

Building planning spaces for the integration of coastal and maritime cultural heritage in local and regional spatial development

Hansen Carsten Jahn ^{1,*}, Azzopardi Elaine ², Beguier Irene ³, Ferguson Laura ⁴, Flannery Wesley ⁴, Frangoudes Ekaterini ⁵

¹ Department of Planning, Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14, 9000, Aalborg, Denmark Carsten Jahn Hansen

² University of York, York, UK

³ Parc Naturel Régional du Golfe du Morbihan, Vannes, France

⁴ Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland

⁵ Université de Bretagne Occidentale, Brest, France

* Corresponding author : Carsten Jahn Hanse, email address : jahn@plan.aau.dk

Abstract :

Coastal and maritime cultural heritage (CMCH) is a relative newcomer on spatial development policy agendas and in spatial planning activities. Cultural heritage (CH) may assist in reconstructing place narratives and identities in local and regional strategies and plans, and it may create stronger place attractiveness for outsiders. This article explores the challenges and opportunities of integrating CMCH aspects in spatial development and planning activities at local and regional levels. It specifically investigates contemporary attempts at building planning and governance spaces concerned with CMCH, based on case studies in Scotland, France, Northern Ireland, and Denmark. Emphasis is on mandatory as well as non-mandatory spatial policy and planning activities for a more sustainable and resilient coastal development. The cases show how attempts at building planning spaces concerned with both CH and CMCH have sometimes led to, or contributed to, new types of planning collaborations and products, facilitated changes in existing ones, or illuminated a lack of community involvement to be dealt with in next generation planning. Together, the cases illustrate the importance and challenges of enabling a more place-sensitive planning and of 'finding the right planning space' for CH integration.

Keywords : Planning spaces, Coastal development, Cultural heritage, Place-sensitive

1. Introduction

The integration of new themes into spatial development policies and planning activities has been ongoing for decades, e.g. the integration of numerous environmental and social considerations. Adding yet another theme, such as coastal and maritime cultural heritage (CMCH), could then be assumed to be business-as-usual for policymakers and planners. However, each upcoming theme tends to carry with it its own unique characteristics, challenges and opportunities, mindsets, and perspectives, which means that copy-pasting earlier approaches are unlikely to be sufficient. This makes it even more important to build up an empirical basis and investigate the framings and workings of the new theme, in this case CMCH, and especially to search for parameters and ways in which integration efforts may succeed.

Although CMCH is considered a relative newcomer on spatial development policy agendas and in spatial planning activities, the broader concept of cultural heritage (CH) has been influencing policies since the 1950s (Ounanian et al, 2021). Originally, heritage conservation in the West was mostly concerned with protecting tangible physical objects, such as buildings, monuments, and historical sites, (Ahmad, 2006), and primarily through traditional authority-based and technical-rational planning approaches. More recently, attention to intangible and immaterial aspects of CH

have evolved (Vecco, 2010), especially in regional and local development discussions. For instance, CH may potentially help to reconstruct place narratives and identities, as well as to create a stronger place attractiveness to visitors, tourists, and current and potential residents (Katelieva et al., 2020). To remote coastal and maritime communities such opportunities may be seen as a help to 'turn the tides' of development and become more self-sustained and resilient. While in more urban settings, attention to CH and CMCH may assist or lead the way to sustainable regeneration of seaside neighbourhoods and harbour areas.

A CMCH focus may therefore trigger a need for new types of qualitative and citizen-based input and knowledge sources for development discussions than the usual suspects. It may imply the active involvement of additional jurisdictions, institutions, interests, networks, social capital, etc. in spatial policy and planning. As such, attention to CMCH will require a discussion of how to appropriately integrate various aspects of CMCH into spatial governance and planning settings and practices. How is CMCH spoken of, cared for, dealt with, and institutionalised alongside established planning themes (e.g. infrastructures, environment, services)? Which 'spaces' may emerge for the governance and planning of CMCH?

Hence, the main objective of this article is to explore challenges and opportunities of integrating CMCH aspects into spatial development and planning activities. It investigates specific attempts at building new governance and planning spaces concerned with CMCH and CH integration, and how such spaces are related to existing spatial governance, regulation, and mandatory planning activities. The exploration is based on case studies in Scotland, France, Northern Ireland, and Denmark, with an emphasis on recent and on-going spatial policy and planning practices for a more sustainable and resilient development.

2. Coastal and maritime cultural heritage in spatial development and planning

Empirical studies into how tangible and intangible coastal and maritime cultural heritage aspects are integrated into spatial policy and planning are somewhat sparse. It is therefore a purpose, in itself, of this article to provide such insights from specific case studies. This section presents potentially useful concepts and guidance for questioning the cases, keeping in mind that the explorative nature of the studies also imply that concepts and variables are likely to emerge from the cases themselves.

Coastal and maritime cultural heritage perspectives and roles

CMCH broadly refers to the tangible and intangible aspects of past human activities, and their present continuation, in coastal and maritime areas. This can include coastal and submerged sites, monuments, wrecks, buildings, and objects as well as practices and their associated knowledge and material culture, language, oral traditions, and songs (Galili and Rosen, 2010; Kurin, 2004; Vecco, 2010). Hence, CMCH concerns cultural heritage relating to a maritime and/or coastal context.

Heritage is also that which we attribute heritage value to (Tengberg et al., 2012), and as values and perceptions change over time, what is valued as heritage must also be considered to be dynamic and changeable rather than static and fixed in time (DeSilvey, 2012; DeSilvey & Harrison, 2020; Flannery et al., this issue; Fredheim & Khalaf, 2016; Stephenson, 2008; Tengberg et al.,

2012). Linked to this is the view that there is no one singular heritage of any place or society and that a better way to approach heritage is through the notion of a multiplicity of heritage or heritage narratives (e.g. Massey, 2018). Therefore, this article will primarily use the notion of CH as a broad overall term, in which various kinds of more context dependent expressions of CH can possibly exist, such as CMCH. E.g. when a relation to a maritime or coastal context is evident, then CMCH will be used. This also creates the possibility to study CMCH in relation to other CH aspects and attempts at more holistic CH perceptions.

