nature, conservation of biodiversity within the farming systems, sustainable land uses, enhancing of scenic beauties (IUCN, 2013).

Components of CLs

According to Jelen et al. (2021) identification of the different types of CLs requires consideration of both the natural and cultural elements that are in place. Schulp et al. (2019) state that a common understanding of the CLs should encompass the qualities that make up their structure in addition to the meanings of high value to the people concerned. Shamsuddin et al. (2012) classify and describe landscape in cultural terms. This is according to a cultural environment that they opine evolves with changes in nature. Back as early as 1925 Sauer opined that the CLs are fashioned from natural landscapes by culture groups in which culture is the agent and the natural area is the medium of action thus resulting in the cultural landscape as the end product (Sauer, 1925). ICOMOS (2008) Principle 3 part 4 states that “the surrounding landscape, natural environment and geographical setting and integral parts of a site’s historical and cultural significance should be considered in its interpretation” (ICOMOS, 2008). The following Table 1 summarizes the components and sub-components that have been included by some selected researchers in analyzing CLs.

Table 1: Components and Sub-Components of Cls

Authors	Cl's Area Of Concern	Components	Sub-Components
Ziyace (2018)	-Matrix of CLs in assessing urban identity	-Materials	-Natural forms in terms of topology, vegetation -Manmade forms in terms of gardens, monuments, buildings and roads
		-Immaterials	-Beliefs in terms of ideologies, religions and values. -Rules -Behavior in terms of stories, myths, activities, meanings, icons, social practices, symbols.
		-Links	Time and process in terms of memory and history
Cuerrier et al. (2015)	-Conservation, restoration in CKPs as part of CLs	-Socio economic & environmental	-Fuel & shelter, food security, biodiversity resources.

		-Cultural & environmental	-Collective memory, traditional activities, spiritual and ritual practices, language & stories, traditional management, cultural keystone species.
		-Socio-economic & cultural	-Travel, exchange of goods & knowledge. Archaeological preservation and tourism
Munarriz (2010)	-CL concept components	-Historical, Geographical, Cultural, , Aesthetic, Meanings and values	

Source: Authors tabulation (2025)

Ziayae (2018) supports earlier works by Schama (1995) who states that landscape is a cultural construct that mirrors our memories and myths. All these are embedded in meanings which can be interpreted and are real. Ziyae (2018) is further supported by Berbahani et al. (2017) who opine that cultural landscapes of heritage value show signs and legacies of civilization in history and culture. This is through the landscapes that are important in attracting tourists. Earlier, Wrbka et al. (2004) opined that landscapes CLs can be regarded as an interplay between the socio-economic and biophysical factors that have historical variable outcomes with several landscape patterns. The patterns include the naturalness, structure of the landscape and the diversity it possesses. These are as a result of ecosystem processes that finally influence both the natural factors such as landforms, climate in addition to the socio-economic factors at play within the CLs (Wrbka et al. 2004).

Importance of CLs

Cuerrier et al. (2015) posit that the interrelationships between people and particular places result into cultural identity (IUCN, 2005; Scazzosi, 2004) in addition to community health and resilience. According to Moreira et al. (2006) CLs provide various functions and values that include natural resources, economic benefits in the forms of goods and services, recreational benefits and lastly are important wildlife habitats (Moreira et al. 2006). They are important for biological biodiversity, natural values in addition to associative values that include aesthetics, cultural and spiritual (IUCN, 2005). According to UNESCO (2009) CLs can be seen as the repository of collective memories. It is becoming apparent that historical identity of individual landscapes is important and that through preservation the landscape itself remains a lasting memorial to the past. Landscapes exist in people’s memories and imaginations, and these are linked to the myths, place names and rituals. (UNESCO, 2009). Memories according K’oyoo (2023a); K’oyoo and Breed, (2023; 2024) are important in the formation of urban landscape identity as a result of interaction with the physical, socio-economic and meaning aspects within a given landscape. This is in support to Scazzosi (2004) who opines that there is need for extended value of landscapes for collective memories. According to Jelen et al. (2021) supported by Capelo et al. (2011) and Scazzosi (2004) the history of the landscapes is also important in terms of the events that took place in the area. This is important in terms of the reflection they have in the present state of the landscape and the perceptions people have of it. A cultural landscape therefore reflects the story of the people who shaped it not only in the present but as well as in the past. Historical CLs have various values and meanings that are important to society. The functional values of historical CLs include agriculture, environmental, forestry, memorial/religious among others (Jelen et al., 2021).

