
Changing Values in Changing Landscapes
- from agriculture to golf

Magnus Sempler Holte

MSc

Cultural Heritage Studies
Glasgow Caledonian University

September 2006

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science, Cultural Heritage Studies.

Acknowledgements

Many people have helped me with this dissertation, and I owe a debt of gratitude to these people. Firstly, I am sincerely grateful to The Heyerdahl Institute for giving me the opportunity to go abroad for my MSc. I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Ian Baxter for good guidance, especially in the essential phase of focusing and narrowing down my research topic. I would also like to say a big thank you to Sigmund Haugsjå for suggesting my case study and for being so enthusiastic and helpful. I wish to thank my respondents, both in Scotland and Norway, for giving me insight in their work and thoughts, and for being so forthcoming. This piece of work could not have been written without them. Finally, I owe my dear Lene a gigantic thank you. Thank you for your patience; proof reading; feedback; and above all support.

Abstract

The research presented in this dissertation sets out to investigate how changes in landscape and landscape management affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage. By exploring a case study in Norway where a golf course is developed in a cultural landscape, the research has identified the different values that inform those understandings and presentations. Theory suggests several methods of assessing these values, ranging from a focus on the cultural significance of heritage to the economic values. The research revealed that assessing the values of heritage in processes of change is essential, because these assessments will inform the decisions regarding what should be preserved for the future and what should not. The interviews from the case study in Norway showed that the stakeholders had different and competing values in relation to the perception of heritage. It was therefore interesting to do a comparison of the case study in Norway and Scotland to investigate if golf course developments in cultural landscapes generate the same values and issues, especially since Scotland is perceived as the 'home' of golf. The findings from this study revealed that the handling of golf course development was quite similar in the two countries, and although Scotland has a much longer history of such development, the values and issues that arise are still the same.

Nevertheless, the values and issues identified during the research did not include the public's values in regard to the golf course development in Norway. Although the politicians and policy makers de facto are deemed to represent the public in such decision making processes, an assessment of the public values could represent a balanced view which can not be obtained elsewhere.

Changes in a landscape will affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage, thus this research calls for further development and implementation of existing methods of value assessment. This will enable a greater knowledge of how change affects the understanding and presentation of heritage.

Declaration

I declare that this dissertation is substantially my own work. Where reference has been made to the work of others the extent to which that work has been used has been duly acknowledged in the text and the bibliography. The length of this dissertation, excluding bibliography and appendices, does not exceed 15,000 words.

Magnus Sempler Holte

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Abstract	2
Declaration	3
Table of Contents	4
Table of Figures	5
1 Introduction	6
1.1 <i>Research problem</i>	6
1.2 <i>Case study</i>	7
1.3 <i>Structure of dissertation</i>	8
2 Literature review	10
2.1 <i>Value assessment</i>	11
2.2 <i>Public value</i>	11
2.3 <i>Economic value</i>	14
2.4 <i>Cultural significance</i>	16
2.5 <i>Economic and cultural value</i>	16
2.6 <i>Sustainable development</i>	17
2.7 <i>Norwegian policy</i>	18
2.8 <i>Summary</i>	19
3 Setting the context	20
3.1 <i>Relevant agencies and bodies</i>	20
3.2 <i>The Atlungstad case study</i>	20
4 Methodology	23
4.1 <i>Research design</i>	23
4.2 <i>Case study</i>	23
4.3 <i>Comparative study</i>	25
4.4 <i>Qualitative interview</i>	25
4.5 <i>Validity and reliability</i>	28
5 Summary of results	31
5.1 <i>Cultural landscape</i>	31
5.2 <i>Golf and cultural heritage</i>	32

5.3	<i>Cultural heritage project in Atlungstad</i>	33
5.4	<i>Setting</i>	33
5.5	<i>The public</i>	34
6	Analysis of results	35
6.1	<i>The Atlungstad case</i>	35
6.1.1	Landscape	35
6.1.2	Change	36
6.1.3	Setting	38
6.1.4	Stakeholders	39
6.1.5	Sustainable development	41
6.2	<i>Scotland – Norway</i>	42
7	Conclusion	45
7.1	<i>Contribution to wider debate</i>	47
7.2	<i>Policy recommendations</i>	47
7.3	<i>Further development – future research</i>	48
	Bibliography	49
	Appendix 1: Summary of Interview - Stange municipality	55
	Appendix 2: Summary of Interview - Norwegian Golf Association	58
	Appendix 3: Summary of Interview - Initiator Atlungstad Golf Course ...	62
	Appendix 4: Summary of Interview - Hedmark county council	66
	Appendix 5: Summary of Interviews and mail correspondence - Historic Scotland	71

Table of Figures

Table 1: Relevant agencies and bodies	20
---	----

1 Introduction

The work presented in this dissertation is part of the MSc Cultural Heritage Studies at Glasgow Caledonian University. This research-led post-graduate programme is taught over three semesters in a twelve month period, awarding the student with Master of Science in Cultural Heritage Studies.

1.1 *Research problem*

The main purpose of this research is to examine the understanding of cultural heritage and landscapes when affected by change. By proposing a change in a cultural landscape, the landscape will be altered in some way. Therefore it is important to look at how the qualities of the landscape are evaluated and assessed in this process of change. These evaluations can inform the decisions and thus the future of the landscape and its heritage. The research question for this study is therefore:

How do changes in landscape and landscape management affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage?