Heritage is also a way in which people see meaning and memory in the world and thus contributes to national, regional, local, and individual identity through influencing place identity, and through engendering a sense of continuity and a sense of collective identity (Hawke, 2002; Tengberg et al., 2012; Tuan, 2001). However, for heritage to be included, to any measurable extent, in the construction of a legitimate and authentic place identity at regional and local levels, it is important for the heritage narratives of all relevant social actors to be recognised. Otherwise, there is a risk of developing a hegemonic heritage-based place identity that includes some, but excludes others (Massey, 2018; Flannery et al, this issue). Hence, this article will apply a broad notion of narratives, as stories, story-telling, experiences, etc. by relevant actors, and by any means, that expresses or relate to CH aspects.

Traditionally, there has been a preservationist stance taken to heritage based on a recognition of its intrinsic value and on a felt duty to pass heritage on to future generations undamaged (DeSilvey & Harrison, 2020; Holtorf, 2018; Mason, 2002). However, within the heritage sector there is growing recognition that a strict preservationist stance is not always possible or beneficial, and that approaches to heritage management should expand to include acceptance and management of loss as well as the possibilities for transformation (Flannery et al, this issue, Ounanian et al, 2021).

Simultaneously, there is a growing wider recognition, e.g. in UNESCO conventions and EU policies (Ounanian et al, 2021), that heritage can be better exploited for societal benefit and in spatial development activities. For instance, in contributing to place identity and place attractiveness heritage can play a role in building community resilience (Holtorf, 2018). This depends to some extent on the heritage management and planning approaches taken. Here, some argue that the faithful preservation of heritage is necessary in fostering community resilience (Jigyasu, 2013), while others argue that both heritage views and communities must continuously adapt and transform to maintain relevance and build resilience in the face of rapid change (Holtorf, 2018).

Planning spaces for coastal and maritime cultural heritage in spatial development

Recognising the changeable and dynamic potential of CH and CMCH makes it an attractive theme for proactive – and not only reactive, protective, and preventive – spatial development, policymaking, and planning activities. This mirrors a tendency where culture aspects are viewed as ‘cultural capital’ (Cochrane, 2006) or resources, and are adapted as part of potential ‘drivers’ in regional and local development discussions, e.g. in experience economy and urban development perspectives (Pine & Gilmore, 1999; Lorentzen & Hansen, 2012). Also, attention to both tangible and especially intangible CH can be seen as an expression of a push for more value-oriented and citizen-centred development agendas in regional and local settings. In spatial governance and

planning activities, requests for such qualitative and more situation-tailored and place-based considerations have increasingly become the norm (Healey, 2010; Allmendinger, 2017).

The need to perceive regional and local spatial development from more place-based perspectives has been widely expressed in later years (Kristjánsdóttir, 2018). ‘The place-based argument’ draws attention to the uniqueness of local development characteristics, and how this should lead to more ‘place-aware’ development interventions that understand and make a better use of place qualities and capacities (Barca et al, 2012; Plummer et al, 2014). CH aspects fall easily into such discussions, as CH is typically seen as a unique ‘place-bound’ resource. Also, Healey (2007, p2) has emphasised that places are complex constructs created by the interaction of actors in multiple networks who invest in material projects and who give meaning to the quality of places. It implies that place development strategies and plans must consider the local (place) governance landscape and potentially reconsider the settings and roles of local actors and institutions, to better ‘fit’ the actual situations, challenges, and opportunities at hand. Here, increased attention to CH and CMCH aspects may result in the introduction of new actors or renewed roles of actors, e.g. museums and citizens, in place governance and spatial planning activities.

This also draws attention to consider and discuss place governance and planning spaces as such, and their appropriateness in dealing with the integration of CH and CMCH aspects. Planning studies have shown, how territorial and spatial governance settings and practices, and the governance and planning culture, have sometimes changed significantly as a result of renewed development perspectives and/or societal and state restructuring activities (Brenner, 2004; Healey, 2010; Janssen-Jansen and Hutton, 2011; Allmendinger, 2017; Hansen, 2018). Here, a general tendency seems to be systemic changes that reduce hierarchical structures and instead caters for more flexible and networking approaches. Also, such studies tend to show a move away from traditional desk-based and regulatory planning, with openings towards the development of more situation-specific and facilitating approaches, by considering local socio-cultural capital and networks. This can result in new participatory strategies to release local potentials, engagement, and resources better – often based in the premise that relevant authorities do not have sufficient resources for creating a balanced (sustainable and resilient) development.

Under such conditions and given the value-laden and diverse nature of CH, participatory and deliberative strategies can be viewed as essential to the integration of CH and CMCH perspectives. Here, participation emphasises inclusiveness and equality between participants as a condition for policy effectiveness and especially legitimacy. Deliberation stresses the importance of public discussion for the same purpose, although with more concern for expanding and using reasoned debate in decision-making processes, as opposed to decision-making based primarily on the balance of power of different interests (Papadopoulos and Warin, 2007; Ounanian et al, 2021).

However, adapting place governance and planning to (perceptions of) an ever-increasing complexity, number of spatial development variables, themes (such as CH), and actors and interests can also result in fragmentation and new coordination challenges. In many countries and places this has spurred the development of new forms and ‘spaces’ of governance. These new spaces of governance have been conceptualised as ‘soft spaces’ with ‘fuzzy boundaries’, as they are often located in between formal levels of governance and are not necessarily univocally

bounded (Olesen and Hansen, 2020, 366; Haughton et al., 2010, Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009). New 'soft' governance spaces can emerge for various reasons, such as state restructuring, experimentation and entrepreneurialism, adjustment to functionalities and geography, and neoliberal agendas of efficiency and effectiveness (Olesen and Hansen, 2020; Brenner, 2004; Davoudi and Strange, 2009; Haughton et al, 2010).

It can be debated whether soft governance spaces are in between formal levels or sectors of governance, additions to, or in combination with or sometimes even part of formal governance. In any case, it is the needs-based, adaptive and flexible nature of such spaces that inspires this article to consider how new or renewed governance and planning spaces, and their implied boundaries and borders (fuzzy or not), are (re-)negotiated (Allmendinger et al, 2015).