According to the Council of Europe (2000), landscape is recognized as an essential feature of the human surroundings that contributes to the formation of local cultures. It's a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage that is important in contributing to the European identity (CoE, 2000). According to UNESCO (2002) CLs represent the places of people's livelihoods, identities and systems of belief. This further provides for the recognition of values associated with landscapes and features they possess to the people who are indigenous. The importance of protecting the diversity exhibited biologically and the diversity in culture is also acknowledged with CLs. By 2002 from 1992, UNESCO had 30 cultural landscapes that were inscribed on the world heritage list (UNESCO, 2002). IUCN (2013) states the convergence of its activities in support of UNESCO in terms of concern for protected areas that double up as CLs due to their importance in terms of essential biodiversity, landscapes qualities that need protection, conservation for the sake of sustainable development (IUCN, 2013). UNESCO (2009) supporting the role of IUCN in CLs state that the global environmental movement is interested in CLs because many are important for nature conservation and may contain habitats that are of value to biodiversity conservation (UNESCO, 2009).

Samsudin and Maliki (2015) supported by Gong et al. (2022) opine that CLs in recent years have been used for tourism reasons especially in the developing countries. These authors state that strategies for landscape tourism can ensure sustainability of culture in tourism activities. This can ensure acquisition of CL knowledge (Samsudin & Maliki, 2015). Gong et al. (2022) states that heritage tourism can make their outstanding and unique values to be known by the public and hence their protection.

Emerging Areas of Concern for CLs

Land Use Threats to Existence of CLs

According to UNESCO (2009:36) "Heritage values of landscapes often include cultural traditions, intergenerational use and continuity, socio-economic systems, and the natural environment. Since all these are inherently dynamic factors, landscapes are characterized by cultural and ecological change. Characteristic landscape materials, such as vegetation and ecosystems as well as certain types of built features, are ephemeral and subject to change over time According to Plieninger et al. (2014) CLs exhibit inherent changes from to time and so the focus should be on the drivers of the landscape change. Urbanization (Schulp et al. 2019; Yu et al., 2016), extraction of non-renewable resources completely changes landscapes (Plieninger et al. 2014) and decreasing number of farmers and afforestation of fields and pastures (Stenseke (2009). Cuerrier et al. (2015) point out the eminent and existing threat to cultural landscapes in terms of activities that alter the landscapes. These include logging, mining and quarrying activities, transportation corridors and problems from construction of new developments. These authors opine that these activities usually result in impacts with devastating nature thus affecting negatively the people who value these places. The values attached by the people to these places include sustenance and personal spiritual and cultural values. These authors also point out the important aspect of change within a given time factor in CLs.

The key issue of concern to Bridgewater and Bridgewater (2004) is the threat from homogenization within various realms and the sweeping globalization trends. They posit that there is need for settings in policy to ensure the CLs survive the threats attributed to these world trends that are fast making environments similar. These authors point out the historical and cultural frames that are formed by CLs for various people who