The research focuses on how people perceive landscapes and cultural heritage, and builds its assumptions of landscape on the European Landscape Convention's definition which emphasise people's perception and interaction with the landscape:

“**Landscape**” means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors. The term “landscape” is thus defined as a zone or area as perceived by local people or visitors, whose visual features and character are the result of the action of natural and/or cultural (that is, human) factors. This definition reflects the idea that landscapes evolve through time, as a result of being acted upon by natural forces and human beings. It also underlines that a landscape forms a whole, whose natural and cultural components are taken together, not separately’ (Council of Europe 2000a).

With this emphasis on the people's perceptions, the research will, through existing literature, investigate the values of heritage and the methods to assess them. The

public values are essential in relation to landscape and heritage, because they can reveal alternative conceptions of the landscape than to those attained by the policy makers and experts (Riley and Harvey 2005). So, by using methodological approaches that are able to tap into these alternative strands of knowledge construction, it will be possible to ‘democratise’ the construction of knowledge which inform decisions concerning landscape and heritage (Riley and Harvey 2005). Furthermore the research question focuses on the effect change has on the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage. This focus allows the research to examine how change makes different and often competing values related to heritage visible. To understand how these values inform the decisions that affect the understanding and presentation of heritage, this research has examined a case study where radical changes in a cultural landscape are in progress. Drawing upon existing literature and the findings from the case study, the research will initiate discussion on how a process involving change in cultural landscapes is to be carried out.

1.2 Case study

The case study is located in Norway and identifies the challenges of developing a golf course in an agricultural landscape. On the fields of Atlungstad farm in Stange municipality, the development of a new golf course is soon to be finished. This is an old farm with surrounding buildings such as a distillery from 1855 (Stang 2000). The reason why this is an interesting case study is because it reveals the process of developing a modern cultural landscape in an old cultural landscape and the issues and challenges that may arise with it. Furthermore, since Scotland is perceived as the ‘home’ of golf, the research has carried out a comparative study of the case study in Norway and the Scottish conditions seen through the eyes of Historic Scotland. The golf sport’s different status in these two countries is an interesting starting point to investigate whether or not this has an affect on how golf development projects are handled.

The target group for this research is the heritage professionals, policy makers, developers and public, mainly in Norway. However, since the issues outlined and discussed are of a general nature which makes them applicable to heritage regardless of its location, the research will be relevant outside Norway.

1.3 Structure of dissertation

In this dissertation the structure is based on five main chapters: the literature review; setting the context; the methodology; summary of results; and the analysis. The literature chapter will identify the challenges of assessing the values of heritage. It will look at the different methods which each have different emphasis in relation to cultural significance, economics and sustainable development. The assessment of the cultural values of heritage is complicated because of the strong element of individual and subjective influence (Howard 2003), while the economics of heritage is criticised for reducing the values of heritage to a monetary term. Sustainable development tries to balance the needs of today without comprising with the predicted needs of the next generation (UNECE 2005), bringing together and balancing the cultural and economic values of heritage. However, this method is quite new in relation to heritage and requires a broad assessment of the benefits and impact of heritage in the society (Clark 2006b). Furthermore, the chapter will focus on the public values of heritage, which is in accordance with the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe 2000b) and the development of heritage policy in both England (Jowell 2006) and Norway (St.meld. nr. 16 2004-2005). The literature chapter will also briefly outline the Norwegian government's policy on cultural heritage enabling the reader to get the best possible understanding of the case study.

In 'setting the context', the reader will be given a short description of relevant agencies and bodies in Norway and Scotland. Moreover the case study will be introduced by a short history of the process that led to the development of the golf course. The next chapter, the methodology, will explain and discuss the methodology used for this research, which involves identifying the challenges of case study research and reliability and validity issues. As qualitative interviews was the main strategy for collecting evidence, the design and conducting of such interviews are outlined and discussed to explain how the evidence for this research was attained. This chapter is followed by a summary of the results from the research and focuses on evidence relevant in relation to the research question. In addition this summary will present evidence concerning the issues that will be given emphasis in the analysis. The analysis in the next chapter is investigating the research question through a focus on five issues concerning: landscape; change; setting; stakeholders; and sustainable

development. These issues are chosen on the basis that they are relevant to how cultural heritage is understood and presented. Moreover these issues identify the different and competing values in a process of change, which enables a discussion on how to bring such processes forward in the best possible way. The analysis also includes a comparative study of Norway and Scotland in relation to golf course development and how such development is dealt with. The basis for this study is the case study analysis and interviews with representatives from Historic Scotland. Finally, drawing upon the collected evidence, the conclusion will elaborate on the research question and give recommendations and reflections for policy development. These reflections are followed by the acknowledgement that this study and its essence should be subject for future research.