In this article we focus on the emergence and development of CH and CMCH oriented governance and planning spaces at regional and local levels. We do so to explore challenges and opportunities of integrating CMCH aspects into spatial development and planning activities. The vocabulary above is useful, but not conditional to our views and attention. We are interested in identifying both new and existing spaces and how they may be related, for instance how voluntary fit-for-purpose spaces are related to existing wider spatial governance, regulation, and mandatory planning activities. We are in search of variables, and therefore our entry point for further discussion is a tentative and broad conceptualisation of a 'planning space' as a space for organising and doing the activities of planning (mandatory or not). It includes discussing the characteristics, actors, perceptions, needs, challenges, opportunities, visions, purposes, goals, etc. of 'a place', and how such knowledge and intent can be generative for identifying specific means and actions for place development and place management. Within this we ask how CH and CMCH is spoken of, cared for, dealt with, and institutionalised alongside more traditional spatial planning themes (e.g. infrastructures, environment, services)? Which 'spaces' emerge for the governance and planning of CMCH?

Finally, the coastal and maritime context for discussing such emerging planning spaces for CH integration implies that this study can potentially contribute to debates on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM). Although viewed in very different ways in different countries in Europe, ICZM is in conceptual terms an accepted holistic approach, or process, for attempting to manage coastal areas with respect to a sustainable balancing of environmental, economic, social and cultural concerns (Khakzad et al, 2015). Here, and as part of the framing of this article, the notion of integration is taken to refer to overcoming fragmentation, sectorisation and coordination challenges in activities between different levels of government. Hence indicating both vertical and horizontal integration aspects. In doing so, we also stress the need to view integration in terms of building coordination between mandatory and non-mandatory spatial planning activities.

3. Cases of CMCH in spatial development and planning

The cases are part of the Horizon2020 project PERICLES, 2018-2021, in which the objective has been to study and enable a sustainable usage of maritime and coastal cultural heritage. We have selected cases within PERICLES, which have proven rich in data concerning attempts at integrating CH into spatial policy and planning activities.

Methodology and case study methods

The tentative conceptualisations above led us to consider various dimensions in the cases and to develop a common template for analysis. The template focused on: country context of spatial planning system and planning for CH; strategies/plans/projects; key actors and interests; key narratives, perceptions and motivations concerning CH, and how CH is perceived to be used; mandatory and non-mandatory planning settings and practices. In addition, each case should: identify main lessons learned across variables concerning challenges and opportunities of integrating CMCH aspects into specific spatial development and planning activities; characterise the 'planning space' for integration of CMCH into spatial development activities, and; indicate the relations between new governance and planning spaces (concerned with CH integration) and existing regulation and planning activities. As the context and policy level of the cases vary, the use of the template also results in variations in what turns out to be of importance in each case. Hence, the cases stories below contain variations in focus and occasionally in structure (although in general a common structure has been applied), in order to portray the most relevant aspects and pressing points dealt with concerning CH integration in each case.

The case study methods in the four cases have been very similar and thoroughly reported in PERICLES deliverables, see www.pericles-heritage.eu. In short, we have used: document studies (strategies, plans, reports, minutes, media products, etc.); semi-structured interviews (30 in total, divided between all the authors and on location in each case) with community stakeholders, NGO's, heritage and planning professionals and policymakers at local, regional, and national levels; workshops with stakeholders and citizens (in the French and Danish cases); and seminars and meetings with key actors. In doing so, we have interacted with key actors in mutual knowledge sharing and learning processes, see more on www.pericles-heritage.eu.

Scotland – difficulties in capturing the full value of CH in regional marine planning

The Scottish case investigated the implementation of the National Marine Plan (NMP) in new Regional Marine Plans (RMPs), with the broad purpose to discuss the overall role and integration of both tangible and intangible CH values and aspects at the regional policymaking level.

Scottish Marine Planning is based on the UK Marine Policy Statement (HM Government et al., 2011) and the Marine Scotland Act (2010). This includes statutory provision for cultural heritage and its protection within marine planning and management tools. The Marine Atlas (Marine Scotland, 2011) provides the evidence base for the NMP (The Scottish Government, 2015), and in terms of CH this includes designated sites, coastal monuments, listed buildings, protected military remains and eight Historic Marine Protected Areas. Eleven Scottish marine regions have been created to facilitate the implementation of the NMP at the regional level through RMPs. The RMPs must conform to the NMP but are intended to acknowledge different regional needs and contexts and are developed by Planning Partnerships in a phased process. Three RMPs are currently (2021) under development and have been subject to this case study.

The mandatory consideration, protection and enhancement of CH seems well embedded in the NMP. Interviewees broadly agreed that CH is listed in the Marine Atlas, it is legislatively protected through different measures, and it is well catered for and well recognised in marine management.

However, focus is currently exclusively on tangible heritage assets. CH is argued within the 'Productive Seas' principle (Marine Scotland, 2011), indicating that it is conceptualised as a contribution to societal wellbeing and Blue Growth opportunities. Here, some interviewees felt that CH was still seen as more of a constraint, e.g. in marine licensing decisions. Hence, there is a potential conflict where some initiatives may either impact or be constrained by CH. Furthermore, a consequence of including CH in the Productive Seas principle is the valuation implications, as the importance of CH is currently being evaluated through economic benefit analysis. It means that the real value of CH is potentially being obscured by a monetary approach, which cannot 'capture the full value of CH', for instance by including intangible aspects of importance to place narratives and identity.

A second concern was that while this system was considered to work well at a national level and for protected sites, it is currently unable to capture places or objects that are socially valued as heritage but are not protected legislatively, or which are important at a regional or local rather than at a national level. In theory, the RMPs are intended to address such gaps. However, while there is a drive for public participation to capture such information at the development stage, it is difficult to capture the full human dimension or heritage value of places or practices in the current spatial management tools. This is an area of concern for both heritage and marine planning professionals. A related concern is that even if such information can be captured at the plan development stage, it is not clear what weight it will then be given in the decision-making process, where there may be potential conflicts. As it stands, discussions on the value of such places emerge when conflicts do arise, meaning that the process or recognition of valued places is reactive rather than forward-looking.