are indigenous to a given locale (Bridgewater & Bridgewater, 2004). This supports earlier concerns by Mitchell and Buggay (2000) that raised the issue of rapid social and economic developments. These have the effect of threatening the most fragile sites where the CLs are found. This is supported by Schulp et al. (2019); Burgi et al. (2017b) who posit that there is growing attention on CLs that is triggered in the present times. This is due to the fact that their values and characteristics have been undergoing disappearance and are threats in many parts of the world. These authors point the greatest threats to include urbanization (Yu et al., 2016), intensification of human activities through agriculture. This is supported by Plieninger et al. (2014); Moreira et al. (2006) who also mention urbanization and agricultural intensification as the greatest threats to CLs. Recently, Burgi et al. (2017a) state that there is need to know the forces that are driving changes within the CLs. This is because the evolution of the CLs over time may not be in line with the societal needs (Burgi et al., 2017b). There is need to check CLs over time due to threat of changes over time. This is supported by Cuerrier et al. (2015). According to these authors natural habitats are dynamic to the extent that some places may change thus affecting the cultural bond that existed before.

ICOMOS (2005) through the China conference stressed how important the settings are in conservation of heritage with the fast-changing landscapes and townscapes. It should be acknowledged not only through protection of the physical aspects but also through the social and cultural dimensions. Both the tangible and intangibles should be included in this process (ICOMOS, 2005). Later studies by K'oyoo (2023b) and K'oyoo and Breed (2023; 2024) investigated the importance of urban landscape identity in fast changing urban realms due to urban renewal changes and found out the value placed on the various elements of the natural and manmade environments, and which were symbolic and had individual and collective memories to the residents. Bott (2018); Yu et al. (2016) also support the vulnerable nature of the CLs and in terms of change and threats from different land uses. The changes threaten heritage and cultural resources that are associated with natural landscapes that are traditional and man-made environments. The changes are occasioned by the current changes transforming many places globally. Cuerrier et al. (2015) opine that change over time affects the CLs as people's ways of life change and so the people may not identify with a place that was at one time important in the past to be significant in the present days. They support earlier study by Scazzosi (2004) who refers to landscapes as a huge archive that is full of traces that are either immaterial or material and which undergo continuous changes.

Need For Inventories

According to Vlami et al. (2017) CLs are poorly inventoried and evaluated especially in natural areas that are protected. Jelen et al. (2021) supporting Taylor and Lennon (2011) classification of historical CLs it is first necessary to identify the most important elements of the natural and cultural environments. There are many cultural elements within various landscapes that are important in shaping its natural character. Viami et al. (2017) posit that there is poor inventorying and evaluation of CLs. This is especially so in areas that are protected and natural in nature. There is need to carry out an assessment of the values and features of the landscapes in reference to CLs. The analysis for the inventories can be carried along attributes that fall under heritage values that deal with culture, land uses that are traditional and lastly qualities that relate to aesthetics. All these qualities can be scored to assess the cultural values of each CL. These authors aver that basic identification that can generate inventories based on assessments of CLs have been poorly developed over time especially in the European contexts (Viami et al. 2017). Bridgewater and Bridgewater (2004) delve into the aspect of CLs in terms of how to identify and maintain them. These authors posit that the

major factor is the understanding of the world views in terms of what has shaped them. According to UNESCO (2009) between 1992 and 2009, a total of 66 CLs had been inscribed on the world heritage list.

According to Council of Europe (2000) the identification, description and assessment of landscapes constitutes the preliminary phase of any landscape policies. These are created to preserve the heritage within Europe that is unique. The European Landscape Convention thus encourages its signatory countries to undertake identification and descriptions of their landscapes in terms of analyzing their characters, functions, qualities (Council of Europe, 2000). According to Cuerrier et al. (2015) assessment of the CLs should be carried out through several factors. These include agreeing with the importance of a place within a given cultural group, analyzing the uses in terms of intensity, frequency, diversity, antiquity, diversity in ecological aspects, uniqueness among other site-specific factors. According to Chuman and Romporti (2010) classification of landscapes should reflect the interrelationships between the physical and the cultural. The physical includes the climate, soils, and geological aspects while the cultural encompasses the land uses in addition to human artefacts and features.