2 Literature review

‘Heritage is clearly a problem, and becomes so as soon as different people attach different values to it’ (Howard 2003: 211). Nevertheless, value has always been in the centre of all heritage practice (Clark 2006a), because; a society does not conserve what it does not value (de la Torre and Mason 2002). Historically, those determining these values and therefore what constitutes ‘heritage’ have been experts and specialists, but in the recent decades the concept of what is heritage have evolved and expanded, and thus those identifying it (de la Torre and Mason 2002). This makes the decision making processes much more complicated, as the values assigned by the public often can differ from the values heritage professionals put on heritage. Values are indeed, as Howard (2003) points out, a problem, because every single person values heritage differently. The challenge is therefore to structure and organise values and above all find a way to measure the value of heritage.

In this research the main problem is to investigate how the changes in a landscape affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage. To do this, it is necessary to look at how people value heritage and the methods to measure these values. It is evident that a sudden change in a landscape can affect many people, in different ways. This is because a cultural landscape is not only what the eye can see at once (Benson and Roe 2000), it will also reflect a society and its beliefs, practices and technologies (Crang 1998). This definition of a cultural landscape illustrates that our heritage and identity are embedded in the landscape. It will therefore be likely to experience how different and competing values can become intensified when the possibility of change is proposed in a landscape. Thus, the understanding of values and how they are measured and evaluated is critical to comprehend how change is affecting our cultural heritage. Furthermore, to get a better understanding of the case study, a short outline of the current policy in Norway regarding valuation of heritage is provided in the end of this chapter.

2.1 *Value assessment*

According to Mason (2002) the value assessment for heritage is a threefold challenge: identifying all the different values of the heritage in question; describing them; and integrating and ranking the different, often competing values so they can inform the resolution of the so often diverse stakeholder interests. This ranking will in many cases be very challenging as it is hard to measure how one value can be better than the other.

However, first it is necessary to look at the various ways which heritage is valued. Driven by different motivations (aesthetic, political, economical, spiritual, cultural and others), each person will have different approaches to preserving heritage (Avrami et al. 2000). These values - often competing - inform policy decisions, and it is therefore important to understand the essence of these values and how they can be 'captured' and measured. To capture the value of heritage, it is necessary to examine the construction of cultural significance by assessing the values among the professionals; academics; and community members – in other words the stakeholders (Avrami et al. 2000). The motivations and interests for the valorisation or devalorisation of heritage from these stakeholders will vary and depend upon broader cultural conditions and dynamics. This means that conservation work should be understood as a social process, where the aim is to come to some sort of agreement of the cultural significance of a heritage object among the different stakeholders (Avrami et al. 2000).

2.2 *Public value*

According to the creator of the public value term, Mark Moore (1995), public value is what the public values. Thus, in public value terms, something is public value only if the citizens are willing to give something up in return for it (Kelly et al. 2002).

Adopting a public value approach in relation to heritage demands a different mindset than what has been common in the heritage sector, because it requires a focus on what the citizens value and why. Furthermore it means that there has to be a greater care on the quality of what is delivered – not just that it is delivered (Jowell 2006). With

the public value framework it is therefore possible to identify different types of value and to whom the different values are important.

According to Hewison and Holden (2006), heritage generates three types of value in a public value framework. The first is the so called 'intrinsic' value. This encompasses what often has been the heritage professional approach of valuing and refers to the individual's experience of heritage intellectually, emotionally and spiritually.

Expressions like 'this is beautiful' refer to this type of value. The second type of value is the 'instrumental' value, which refer to the effects used to achieve a social or economic purpose (Hewison and Holden 2006). These effects or benefits can for example be to gain a sense of identity or urban regeneration. The third value is called the 'institutional' value, as it relates to the processes and techniques that the heritage organisations use in how they create value for the public. Institutional value is generated, or destroyed, in the way the heritage organisations engage with their public (Hewison and Holden 2006). So; the practices and attitudes an organisation communicates, is creating the basis for the public notion of this heritage good.

Along with the three types of heritage value, Hewison and Holden (2006) also identify three groups of people with an interest in heritage. These are the politicians and the policy makers; the public; and the professionals in the heritage sector. By examining both the values and the interest groups it is possible to see who is interested in what value. Traditionally the policy makers have been most interested in the benefits of heritage – the instrumental values – such as economical benefits or social outcomes (Hewison and Holden 2006). The professionals are driven by the intrinsic values, as this is their vocation, but also by the institutional values because this is a part of their professionalism as workers in the sector. Finally, the public's preferences are mainly focused on the intrinsic values. However, they are also interested in how they are treated when they experience a heritage good, indicating that the institutional values also are important (Hewison and Holden 2006).

The values of cultural heritage goods can be assessed with environmental valuation techniques as well, because like environmental goods they are both typically public goods (Ready and Navrud 2002). To be a public good, the good must have two properties. Firstly, a public good must be 'non-excludible' (Ready and Navrud 2002).

This means that it is technically impossible to stop the public from enjoying the good. Cultural heritage goods may differ in their level of excludability: while an entrance fee to a museum will keep those who do not pay out, it is very impractical to charge admission for 'going in to' a cultural landscape used for recreation as it is not seen as an excludable activity. Secondly a public good must be non-rival in consumption (Ready and Navrud 2002), meaning that more than two people can experience and enjoy the cultural heritage good without interfering with each other's enjoyment. A good example would be a statue: it can be enjoyed simultaneously without reducing the value that each person receives from the good. Ready and Navrud (2002) see this as important because if a cultural heritage good is non-rival in consumption it will be desirable, even though exclusion is feasible, that as many as possible can experience the good as this will raise the total enjoyment of it. However, heritage can also in some aspects be a private good, meaning a range of goods and services consumed and traded by individuals on markets such as real estate and the services of a restoration carpenter (Mason 2005).