In sum, the Scottish case illuminate challenges in identifying and incorporating places with socially constructed heritage values in regional marine planning. It demonstrates difficulties among non-heritage policy actors in capturing the full value of CH, especially concerning the integration of intangible values with little or no evaluated economic benefit, as well as socially valued CH at the regional level. On the other hand, the case indicates how there can be potential and opportunity in capturing a wider variety of CH aspects in drafting RMPs, thereby allowing the process to become more proactive and broadly founded. This implies a need to create, legitimise and strengthen 'softer' regional and local governance and planning spaces in the early stages of the planning process, in which heritage value can be conceptualised differently, than merely in economic terms, e.g. as levers of place identity and community building.

France - towards a local strategy for sustainable management of coastal maritime heritage in the Morbihan Gulf (Brittany)

The French case focused specifically on the area of the Regional Natural Parc of the Morbihan Gulf (RNPMG) in Brittany, Northwest France. The gulf is characterised by its Atlantic coastline, inland sea with islands, and wide rias. Its biodiversity and diversity of landscape and CH assets makes the gulf an attractive but vulnerable coastal area, which has been the incentive to create the RNPMG in 2014. The case study investigated local efforts to discuss sustainable management of the maritime built heritage in the gulf and integrate CH into formal spatial plans and across several State services.

In France, CH policies are mainly the responsibility of the Ministries of Culture and of Ecological Transition. The policies are implemented through the Heritage code, the Environment code, and the Town Planning code. Administratively, state services at the regional level are responsible together with local authorities. A number of maritime and environmental planning instruments are available: Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP), Sea Basin Strategic Document (SBSD), Scheme for the Development of the Sea (SDS), Regional Natural Park (RNP) charters, and territorial and local urban planning master plans (SCOT/PLU). Those instruments must also comply with specific State induced regulations, such as management of the Public Maritime Domain (PMD), Listed Sites, etc.

Here, the SCOT can potentially specify CH issues in planning guidelines and the PLU can specify this further in building and landscape regulations at municipal level. However, the PLU is not considered effective, as it does not imply regulatory constraints concerning maintenance or protection, and coastal municipalities do not systematically integrate heritage inventories into their PLU. Another systemic framework challenge to CH occurs (also in the gulf) when the State have temporarily authorised the construction of buildings and activities linked to the sea (e.g. shellfish farms, tide mills) in sensitive areas. If the activity ceases, PMD regulations require the destruction of the structure to restore the site to its natural state. However, many of those structures have aged and are now considered expressions of CH and contribute to place identity. This often cause disagreements between different regional State services.

Hence, the general plurality of regulations, charters, schemes, and their differing consideration of CH generates an administrative complexity that is considered problematic to coastal CH preservation. Here, especially the SDS is intended as a central tool for integrated coastal zone management, as it aims to bring together the development of maritime economic and recreational activities with natural preservation and enhancement of coastal zone values.

In the gulf area, the emergence of RNPMG has helped to create new governance spaces for discussing such matters, and an agreement has been signed between the State and the RNPMG on the implementation of a new more CH attentive SDS (2020). The RNPMG is organised around a concerted project for sustainable development, which includes attention to CH aspects. The RNPMG has no regulatory power, but local authorities have approved the RNPMG charter and undertake to implement it and to make their urban planning documents compatible with it. Within the SDS framework, the RNPMG facilitates the 'Coastal Strategy' working group, which deals with CH, landscapes, climate change and urbanisation. Influenced by the RNPMG, the new SDS pays more attention to the CMCH of the gulf, and it relies on the RNPMG for implementation and monitoring of actions to identify and develop CH aspects. In addition, the RNPMG formulates inventories aiming to integrate CH into SCOT's and PLU's. As such, and in partnership with local stakeholders and national authorities, RNPMG carries out actions in favour of threatened coastal heritage, based on participatory governance. However, the SDS is still not sufficiently used, and its regulations are not automatically incorporated into regional and local urban planning schemes.

Interviews and workshop discussions revealed a need to draw up a general 'doctrine' to guide the management of CH in the coastal area or PMD. The stakeholders identified the following challenges: lack of knowledge of CH, resulting in weak integration in spatial planning documents; lack of coordination between State services; inadequacy of tools used at the local level for

sustainable management of CH; and lack of financial, technical, and legal resources. This criticism has inspired RNPMG to suggest, in partnership with relevant administrations, to work with all stakeholders to develop a common strategy for sustainable management of the maritime built heritage in the gulf.

In sum, the case shows challenges in integrating CH into formal regional and local spatial plans, coordinating across several State services, and generating sufficient resources. However, there are available planning instruments and tools with promise for better cross-referencing and adaptation of the CH agenda. Here, the RNPMG has managed to position itself in a key role and to help enable new non-mandatory governance and planning spaces for the preservation of CH through such tools, e.g. the more active use of the SDS framework. RNPMG can be seen as a space for exchange and consultation, involving citizens, associations, scientists, local authorities, and administrations in sustainable management of CMCH. Finally, the improved collaboration between the actors shows potential to further develop the cross-referencing of territorial issues in a complex setting and to build a more adaptive systemic approach to the integration of new themes, such as CH.

Northern Ireland – heritage narratives and community participation in redeveloping Belfast’s urban waterfront

The case in Belfast focused specifically on the redevelopment of the former shipyards on Queen’s Island, now known as Titanic Quarter. Belfast has a rich maritime CH, at one time dominating the global shipbuilding industry and one of Europe’s busiest trading centres. In the wake of its industrial decline, Belfast’s urban waterfront has undergone redevelopment, transforming the former shipyard area to offices, retail outlets, leisure facilities, upmarket residential properties, and a high-end hotel. Culturally inspired by the most famous vessel built in Belfast’s shipyards, references to the Titanic are abundant. Many commercial operations have invested in Titanic Quarter, and it is a popular tourist attraction. The case study sought to understand how dominant CH narratives marginalise local communities in the port area, and to explore options for more inclusive forms of community participation.