According to Capelo et al. (2011) the criteria for evaluation of heritage landscapes comprises several factors. These include the natural biotic and abiotic factors, how rare the heritage is, antiquity of the landscape, recreational potential, scientific potential, pedagogic potential, conservation factors in addition to the symbolic importance, degree of conservation, qualities of aesthetics and lastly the monumental aspects. According to Scazzosi (2004) there is need for appropriate concepts and guidelines that can be used to read and assess CLs for their material and immaterial components. This can be in terms of how authentic, complete they are, their integrity in order to necessitate their restoration, conservation, rehabilitation and preservation (Scazzosi, 2004). Siririsak and Akagawa (2007) decry the UNESCO list of CL sites that are inscribed in the UNESCO list. They opine that there is imbalance in the number of sites that are listed as CLs in the world heritage list since adoption in 1992 by UNESCO. They claim that most of the CLs in the list are found in North America and European region (Siririsak & Akagawa, 2007). Yu et al. (2016) opine that inventories can be used to support the development of strategies to manage that can be used to protect CLs. This is important in guiding conservation of landscapes and land use policy makings.

Need For Public Participation

World heritage site management recognizes the contributions of the people who live in the CL designated areas. Public participation is well stated in the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe, 2000). It's important to involve the locals in the decision-making processes that are relating to CLs. This is important for their sustainability. The people should help in their identification, to describe their values, and assist in their nominations in addition to implementing any educational roles for their long-term success in terms of outcomes. Mitchell and Buggiey (2000) propose the mechanisms that are vital for effective community participation for any CLs. This is important in their management and development. The participation approaches should lead to their sustainability. Xu et al. (2019) demonstrated that public participation added innovations to the planning and development of CLs.

ICOMOS (2008) state the importance of involving the public through communication in CL conservation processes. This is terms of dissemination, popularization, presentation and interpretation. These should relate to their wider contexts in terms of social, cultural, historical and natural settings. Appreciation and understanding of CLs is achieved through involvement of the public. Vlami et al. (2017) posit that effective

communication, education and demonstration projects are needed to raise level of awareness regarding the importance of sustainable utilization of attributes like cultural aspects from the CL protected areas. This is pointing to importance of participation by the public. Stenseke (2009) supports the need for public participation in conserving and maintaining their cultural and biological values. This author however points out several factors for success, potential problems and hindrances to participation of the public in CL issues.

Need For Local Policies to Protect, Conserve and Manage CLs

According to UNESCO (2009) managing the CLs requires addressing of a myriad of issues that should be undertaken from a multi-disciplinary perspective. There is need for education and training on the various ways in which landscapes can be used that include tourism, industry, forestry and agriculture among others (UNESCO, 2009). UNESCO's 16th session in 1992 adopted categories of world heritage CLs through its world heritage committee to ensure the recognition of the combined works of man and nature that outstanding universal value. According to UNESCO (2009:36) management of cultural landscapes is "about managing change in such a way that environmental and cultural values endure: change should take place within limits that will not disrupt those values." (UNESCO 2009:36). IUCN (2005) states that more than half of all world CLs that are currently inscribed on the UN list have natural values that are considered to be sufficiently important to merit them to be designated as areas that are protected by the national and provincial levels of authority (IUCN, 2005).

Dastgerdi and Kheyroddin (2022) explored how policy recommendations can make CLs more resilient to natural hazards. These authors opine that governance, and policy may provide room for enhancing cultural heritage in a resilient manner. According to Dastgerdi and Kheyroddin (2022) posit that CLs constitute cultural heritage and so should be managed and protected through policies. As cultural heritage, CLs are of paramount value to the communities they are found within. Both the heritage that is tangible and intangible links us to the past and informs our identities and developments. Haaren (2002) opines that planning of landscapes of cultural nature is presently hindered and that it should be supported by instruments. The instruments should ensure effective implementation to regulate the trends of consuming from nature within the CLs.