If the private providers were to preserve the cultural heritage as a private good, only profitable goods would be protected (Ready and Navrud 2002). Although a heritage good, such as an old beautiful building on a farm provides social benefits in terms of enjoyment for those who pass by, it may not provide the owner with those benefits. With no incentive of preserving the building and maybe also no resources to do so, this building will not be protected in lack of economical benefits for the owner (Ready and Navrud 2002).

Nevertheless, defining the value of a public good such as cultural heritage should be consistent with how value of goods in the private market is measured (Ready and Navrud 2002). This means that cultural heritage goods need to have a price as all other goods in the private market. However, price is not always a good indicator of value, thus public goods are divided in use value and non-use value (Ready and Navrud 2002). The use value of a cultural heritage good is the largest amount of money a visitor is willing to pay to get access to a site – his or her willingness to pay (WTP) (Ready and Navrud 2002). The total use value of a site will therefore be the sum of all the individual visitors' WTP. The challenge of this method of valuing cultural heritage goods is to measure peoples' WTP for a good where the entry or

enjoyment is free. In addition, peoples' WTP will also depend on their resources and where they live as some cultural heritage goods only generate values for those who live in the area where the good is located (Ready and Navrud 2002). Non-use value indicates the benefits that people get from a cultural heritage good without using it or being there (Ready and Navrud 2002). There are four types of benefits that people can get from non-use value: altruistic values: benefits which are motivated by a desire that a site should be available for other to enjoy; bequest values: a desire to preserve something for future generations; option values: the possibility of going to see a site sometime in the future; and existence values: motivated by the desire that a site should be preserved although no one actually can visit it (Ready and Navrud 2002). These values are indeed hard to measure and so far no methods have been developed to do this properly. It is not the lack of methods that is the problem, but it is to find a method able to assess all the values. Then again, different methods with different approaches will give different answers, and looking at them as a whole may give some new answers. Therefore it is also necessary to investigate the economic methods of assessing value in the heritage sector.

2.3 *Economic value*

The economics of heritage is a widely debated issue as historic preservation mainly is organised to sustain and create cultural values, like sense of place, feeling of identity, aesthetic qualities, historical associations and much more. Therefore, to study the economics of this would be to price the priceless and calculate the incalculable (Mason 2005). From an economical point of view, the question often asked and to some extent studied is: does preservation pay? A good example of this is Donovan Rypkema's study (in Mason 2005) about the relative costs of building rehabilitation versus new construction. His work shows that new construction not necessarily is less expensive than restoration of an existing building. According to Mason (2005) there is a broad agreement that the costs of preservation very often are being outweighed by the benefits, both economically and culturally. However, the economic benefits of heritage are contested. Graham et al. (2000) argues that exaggerated claims are made on behalf of the economic benefits of heritage as a means of development and that in practice the use of heritage to justify capital investment is insufficient.

For the decision makers, a cost-benefit analysis based on use values will be able to show if a cultural heritage good has a positive or negative net benefit, meaning that the benefits exceeds the costs or vice versa (Ready and Navrud 2002). Basically, a cost-benefit analysis involves balance-sheet mathematics measuring incomes and outlays, particularly used to decide between alternatives (Mason 2005). Although a cost-benefit analysis will be a good argument either in favour or against the preservation of a cultural heritage good, it is not enough information to make a decision. This is because there may be good reasons for providing the public good although it does not give a positive net benefit (Ready and Navrud 2002). An example could be the preservation of something not valued and appreciated by the current generation. The cost-benefit analyses are generally not concerned with non-use values (Mason 2005), and will therefore not capture such arguments as the example above.

Economic impact studies are another widely used technique. These studies try to measure the impact an investment in a heritage preservation project will have on the regional economy (Mason 2005). However, economic impact studies also have weaknesses. Although these types of studies account for some aspects of historic preservation well, they do not capture all the different sets of preservation values (Mason 2005). This is because aspects that cannot be represented by a market price will be excluded from the studies. Furthermore these studies do not account for and compare the effects of using money on something else than heritage preservation (Mason 2005). For example; although a study shows that investment in a particular heritage project will generate economic benefits, it does not say anything about if these benefits could have been achieved by investing in something else, such as a golf course.

Regression analysis and contingent valuation are also economic methods to understand the value of preservation. The former consists of mainly two methods: hedonic and travel-cost studies. Hedonic methods measure the impact a popular heritage good has on the property values in the area where it is located, while the travel-cost method is measuring the various costs people are willing to pay for getting to a heritage site (Mason 2005). The latter, contingent valuation studies, measure non-use values of public goods. This is a type of ‘stated-preference study’, which is based on people’s potential preferences in a situation where the public good does not

exist (Mason 2005). For instance, to investigate people's interest in the regeneration of the old town in a city, it is possible to ask how much they are willing to pay in increased taxes to make this happen. However, like other economic value techniques, these methods reduce the values of heritage to a question of price (Mason 2005). In addition the contingent valuation method can be a potential source of error as people do not have to pay what they report to be willing to pay (Mason 2005).