The UK Marine Policy Statement (HM Government et al., 2011) and Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland (DAERA-NI, 2018) both state that the setting of CH assets and the historic seascape must be taken into consideration by public authorities when considering planning proposals for development. In Titanic Quarter, the property construction company Hardcourt Developments has been responsible for the redevelopment of the area, and development applications has been approved by Belfast City Council. The area was designed around the maritime heritage of the site, but according to interviews a narrow perspective of heritage was developed. Marginalisation of other maritime heritages associated with the space has attracted criticism of the selective nature by which the historic seascape of the port was taken into consideration.

The interviews drew attention to the removal of much of the historic context of the area, when many original buildings were demolished in the redevelopment, and that what remains of Belfast’s tangible maritime CH is insufficiently protected. The narrow focus on a single aspect of Belfast’s maritime CH was criticised by interviewees as a poor manifestation of conservation, development

and tourism policy aims. Local heritage narratives, and connections to the port area in particular, have been marginalised.

Therefore, public consultation for the Titanic Quarter redevelopment and incorporation of broader views on CH in plans was viewed as ineffective. Through their lack of involvement local communities felt dissociated in the redevelopment of CH at the site. Stakeholder engagement is usually prominent in Northern Irish development policies but is often focused on public consultation for proposed plans, rather than involving the public meaningfully in the planning process. This type of public consultation was criticised by interviewees as having little impact and often occurring too late, indicating a top-down policy and planning process, despite formal consultation.

A reason often speculated for heritage decisions in planning the new waterfront was that policy was driven by economics rather than heritage. Catering to business and mass market tourism interests has resulted in a place identity that residents fail to recognise, and a space that seems to exclude them.

In particular, the Belfast study shows a need to adopt a more place-sensitive approach to development with better consideration of the CH landscape. It identifies a need for better public engagement, which is more participatory and involves a greater breadth of actors to replace 'ineffective' consultation. In addition, a closer integration of local and national policymaking may be a route towards more deliberative participatory policymaking built on meaningful engagement with stakeholders, including communities.

It can also be argued that, while tourism development in Titanic Quarter was aimed at the mass market and has been hugely successful in satisfying this segment, integrating authentic local narratives and experiences in future plans through more inclusive planning processes can increase place attractiveness, cater for other visitor segments and locals, and bring greater economic benefits to local people. Refining the planning process to include effective engagement is therefore in the interests of developers, as well as communities.

In summary, the key points emerging from the case is that local communities need to feel connected and to be more involved in the planning process. Consultation as a feedback exercise is insufficient, yet it remains the main route which is currently open for challenging plans. Developing community planning spaces and better vertical integration of policymaking between local, regional, and national levels could potentially help to resolve this. Also, imbuing a sense of community ownership and engagement in planning processes could be significant in facilitating it. Ongoing, meaningful engagement through deliberative participatory exercises as an integrated part of the planning process would be a clear step towards inclusive waterfront CH development.

Denmark – integrating CMCH into local development strategies and municipal planning in the Vilsund area

The Danish case focussed on the area of Vilsund, a strait in the Limfjord in Northwest Denmark. A 382-meter bridge connects two villages with altogether approx. 900 inhabitants. The area is experiencing a slow decline in population, and local stakeholders are currently searching for new

development perspectives. It includes discussion on the use of maritime and coastal landscape qualities for recreational, tourism and sports purposes, however also for broader purposes of improving housing potentials and of rethinking the place identity of the area. The case study investigated the role of CH in this transition process, especially concerning relations between non-mandatory local development discussions and mandatory municipal policymaking and spatial planning.

Several Acts (Planning Act, Museum Act, Flooding Act) state that CH should be taken into account in Danish planning activities. In particular, it is the responsibility of municipalities to plan for CH through mandatory municipal and local planning, under advice and sometimes site-protective prohibitory measures from local museums. Most attention is given to tangible and material CH aspects by use of the 'SAVE method', an assessment tool for registering and valuating buildings, cultural (physical) environments and other physical constructs. Intangible CH aspects are randomly dealt with through experimental approaches, but in most local development cases not at all.

In the Vilsund area, CH has become of interest to local community stakeholders, two municipalities and two museums (on each side of the strait), as a potential lever, or as part of a new narrative, for local transition. In particular, a former small-scale shipyard has been renovated and taken over by a local association with the purpose to help boost inshore water sport activities. Here, a strengthening of the awareness of maritime 'fjord-based' CH and maritime recreational history is being debated in a co-production process as a potential help to provide a unique identity in combination with modern water sports, tourism and community development activities. A voluntary local collaboration organisation, Collaboration Forum Vilsund (CFV), has been established by local stakeholders and citizens to help foster and coordinate such development discussions across the strait and jurisdictions (between two municipalities).

Interviews clarified that there is a rather basic attention to tangible physical CH aspects in mandatory local spatial policy and planning, and a general lack of attention to immaterial aspects. Only the bridge (from 1939) has formally been recognised as CH. However, it is a place with hundreds of years of history and narratives of mobility across the strait, and of living next to and off the fjord. A workshop with citizens revealed, that Vilsund is considered 'a meeting place', and that, altogether, such stories 'need to be renewed and told better' for the sake of local identity, as well as for illuminating the attractiveness of the area to visitors, tourists, and potential new residents. Hence, intangible CH assets were found to potentially play an important role in reimagining Vilsund. However, the workshop also drew attention to a risk of loss of at least parts of this place identity, without a physical presence of some sort. In addition, it became clear how local citizens and community actors sees CH aspects as an intertwined variety of many elements (material and non-material) and locations in the area, and that they do not distinguish between CMCH and other types of CH. In fact, they consider such distinctions to be artificial, hence indicating a more relational view to CH. The maritime and coastal heritage of Vilsund cannot be seen independently from, and without taking into account, the relations to and influences from the people and stories of 'the hinterland'

Several examples of recent production of citizen-initiated non-mandatory local development strategies in the area, the set-up of the CFV, increased local dialogue across the strait, and current

discussions on the activation of CH aspects have, altogether, attracted the attention of some politicians but mainly planners in the two municipalities. This has led municipal planners to attempt to integrate a broader array of CH into formalised planning activities, and both municipal councils have increased their funding activity to the two small harbours in the area. Especially, the planners in one municipality have recently (2021) re-oriented and tested their general approach to local development and planning processes in a more co-productive and participatory direction, with better involvement of citizens as well as CH professionals (museums) from the beginning of such processes.