According to Alanen and Melnick (2001) CLs are faced with issues that include preservation. This is in terms of uniqueness, their different interpretations and ways of appreciating them. The difficult decisions regarding their preservation by various land managers is also an issue of concern. According to the World Heritage guidelines the protection of CLs can contribute to modern techniques in land use. This can act to maintain and enhance the natural values within a given landscape. Nezhad et al. (2015) supported by Cuerrier et al. (2015) argue that authenticity of cultural landscapes is a changing aspect that should be considered from time to time. These authors argue for consideration of CLs as process and intangible aspects rather than as products of heritage tangible aspects. The time factor and change aspect is supported by Scazzosi (2004) who posits that landscapes undergo evolution over a given time and so are the economic and social conditions too. This means that society can change its view of the potential CLs and their elements (Scazzosi, 2004).

According to Cuerrier et al. (2015) limits to CLs can be through developments that limit people's ability to access such locations. Places that may not be considered as important to the past or even generations in the present may potentially be considered of high significant value in the coming years. Schulp et al. (2019)

supports the inclusion of policies that focus on qualities of the landscape in managing of the CLs. They aver that when policies are properly designed then they act to alleviate any potential threats to CLs by accounting for impacts from agricultural activities, nature and those policies that regulate spatial aspects. They posit that the policies as well may be a hindrance to the CLs if not properly designed and implemented. According to Council of Europe supported by Schulp et al. (2019) the European Landscape Convention calls for the identification of CLs and taking note of any changes within them. This is however impeded by lack of policies at European Union level apart from the segregated ones that exist in various sector policies that however impact the landscapes. Moreira et al. (2006) states that there is need for frameworks that are restorative and integrative to address the cultural values that are intangible in addition to the scenic features of the CLs to mitigate and address the threats to the CLs.

Conclusions

CLs exist in various contexts and scales in both rural and urban landscapes. CL concept is important in guiding land use planning to guide growth and development and the conservation that is needed for these landscapes. CLs as part of landscapes are under transformations and so careful consideration should be given in planning for their preservation and management. The review concludes by stating that CLs are valued in different places for the various characters of landscapes they exhibit. Several research have been conducted on cultural landscapes. Cuerrier et al. (2015), Toma and Bisson, (2022); Nezhad et al. (2015); Alanen and Melnick (2001) considered their conservation and restoration, Ziyae (2018) assessed urban identity through CLs components, Taylor and Lennon (2011) analyzed their bridge in terms of culture and nature, Behbahani et al. (2017) considered their ecosystem services, Mitchell and Buggey (2000) is concerned with the protection, proper management in addition to need for public participation. Growing concern on CLs is on their very existence as they are threatened by anthropogenic existence and activities that cause landscape changes (Burgi et al., 2017). Plieninger et al. (2014) analyzed the CLs from an ecosystem services perspective in landscape research. Recently Dastgerdi and Kheyroddin (2022) explored the need to make the CLs resilient to natural disasters through governance and policy recommendations.

There are few existing studies on various aspects on CLs in Global South contexts especially in Africa, current research is mainly based in Europe and North America. This study concludes that CLs studies among scholars have been carried out to assess and document various dimensions that vary from place to place depending on landscape characteristics and aspects of culture. Areas of concern to CLs include threats from land uses due to urbanization, agriculture that threaten their very existence. There is need for public participation in preparation of inventories during identification and assessment. Local policies should be enacted at the national and lower levels to protect, conserve and manage the CLs that have already been recognized for protection after inventorying.

Recommendations

There is need for studies on CLs within Africa as part of the Global South on various areas of concern on CLs. There is need for more research in this area that has potential for identification, inventorying, conservation and management of these important landscapes that shape our way of life in various environments.

The following general recommendations have been suggested based on the review:

- Need to carry out elaborate identification, assessment and inventorying of CLs existing in various jurisdictions
- Need to develop and implement local policy recommendations (concepts and approaches) for the protection, conservation and management of the CLs in various jurisdictions.
- To implement land use laws that deal with the safeguarding of the CLs in all areas to avoid threats from urbanization and other anthropogenic activities that threaten their very existence in the present days.
- Need for public participation in all aspects that involve CLs in terms of identification, assessments, conservation and management to encourage and foster environmental stewardship.
- There is need for partnership to enhance and foster sustainable development of CLs at the local, national and regional landscape level from landscape and multi-disciplinary perspectives.
- Need to create awareness about the special landscapes that can constitute CLs amongst the public to ensure environmental stewardship.