2.4 *Cultural significance*

As mentioned before, the economic values of heritage are contested. In 1988, the first edition of the Burra Charter was published; being the first major document stating that the significance of heritage should be at the heart of conservation work (Australia ICOMOS 2000). To establish this significance, or intrinsic value, complicated questions have to be asked: why is this place important, and for whom (Australia ICOMOS 2000)? This document also minimises the economic values of heritage by seeing them as derived from cultural values and therefore not possible to measure separate from culture itself (Mason 2002).

2.5 *Economic and cultural value*

There are also those championing a view which gives economic and cultural values equal status. David Throsby (2001) argues that cultural assets generate both cultural and economical values. This means that he neither sees cultural values as determinants of economic values or the other way around. To do this he is defining heritage as cultural capital, implying in economical terms the distinction of stock and flow. In a heritage context this would mean that a preserved building embodies values as a piece of capital stock where both economic and cultural value will exist independently of each other (Throsby 2006). Moreover, the building offers a flow of services over time, such as benefits for tourists visiting it as a cultural site and accommodation for tenants (Throsby 2006). This flow of services will also generate both cultural and economic value.

According to Throsby (2006), the definition of heritage as cultural capital enables possibilities for assessing values in cost-benefit terms and willingness-to-pay studies.

Nevertheless there is one important difference from ‘ordinary’ studies; both the economic and cultural values should be evaluated at the same time. However, there are some aspects of cultural value that is very difficult to express in monetary terms. These aspects can be divided up in to the following elements: aesthetic value (beauty and harmony); spiritual value (understanding, enlightenment, insight); social value (connection with others, sense of identity); historical value (connection with the past); symbolic value (objects as conveyors of meaning); and authenticity value (integrity, uniqueness) (Throsby 2006). Although these values derive from a cultural discourse about the significance of art, they are not fixed. On the contrary, the values in this context are highly subjective and are likely to change over time (Throsby 2006). Even though a thorough economic evaluation of a heritage object can tell a lot about the cultural value because people often are willing to pay more for objects that they truly appreciate, it may not capture everything as the cultural values mentioned above are very hard to measure and present in monetary terms (Throsby 2006). There is however one method that tries to answer why a person would like to visit a heritage site. Instead of just asking how much he or she is willing to pay, this method, which is called choice modelling study, is asking the respondents to rank detailed attributes articulated to a heritage good, such as price, look, feel etc. (Mason 2005).

2.6 Sustainable development

Although the widely debated and contested economic values and the cultural values of heritage may have different emphasis, they still have some of the same objectives and aims. In many ways, sustainable development brings together the economic and conservation agendas, as both are making its decisions based on the concern for future generations (Throsby 2002). Gro Harlem Brundtland (former prime minister of Norway) and United Nations Commission have defined sustainable development as ‘development which meets the needs of the present without compromising with the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (UNECE 2005: 11). However, the move towards thinking in terms of sustainable development is quite new for the heritage sector and has forced it to focus more on the instrumental benefits of heritage and its impacts on the economy and society in general (Clark 2006b).

Hobson (2004: 3) argues that ‘it is significant to remember that conservation merely represents one way of dealing with historic structures. It is largely a culturally determined attitude of our time that old buildings should be protected.’ This underlines the inevitable truth that new buildings and new landscapes will be created in favour of old ones. In that process of change, it is important that there is a close relationship and cooperation between those championing new design and those maintaining and preserving existing landscapes, because too often, these are opponents instead of working together (English Heritage 2004). English Heritage (2004), the English government's statutory adviser on the historic environment, argues that although protection will remain an important part of managing change, it is need to move from confrontation to a more creative debate, implying a more dynamic co-existence between new and old. However, in this debate it is argued that heritage assets should be treated differently to other goods and services as they are irreplaceable in the sense that, once lost, the original cannot be recreated (Eftec 2005). The question of irreplaceability is maybe more severe for built heritage than other heritage assets (Eftec 2005), but overall it highlights the complexity of decision making processes involving heritage assets.

2.7 Norwegian policy

In the Parliamentary report ‘Living with our Cultural Heritage’, the Norwegian government see cultural monuments and cultural environments as sources of experience and development, and for creating cultural, social and economic benefits (St.meld. nr. 16 2004-2005). The report is based on an understanding that allows for open and flexible value assessments which take into account historical, social and cultural variations (St.meld. nr. 16 2004-2005). In the report, there is clearly a focus on the instrumental benefits of heritage. The government encourages the cooperation between stakeholders and has established a program which is giving grants for projects creating cultural, social and economic benefits on the basis of cultural monuments and cultural environments (St.meld. nr. 16 2004-2005). However, the report does not examine or provide the tools required to assess the values of heritage in practice. With only a focus on the benefits of heritage and not how it is valued, it can be difficult to identify the values that are likely to give the best benefits. As this chapter has shown, there are many ways to do this – with different focuses. In a

decision making process it is inevitable that in the end some values will be preferred to others. Thus, it is important to have tools to identify and measure as many of the values as possible before the decision is made.