In sum, the case shows the relevance and difficulty of introducing a wider array of intangible CH aspects into local spatial policy and planning, both as an instrument for place identity and for rebuilding the attractiveness of the area to outsiders. It illustrates a need to do so in a manner that is more sensitive to local perceptions and needs, than has been the case through traditional spatial planning policies and approaches. It shows the relevance and importance of setting up locally based cross-boundary organisations and collaboration as new arenas or ‘spaces’ for spatial development discussions. In doing so, the development of place-tailored participatory strategies and approaches, such as citizen science-oriented approaches, has been essential in generating new and useful insights. However, it is also clear that such non-mandatory and bottom-up placed-based governance and planning spaces need to be tailored together with (and preferably mandated by) formal decision-making and planning authorities in order to be able to achieve measurable transformative power. In addition, CH experts and authorities (museums) can gain influence when they create alliances with local communities and assist locals directly in ‘seeing’ and expressing CH aspects.

4. Discussion – lessons learned for spatial development and the building of planning spaces for CMCH

The cases illuminate different stages and levels of shaping planning spaces for CH and CMCH. In Scotland, the nationally induced regional marine plans are yet in their early stages of discussing the role of CH in relation to especially economic development perspectives, while the French case shows a more evolved stage of regional governance with coordination challenges between many state, regional and local actors. In Northern Ireland, the aftermath of urban regeneration in Titanic Quarter has provided a basis for discussing hegemonic CH discourses and (lack of) inclusion. Finally, in the Danish case the village-based community-driven collaboration with local authorities is still ongoing but has awoken to the development potential of CH.

Central to any planning space is the establishment of an agenda and a shared view of directions to be taken. Across the cases, CH and CMCH aspects have had difficulties in becoming integrated into spatial development and planning agendas. This lack of priority of CH is similar to what Khakzad et al (2015) found when reviewing ICZM activities in various countries in Europe. CH often ‘fall between chairs’ in being recognised as a legitimate policy issue when debating regional and local development perspectives – ‘what is CH useful for’ and ‘how to balance CH against various needs and development perspectives’ are questions that come up again and again. A key concern is often to identify and attach economic value to CH aspects, such as expressed clearly in the Scottish case, as this would generate up-front attention among politicians and investors. Here, material CH assets tend to stand a better chance at coming into focus, because they are, on the

one hand often already 'on the radar' and ensured some level of preservation and maintenance through legislative and regulatory measures. And, on the other hand, they can be seen as a development opportunity, for instance by being used as physical assets in tourism and experience-oriented development activities.

Whereas tourism may then be a lever for creating attention to some CH aspects, it is also important to ensure that there is no 'runaway' tendency in transforming places to overly exposed and commercialised experience zones. There is a danger of simplification in the hands of tourism development perspectives only, such as feared in the Belfast and French cases, which may threaten local social balances. The Belfast case also shows how this can even threaten the preservation of material CH that is not considered of value to the chosen tourism strategy.

Attempting to put direct economic value to CH can also be difficult, as it is rarely the material CH object itself that generates regional or local turnover. Rather, it is the hotel or restaurant nearby that benefits. Also, the narratives and social values associated with material CH assets often imply the existence of a much broader grounding for the actual (and policy friendly concept of) branding value of the place or area – a branding value (implied to be economic) that can be very difficult to assess, but it is nevertheless often agreed to be a reality by key development and policy actors. Such social / economic value win-win realisations may function as a 'door opener' to view, review and attempt to integrate immaterial and intangible CH to a greater extent in development perspectives, as discussed in particular in the Danish, French and Belfast cases. Intangible CH aspects seem to stand a better chance to enter into policy agendas if they are claimed as instrumental, directly or indirectly, in developing and transforming communities. Especially if CH is argued to provide both extra needed place promoting (external) awareness and (internal) place identity dimensions to the assumptions in policies and plans of the 'attractiveness of the place' to both tourists, visitors and residents alike, as portrayed in the Danish case. The Danish and Belfast cases also showed how there is potential in trying to match attention to CH with the aspirations of the citizens themselves, e.g. the propensity of locals to seek (new) ways to see themselves as 'part of the place' and to find meaning and place identity.

Such considerations imply that the integration of CH aspects into spatial development and planning is best served through developing holistic perspectives, where synergies between various CH issues and other policy issues are actively explored and sought out, such as also called for by Khakzad et al (2015). Even in extreme cases of world known 'lighthouse' CH assets such as Titanic Quarter, it is indeed shown that there is no one singular heritage of a place and that a better way to approach heritage is through the notion of a multiplicity of heritage or heritage narratives (Massey, 2018) as well as through attention to broader notions of place identity and local social values. Developing a hegemonic heritage-based place identity tend to create social exclusion and lack of broad local acceptance, which can result in conflicts between residents and visitors. This will inevitably lead to problems of legitimacy in planning and development decisions.

This also means that it can be troublesome to insist only on CMCH aspects in policy and planning spaces, despite their rich and varied characteristics. The Vilsund case illustrates how CMCH and other CH aspects can hardly be separated in meaningful manners. Citizens and local stakeholders tend to view CH assets as relational and intertwined with larger narratives and perceptions of

‘who we are’ and ‘the role of our place in the bigger picture’. In the Morbihan Gulf example there is also an increased attention to discuss nature-culture synergies and create strategies between CH, natural heritage, natural protection, diversity, and ecological values.

Another key concern of planning spaces is how to organise and coordinate activities. The cases all show a general concern that there is insufficient coordination at both national, regional and local levels, as well as between formal authorities and a range of informal or non-statutory interests and actors. This might hinder the establishment of more coherent CH integration strategies and the achievement of sustainable synergies, e.g. through ICZM approaches. However, especially the French and Danish cases show promising potentials to resolve at least some coordination challenges through the establishment of what can be termed ‘boundary organisations’ (the RNPMG and CFV) that seek to bridge, develop and exploit ‘collaborative advantages’ across boundaries (Powe, 2019), including across ‘area borders’ (Stokke and Clemetsen, 2021) or jurisdictions.