References

- Alanen, A. R., & Melnick, R. Z. (2001). Preserving cultural landscapes in America. *Geographical Review*, 91(4), 739–741. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3594732>
- Behbahani, H. I., Pajouh, H. D., & Bostanban, M. (2017). Cultural heritage landscape in order to cultural ecosystem services. *International Journal of Urban Management, Energy & Sustainability*, 1(1), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijumes.2017.01.01.004>
- Bott, S. E. (2018). The measurement of meaning—Psychometrics and sense of place. In J. Wells & B. Stiefel (Eds.), *Human-centered built environment heritage preservation* (pp. 45–66). Routledge.
- Bridgewater, P., & Bridgewater, C. (2004). Is there a future for cultural landscapes? In R. H. G. Jongman (Ed.), *The new dimensions of the European landscape* (pp. 193–200). Springer.
- Bürgi, M., Bieling, C., Hackwitz, K., Kizos, T., Lieskovský, J., Martin, M. G., & Verburg, P. H. (2017). Processes and driving forces in changing cultural landscapes across Europe. *Landscape Ecology*, 32, 2097–2112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-017-0513-z>
- Bürgi, M., Verburg, P. H., Kuemmerle, T., & Plieninger, T. (2017). Landscape ecology. *Landscape Ecology*, 32, 2077–2081. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-017-0573-0>
- Capelo, S., Barata, F. T., & Mascarenhas, J. M. (2012). Why are cultural landscapes of various values? Thinking about heritage landscape evaluation and monitoring tools. *Journal of Landscape Ecology*, 4(1), 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10285-012-0030-3>

Caspersen, E. H. (2009). Public participation in strengthening cultural heritage: The role of landscape character assessment in Denmark. *Danish Journal of Geography*, 109(1), 33–45.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00167223.2009.10649594>

Council of Europe. (2000). *European landscape convention*. European Treaty Series No. 176.

Cuerrier, A., Turner, N. J., Gomes, T. C., Garibaldi, A., & Downing, A. (2015). Cultural keystone places: Conservation and restoration in cultural landscapes. *Journal of Ethnobiology*, 35(3), 427–448.

ICOMOS. (2005). *World report on monuments and sites in danger*.

ICOMOS. (2008). *Interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites* (16th General Assembly, Québec).

IUCN International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. (2005). *The protected landscape approach: Linking nature, culture and community*.

IUCN International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. (2013). *Linking landscapes: Exploring the relationships between World Heritage cultural landscapes and IUCN protected areas* (World Heritage Studies No. 11).

Jelen, J., Šantrůčková, M., & Komárek, M. (2021). Typology of historical cultural landscapes based on their cultural elements. *Geografie*, 126(3). <https://doi.org/10.37040/geografie2021126030243>

K'oyoo, E., & Breed, C. (2024). Urban memory and identity weighed against economic investment in urban renewal projects: A case of Kisumu City, Kenya. *Acta Structilia*, 31(1), 84–119.

K'oyoo, E. O., & Breed, C. A. (2023). Capturing landscape identity in the context of urban renewal: The case of Kisumu City, Kenya. *Town and Regional Planning*, (83), 18–32.

<https://doi.org/10.38140/trp.v83i.7469>

K'oyoo, E. (2023a). Use of photo-elicitation interviews to explore urban landscape identity in the context of urban renewal changes: A case of Kisumu City, Kenya. *Acta Structilia*, 30(2), 35–60.