2.8 *Summary*

In the twenty-first century new leisure landscapes such as golf courses, community forests and centre parks open up the countryside to a much wider public, especially those from urban areas. Historically this can be compared to the twentieth centuries hunting lodges (Green and Vos 2001). However, some of them, such as golf courses, have been accused for a narrow exclusivity in their usage (Green and Vos 2001). To develop a golf course is to create a new cultural landscape where the demands generated from an increasingly urban society are likely to get in conflict from those of the rural society (Green and Vos 2001). However, this is not as simple as a conflict between the urban society and the rural society. This is a conflict that shows how different people will predict different impacts of the new landscape. These impacts are based on different values which very often will be competing. The methods for valuation of heritage outlined in this chapter, reveals the difficulties in measuring these values. First of all, these methods emphasise very different aspects of heritage which calls for a combined use in order to identify all the values. Secondly, the difficulties of measuring the so called intrinsic values makes the valuation process complicated, especially as these are regarded by many as the most important values of heritage. Thirdly, when all the values supposedly are identified, the challenge will be to navigate in the process of ranking these often competing values. Some of the valuation methods will give an answer to this, quite simply because the actual value can be revealed in monetary terms. However, for the 'remaining' values the evaluations must be based on both the projected benefits and negative sides of a change, but in the end it is inevitable that individual and subjective perceptions will influence the decision making process.

3 Setting the context

This chapter will give a short description of the local and regional administration in Norway and the governmental heritage agencies in Norway and Scotland. Moreover it will set the context for the case study carried out in Atlungstad.

3.1 *Relevant agencies and bodies*

Municipality	The municipality is the local administration in Norway and is in several instances responsible for carrying out the policy of the central government. One area of responsibility is the area development plans, which regulate the land-use in the municipality. The municipality is a democratically elected body (norge.no 2006).
County Council	The county council is the regional administration in Norway with responsibilities for public welfare and services in the county, such as cultural heritage. The county council is a democratically elected body (Hedmark Fylkeskommune 2006).
County Governor	The county governor in Norway is the government's representative in the county. The county governor is responsible for inspection and supervision on behalf of several Ministries (norge.no 2006).
Directorate for Cultural Heritage	The Directorate for Cultural Heritage in Norway is responsible for the practical implementation of the Norwegian Cultural Heritage Act and the objectives laid down by the Norwegian Parliament and the Ministry of the Environment. The Directorate is responsible for ensuring that a representative selection of monuments and sites is preserved for future generations (Riksantikvaren 2006).
Historic Scotland	Historic Scotland is an agency within the Scottish Executive Education Department and is directly responsible to Scottish Ministers for safeguarding the nation's historical environment, and promoting its understanding and enjoyment. All functions performed by Historic Scotland are carried out on the behalf of Scottish Ministers (Historic Scotland 2006).

Table 1: Relevant agencies and bodies

3.2 *The Atlungstad case study*

On the fields of Atlungstad farm in Stange municipality, located in the inland area north of Oslo in Norway, the development of a new golf course is to be finished in 2007. This old farm with its surrounding buildings such as a distillery from 1855

(Stang 2000) is the case study for this research. The area in which the farm is located is one of twelve valuable cultural landscapes in Hedmark County, designated by the county governor and the county council. Today the farmland is transformed into fairways and greens, and it is decided that parts of the old distillery, which still is in use sporadically, is going to function as a club house.

The plans for a golf course in Atlungstad started in the early 1990s and were the beginning of a long process that did not end before the final decision which approved the golf course development came from the Ministry of the Environment in 2003. The long process in front of the final decision was characterised by a heated discussion on the basis of protection of farmland. In Norway the farmland amounts to approximately three per cent of the country's area and is strongly protected through legislation and regulations (St.meld. nr. 29 1996-1997; St.meld. nr. 19 1999-2000). The county governor considered the golf course development to violate with this legislation and therefore raised an objection which later was rejected by the Ministry of the Environment.

While the protection of farmland was the main controversy in the process, the protection and preservation of the cultural heritage in the area were also an issue. Before any development could start, it was carried out archaeological excavations to secure and protect the possible undiscovered remains under ground. However, the findings from this excavation were quite small, and not at all as expected. The expectations were based on the results from previous excavations in the area around Atlungstad which had uncovered an extensive range of objects and remains.

As for the rest of the cultural heritage in the area, it would not be affected directly by the proposed golf course. Nevertheless it was a concern that the radical changes in the landscape would destroy the cultural environment in which the existing heritage needed to be seen in relation with. Especially since this was defined as a valuable cultural landscape. There were also concerns regarding the future accessibility to the area for those in the public not playing golf. However, the benefits of the increased activity in the old distillery and other parts of the area were regarded as positive. From the beginning the county council, as the cultural heritage authority, was not very positive to the development of the golf course. Yet, its assessment of the cultural

heritage in Atlungstad did not provide strong enough arguments to stop the golf course development. Today, some of the cultural heritage in the area such as old buildings is being restored to function as tourist attractions in co-existence with the golf course.

4 Methodology

It is challenging to identify values in research. Therefore it is essential to use the right tools and techniques to accomplish this identification, but just as important is the awareness of why the chosen approach is the most suitable. With such awareness the research will obtain a stronger validity and reliability. This chapter will outline and describe the research design of this study; how the research was conducted; the analysis; and reliability and validity issues concerned with the research. As a researcher it is essential to know the strengths and weaknesses of the approach and strategy used. Therefore, the decisions taken during the research concerning methodological issues will be discussed and evaluated both from a theoretical point of view and on the basis of experience from the research itself.