In the French case, the Regional Natural Parc of Morbihan Gulf (RNPMG) collaborate closely with both national, regional, and local authorities and administrations, natural site managers, and a range of local stakeholders. This has, so far, resulted in the implementation of a new development scheme (SDS) in 2020, and the initiation of a strategy for the valorisation of the maritime built heritage, thereby creating an emerging planning space for better CH integration in local and regional development activities. However, without regulatory powers as such, the RNPMG also experiences challenges in ensuring credibility and legitimacy for such transboundary activities (Powe, 2019; Cash et al, 2003), as well as administrative complexities and lack of resources. In the Danish case, the evolving collaboration across the Vilsund strait, such as portrayed through Collaboration Forum Vilsund (CFV), has improved relations and helped to build a space for common strategic and project-oriented activities between local authorities, museum districts, and key local community stakeholders. However, as in the French case, the power to release collaborative advantages and transformative potentials rest in the ability to converge mandatory and non-mandatory organisations and their views, aims and means. Regional and local (trans)boundary organisations need to be associated better with – and preferably mandated by – formal decision-making and planning authorities at an early stage in development discussions in order to be able to achieve measurable transformative power.

Planning spaces for CH integration should also contain careful consideration of participatory strategies. The cases show various experiences, but they all indicate a need for the development of more place-tailored participatory strategies and approaches. As discussed in the Belfast case, local communities can be argued to be the most important heritage actors and should have more influence on planning and managing their heritage. Places and sites should be acknowledged as living spaces, implying the need to move from traditional consultation towards improving inclusion, participation in planning, and mobilisation of communities. Citizens are not just there to be enrolled and co-opted in formal decision-making, but also to be empowered and recognised for their local knowledge, socio-cultural capital and problem-solving capabilities (Escobar, 2017). As indicated in the French and Danish cases, continuous meaningful engagement through deliberative participatory exercises and between a purposefully differentiated crowd of stakeholders and citizens is essential – both in order to generate (CH and place) insights,

resources, alliances, and a renewed shared place identity. When carried out between a range of mainly formal planning actors, this potentially builds common policy agendas and influences the contents of spatial policies and plans, such as in the French case. And when carried out between a range of mainly local stakeholders with participation from local authorities, such as in Vilsund, it can both influence the contents of formal planning, but also initiate reflection on the settings, practices, and usefulness of participatory methods themselves.

5. Conclusion

Altogether, the cases illustrate the importance and challenges of enabling a more 'place-sensitive planning' and of 'finding the right planning space' (Hansen, 2021) for CH integration. Here, 'place-sensitivity' can be seen as a term to emphasise attention and responsiveness to specific local and regional issues, conditions and actors, but stresses the needs of a place without being solely place-based (Rodríguez-Pose, 2018; Iammarino et al, 2019; Sotarauta, 2020). It implies recognition of a need to see places as relational (Healey, 2007) and gives attention to a mixture of both local and professional/general knowledges and influences, the building of transboundary organisations, as well as to boundary-spanning deliberate spaces for participation, decision-making and implementation. It recommends the establishment of a common community infused planning space where CH aspects can potentially add a deeper cultural perspective to both the planning process and its contents.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the input and help from researchers Nicolas Boillet, Lars Bodum, Lasse Schytt Nørgaard, and all the stakeholders and citizens who contributed with interviews, participation in workshops, and relevant material.

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Ahmad Y (2006) The Scope and Definitions of Heritage, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12(3), pp.292-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600604639>.
- Allmendinger P and Haughton G (2009) Soft spaces, fuzzy boundaries, and metagovernance: The new spatial planning in the Thames Gateway, *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 41(3): pp.617–633.
- Allmendinger P, Haughton G, Knieling J, et al. (eds) (2015) *Soft Spaces in Europe: Re-negotiating Governance, Boundaries and Borders*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Allmendinger P (2017) *Planning Theory*. 3rd edition. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barca F, McCann P, Rodríguez-Pose A (2012) The case for regional development intervention: Place-based versus place-neutral approaches, *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol.52, no.1, 134-152.
- Brenner N (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cash D W, Clark W C, Alcock F, Dickson N M, Eckley N, Guston D H, Jäger J and Mitchell R B (2003) Knowledge systems for sustainable development, *Proceedings National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 8086–91.

- Cochrane (2006) Exploring cultural capital and its importance in sustainable development, *Ecological Economics*, 57, pp.318–330.
- Davoudi S and Strange I (eds) (2009) *Conceptions of Space and Place in Strategic Spatial Planning*, London: Routledge.
- Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (2018) Draft Marine Plan for Northern Ireland, Northern Ireland: Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs. Online: <https://www.daera-ni.gov.uk/articles/marine-plan-northern-ireland>. [Accessed 24 April 2021].
- DeSilvey C (2012) Making sense of transience: an anticipatory history. *Cultural Geographies*, 19(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474010397599>
- DeSilvey C, and Harrison R (2020) Anticipating loss: rethinking endangerment in heritage futures. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 26(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1644530>
- Escobar O (2017) Pluralism and Democratic Participation: What Kind of Citizen are Citizens Invited to be?, *Contemporary Pragmatism*, 14, pp. 416-438.
- Flannery et al., this issue. Steering resilience in coastal and marine cultural heritage: discontinuity, continuity and transformative processes
- Fredheim L H and Khalaf M (2016) The significance of values: heritage value typologies re-examined. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 22(6), 466–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2016.1171247>
- Galili E and Rosen B (2010) Preserving the Maritime Cultural Heritage of the Mediterranean, a Cradle of Cultures, Religions and Civilizations-the Holy Land Perspective, *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11852-010-0107-2>.
- Hansen C J (2018) The new DNA of Danish spatial planning culture. The case of regional planning, in Sigríður Kristjánsdóttir (ed.) *Nordic Experiences of Sustainable Planning: Policy and Practice*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 105–126.
- Hansen C J (2021) Planlægning i kystområder i Danmark – kampen mellem beskyttelse og benyttelse, in Hauge, K.B. & Stokke, K.B. (red.) *Integrert kystsonforvaltning. Planfaglege, samfunnsvitskapelege og juridiske perspektiv*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18261/9788215045078-2021-09>
- Haughton G, Allmendinger P, Counsell D, et al. (2010) *The New Spatial Planning: Territorial Management with Soft Spaces and Fuzzy Boundaries*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hawke S K (2002) Heritage and Sense of Place: Amplifying local voice and co-constructing meaning. In, I. Convery, G. Corsane and P. Davis (Eds.), *Making sense of Place: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 235-248.
- Healey P (2007) *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for Our Times*, London: Routledge.
- Healey P (2010) *Making Better Places. The Planning Project in the Twenty-First Century*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holtorf C (2018) Embracing change: how cultural resilience is increased through cultural heritage. *World Archaeology*, pp.1-12.
- HM Government, Northern Ireland Executive, Scottish Government and Welsh Assembly Government (2011) *UK Marine Policy Statement*, London: HM Government. Available online at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69322/pb3654-marine-policy-statement-110316.pdf. [Accessed 24 April 2021].