<https://doi.org/10.38140/as.v30i2.7477>

K'oyoo, E. (2023b). Impact of urban renewal changes on urban landscape identity: Case study of Kisumu City, Kenya. *Acta Structilia*, 30(1), 156–185. <https://doi.org/10.38140/as.v30i1.7036>

Mitchell, N., & Buggey, S. (2000). Protected landscapes and cultural landscapes: Taking advantage of diverse approaches. *The George Wright Forum*, 17(1), 35–46. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43597661>

Moreira, F., Queiroz, A. I., & Aronson, J. (2006). Restoration principles applied to cultural landscapes. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 14, 217–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2006.05.007>

Munarriz, L. A. (2010). The cultural landscape concept. *AIBR Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, 6(1), 50–69. <https://doi.org/10.11156/aibr.060104e>

Nezhad, S. F., Eshrati, P., & Eshrati, D. (2015). A definition of authenticity concept in conservation of cultural landscapes. *Archnet-IJAR*, 9(1), 93–107.

- Plieninger, T., van der Horst, D., Schleyer, C., & Bieling, C. (2014). Sustaining ecosystem services in cultural landscapes. *Ecology and Society*, 19(2), 59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06159-190259>
- Samsudin, P. Y., & Maliki, N. Z. (2015). Preserving cultural landscape in homestay programme towards sustainable tourism: Brief critical review concept. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 170, 433–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.004>
- Sauer, C. O. (1925). The morphology of landscape. *University of California Publications in Geography*, 2(2), 19–54. Reprinted in J. Leighly (Ed.), *Land and life: A selection from the writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer* (1963, pp. 315–350). University of California Press.
- Scazzosi, L. (2004). Reading and assessing the landscape as cultural and historical heritage. *Landscape Research*, 29(4), 335–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142639042000288993>
- Schama, S. (1995). *Landscape and memory*. Western Washington University.
- Schulp, C. J. E., Levers, C., Kuemmerle, T., Tieskens, K. F., & Verburg, P. H. (2019). Mapping and modelling past and future land use change in Europe’s cultural landscapes. *Land Use Policy*, 332–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.04.030>
- Shamsuddin, S., Sulaiman, A. B., & Amat, R. C. (2012). Urban landscape factors that influenced the character of George Town, Penang UNESCO World Heritage Site. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 50, 238–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.031>
- Sirisrisak, T., & Akagawa, N. (2007). Cultural landscape in the world heritage list: Understanding the gap and categorization. *City & Time*, 2(3), 11–20. <http://www.ct.ceci-br.org>
- Stenseke, M. (2009). Local participation in cultural landscape maintenance: Lessons from Sweden. *Land Use Policy*, 26(2), 214–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2008.01.005>
- Taylor, K., & Lennon, J. L. (2011). Cultural landscapes: A bridge between culture and nature. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.618246>
- Taylor, K. (2008). Landscape and memory: Cultural landscapes, intangible values and some thoughts on Asia. In *16th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Symposium: Finding the spirit of place – Between the tangible and the intangible* (Québec, Canada).
- Toma, T. S. P., & Buisson, E. (2022). Taking cultural landscapes into account: Implications for scaling up ecological restoration. *Land Use Policy*, 120, 1–8.
- Vlami, V., Kokkoris, I. P., Zogaris, S., Cartalis, C., Kehayias, G., & Dimopoulos, P. (2017). Cultural landscapes and attributes of “culturalness” in protected areas: An exploratory assessment in Greece. *Science of the Total Environment*, 595, 229–243. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.03.211>
- Wrbka, T., Erb, K. H., Schulz, N. B., Peterseil, J., Hahn, C., & Haberl, H. (2004). Linking pattern and process in cultural landscapes: An empirical study based on spatially explicit indicators. *Land Use Policy*, 21, 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2003.10.012>

Yu, H., Verburg, P. H., Liu, L., & Eitelberg, D. A. (2016). Spatial analysis of cultural heritage landscapes in rural China: Land use change and its risks for conservation. *Environmental Management*, 57, 1304–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-016-0683-5>

Ziyae, M. (2018). Assessment of urban identity through a matrix of cultural landscapes. *Cities*, 74, 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.10.021>