4.1 Research design

When deciding on case study as the research strategy, this was based on the possibilities and restrictions the research problem gave the forthcoming study. According to Yin (2003) a research problem asking ‘how’ or ‘why’ is explanatory, and is best suited for case study, history or experiment strategies. As the research problem for this study is concerned with how changes in landscape affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage, a case study approach was most suitable because it does not require control over behavioural events and it focuses on contemporary events (Yin 2003). In addition, it was considered by the researcher to be very difficult to understand the process this research problem proposes without examining a real case.

4.2 Case study

According to the Oxford Dictionary of English, a case study can be understood as ‘a process or record of research in which detailed consideration is given to the development of a particular person, group, or situation over a period of time’ (ODE 1998: 282). Yin (2003: 13) divides the definition of case study research into ‘the scope of a case study’ and ‘the case study inquiry’. The former points to the case study as an empirical inquiry that explores a topic or phenomenon in its real-life

context, particularly when there is not a clear distinction between the topic or phenomenon and its context (Yin 2003). This means that a case study is suitable in situations where it is difficult to understand a phenomenon or topic separated from its context. The latter points to the process of collecting data and that the many variables of interest in a case study requires the use of multiple sources of evidence so data can be cross-checked and compared (Yin 2003). This data collection benefits from and is guided by theoretical propositions (Yin 2003). So, guided by existing theory and by using different data collection techniques and triangulating the collected evidence, a case study can be a good strategy to investigate a phenomenon or topic which is hard to grasp outside a particular context.

However, the case study approach has been object for criticism on particularly three matters. The first is that a case study can be too time consuming and result in massive and unmanageable documents (Yin 2003). Secondly, it is the lack of rigour in case study research, which is often due to the researcher not following systematic procedures when undertaking the research and analysing it (Yin 2003). Thirdly, it is argued that a case study research provide little basis for generalisation (Yin 2003). Yin (2003) argues that the two first concerns can be dealt with through a good structured research design, and he also points out that a case study does not have to take a long time because of the various available research methods. Although a case study, as a single case, will not form the basis for generalisation, it can be a contribution to existing theory and a link between theory and practice (Yin 2003).

As mentioned earlier there are several approaches to collect the evidence in a case study research. In the process of collecting evidence from the case study in Atlungstad, three approaches were used: documentation, archival records and qualitative interviews. The use of documentation and archival records, which contained area development plans; official letters; progression plans; policy documents; and newspaper articles, was a way to get a good understanding of the situation and process leading up to important decisions. The qualitative interviews were chosen to identify the possible different and competing values of key persons in the process of developing a golf course in Atlungstad. The evidence this research was looking for, can be hard to find in the sense that values in many ways are communicated amongst people and not stated literally.

4.3 Comparative study

In addition to the case study in Atlungstad, the researcher conducted interviews with representatives from Historic Scotland. The results of these interviews are interpreted in the analysis through a comparison between the situations in Norway and Scotland. The differences in the golf sport's history in the two countries makes this comparison particularly interesting because it reveals how or if this influences the handling of golf development projects. According to Bryman (2004) the comparative research entails the comparison of two or more cases to generate theoretical insight on contrasting or coinciding findings. The evidence from such studies is considered to be more compelling and robust than single-case studies (Heriott and Firestone in Yin 2003). However, it requires extensive resources and time to undertake the research of two or more cases, something which often is beyond the means of a single researcher (Yin 2003). This was acknowledged in the design of this research and although the comparison will not include a particular case from Scotland, it will enable some general thoughts on the similarities and contrasts between the two countries. Again, the researcher acknowledges that collecting evidence from only one source, which in this case is Historic Scotland, can give an insufficient picture of the situation. However, as this research is concerned with the change of landscape and how this affects the understanding of cultural heritage, it was considered to be of great value for the research to interview the cultural heritage authorities in Scotland. The interviews were conducted as informal conversations and involved three representatives from Historic Scotland.

4.4 Qualitative interview

Qualitative interviewing is seen as 'conversations with a purpose' (Burgess cited in Byrne 2004: 181), and is normally done face-to-face. The advantages of qualitative interviewing is the acquisition of better explanations, more in depth answers and a greater accuracy of the collected evidence (Byrne 2004). In the interview situation, the researcher is not only interested in what the respondent says, but also how he or she says it (Bryman 2004). Thus, qualitative interviewing can be seen as an approach to understand why people answer like they do. In a context where the researcher investigated how heritage values are assessed, the qualitative interview was

considered to be a good way to understand such a complex term. To get a broad understanding of this term it was also important to interview people with different backgrounds and interests in the development in Atlungstad. Kvale (2001) argues that the number of interviewees depends on how many of them are needed for the researcher to find out what he or she is looking for. However, to conduct a big number of qualitative interviews are both time consuming and expensive, therefore the most important thing is not the number of interviews, but the information they provide (Ryen 2002). Another aspect of the qualitative interview is that it usually is recorded. This was also done for the case study in Atlungstad. By recording the interviews it helped the researcher to be more focused, as it was not necessary to take notes. A recorded and transcribed interview will also make it easier for the reader and a later researcher to trace the evidence. However, during some of the interviews it was evident that the recorder made the respondent a bit more correct and formal. This may have resulted in the respondent giving a less personal interview than wanted. Nevertheless, these are only speculations and a less focused interviewer was considered to be a greater disadvantage.