Iammarino S, Rodriguez-Pose A, Storper M (2019) Regional inequality in Europe: Evidence, theory and policy implications. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19, 273-298.

Janssen-Jansen LB and Hutton TA (2011) Reconfiguring the governance structures of the twentyfirst-century city-region: Observations and conclusions, *International Planning Studies* 16(3): pp.305–312.

Jigyasu R (2013) Heritage and Resilience: Issues and Opportunities for Reducing Disaster Risks, Background paper. Accessed 8 April 2018. http://icorp.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Heritage_and_Resilience_Report_for_UNISDR_2013.pdf

Khakzad S, Pieters M, Van Balen K (2015) Coastal cultural heritage: A resource to be included in integrated coastal zone management, *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 118, pp.110-128.

Kateliava M, Muhar A and Penker M (2020) Nature-related Knowledge as Intangible Cultural Heritage: Safeguarding and Tourism Utilisation in Austria, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 18(6), pp.673-689.

Kurin R (2004) Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention: a critical appraisal. *Museum international*, 56(1-2), pp.66-77.

Lorentzen A & Hansen C J (eds.) (2012) *The City in the Experience Economy. Role and Transformation*, UK: Routledge.

Marine Scotland (2011) *Scotland's Marine Atlas: Information for The National Marine Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-marine-atlas-information-national-marine-plan/>. [Accessed 16 July 2021]

Mason R (2002) *Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices*. In, *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage*. The Getty conservation Institute, Los Angeles.

Massey D (2018) Power-Geometry and a Progressive Sense of Place, in *The Doreen Massey Reader*, edited by Brett Christophers, Rebecca Lave, Jamie Peck, and Marion Werner, 149–57. Newcastle, UK: Agenda Publishing Limited.

Olesen K and Hansen C J (2020) Introducing Business Regions in Denmark: The 'Businessification' of Strategic Spatial Planning?, *Journal of Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, pp.366-383.

Ounanian K, Tatenhove J P M van, Hansen C J, Delaney A E, Bohnstedt H, Azzopardi E, Flannery W, Toonen H, Kenter J O, Ferguson L, Kraan M, Macias J V, Lamers M, Pita C, Silva A M F da, Albuquerque H, Alves F, Mylona D and Frangoudes K (2021) Conceptualizing Coastal and Maritime Cultural Heritage through Communities of Meaning and Participation, *Ocean and Coastal Management*.

Papadopoulos Y and Warin P (2007) Are Innovative, Participatory and Deliberative Procedures in Policy Making Democratic and Effective?, *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (4): pp.445–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2007.00696.x>.

Pine J B II and Gilmore J H (1999) *The Experience Economy*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Plummer P, Tonts M, Martinus K (2014) Endogenous Growth, Local Competitiveness and Regional Development: Western Australia's Regional Cities, 2001-2011, *Journal of Economic and Social Policy*, vol.16, no.1, 1-29.

Powe N (2019) Community enterprises as boundary organisations aiding small-town revival: exploring the potential, *Town Planning Review*, 40, pp. 625-651.

- Rodríguez-Pose A (2018) The revenge of the places that don't matter (and what to do about it). *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 11, 189–209.
- Kristjánsdóttir S (2018) The physical frame of planning, in Sigríður Kristjánsdóttir (ed.) *Nordic Experiences of Sustainable Planning: Policy and Practice*, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 37-47.
- Sotarauta M (2020) Place-based Policy, Place Sensitivity and Place Leadership, Sente Working Papers 46/2020, for RSA Place-based Policy Expo: Enhancing Relevance, Sharpening Our Understanding.
- State services of Morbihan, *Scheme for the Development of the Sea of the Morbihan Gulf (SDS)*. August 2020. <https://www.morbihan.gouv.fr/Politiques-publiques/Mer-littoral-et-securite-maritime/Le-Schema-de-Mise-en-Valeur-de-la-Mer-SDS-du-Golfe-du-Morbihan>
- Stephenson J (2008) The Cultural Values Model: An integrated approach to values in landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 84(2), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.07.003>
- Stokke K B and Clemetsen M (2021) Planning the tourism landscape across protected area borders, in Peter Fredman and Jan Vidar Haukeland (eds.) *Nordic Perspectives on Nature-based Tourism*, Cheltenham (UK): Edward Elgar Publishing, pp.80-94. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789904031>
- Tengberg A, Fredholm S, Eliasson I, Knez I, Saltzman K, and Wetterberg O (2012) Cultural ecosystem services provided by landscapes: Assessment of heritage values and identity. *Ecosystem Services*, 2, 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.07.006>
- The Scottish Government (2015) Scotland's National Marine Plan A Single Framework for Managing Our Seas. Available online at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scotlands-national-marine-plan/>. [Accessed 16 July 2021]
- Tuan Y (2001) *Space and Place*, 8th edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Vecco M (2010) A Definition of Cultural Heritage: From the Tangible to the Intangible, *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 11 (3): pp.321–324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2010.01.006>.