For the case study in Atlungstad it was essential to make a good evaluation of the possible respondents before deciding on interviewees and number of interviews. On the basis of time limitations and predicted findings there were conducted four qualitative interviews, and the interviewees were all selected to get a diverse composition of interests and values. The selected respondents were: a representative from Stange municipality; one of the initiators of the golf course in Atlungstad; a representative from the cultural heritage division in Hedmark county council; and a representative from the Norwegian Golf Association. With these respondents it was possible to get views from stakeholders with very different interests and value assessments, ranging from the heritage professional's approach, to the golf course developer's approach. These respondents were therefore likely to give a good illustration of the different value assessments related to the development in Atlungstad, apart from one exception: the public's values. This was however a deliberate choice from the researcher as capturing the public value would have required many interviews and therefore too much time. In addition it was never carried out a formal assessment of the public's views of the golf course development in Atlungstad. Thus, these values were not a part of the decision making process. Yet,

this is an interesting aspect of the case study and will be elaborated upon in the analysis.

Regarding the anonymity of the respondents in the case study, this will be hard to obtain towards readers coming from the region around Atlungstad. Although names are not stated, the information regarding their involvement in the case study will reveal their identity for local readers. To a certain extent this will also apply for the respondents from Historic Scotland. This is not a big ethical issue since the respondents already are public persons in the region and are aware that it will be hard to conceal their identity. However, it is necessary to be aware of this fact as it may have influenced how they behaved in the interviews.

The challenge when conducting the interviews was to get access to the respondents' 'worldview' (Ryen 2002). With such access it would be possible to get relevant information for the research problem. The approach chosen in the interviews were semi-structured, which means that the researcher puts down the main topics or questions in front of the interview, but without determining the order of questions or the exact formulation of them (Ryen 2002). This makes the interview more like a conversation, and enables the respondent to come forward with spontaneous stories and let him or her take some control over the interview (Ryen 2002). For the researcher this was a critical success factor, because talking about values is not easy as they might be personal and hard to describe. In some ways it is more likely that these values will become evident during a conversation on different related topics. To establish an atmosphere for this kind of conversation it is important to structure the interview in an opening phase, a main phase, and a closure phase (Ryen 2002). The opening and closure phase is suited for simple, straight forward questions, while the main phase is suited for the respondent's story about the topics in question (Ryen 2002). In the Atlungstad case study, the respondents to a certain extent told the same story but with different perspectives. It therefore required the researcher to be deliberate naive, which would lead to a more supplementary answer (Kvale 2001). By pretending not to know the stories, the researcher obtained differing perspectives which would turn out very valuable for the analysis.

4.5 *Validity and reliability*

The quality of a research can be judged by its trustworthiness, credibility, confirmability, and dependability (U.S. General Accounting Office in Yin 2003: 33). Thus, the validity and reliability of this research is based on what Yin (2003) states as the four tests. The first test is construct validity, and refers to how the researcher needs to specify which changes that are to be studied and that the measures of these changes have to reflect the changes that have been chosen (Yin 2003). For the research in Atlungstad the researcher wanted to investigate how changes in the landscape affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage. To measure this change the method chosen was the value assessment of cultural heritage from the involved key persons. This method was selected because by investigating the values attached to the heritage in the area, it would also be possible to see how these values affected the management and presentation of the heritage. To increase the construct validity, the test suggests the use of multiple sources of evidence and the establishment of a chain of evidence to ensure the truthfulness of the findings (Yin 2003). To ensure the truthfulness of the case study in Atlungstad, the researcher used qualitative interviews, documentation and archive records to get a good overview of the case and to cross-check and triangulate the findings. The interviews were the main source of information, while the documentation and archive records were used to confirm and cross-check the interviewees' views and to get a good understanding of the process. The chain of evidence from the case study can be traced as the interviews were recorded and transcribed, while other documentation is referenced to and are official documents which are accessible for the public. Thus, it is possible for the reader to trace the evidentiary process backward (Yin 2003: 105). However, the analysis and interpretation of the interviews are made on the basis of impressions which the transcripts are not able to capture and will to a certain extent be subjective.

The second test, internal validity, deals with the question whether or not a finding which claims a causal relationship between two or more variables is sound (Bryman 2004). This can be explained by analysing if an event y led to the event x . However, this claim can become a threat to internal validity if it turns out that a third factor, event z also may have led to the event y (Yin 2003). To deal with internal validity in the case study in Atlungstad, the researcher used a technique called pattern matching.

This is a technique used in the data analysis which compares the propositions from the theory with the empirical patterns and strengthens the study's internal validity if these patterns coincide (Yin 2003). When analysing the Atlungstad case study it was therefore essential to look at the propositions from the theory concerning value assessment to see if they matched with the patterns from the findings. The assumption that the assessment of heritage values will be the basis for how cultural heritage is presented and understood in a changing landscape, were in this case the event y that would lead to event x . This assumption was based on the fact that both personal and organisational values inform decisions. Therefore the research needed some theoretical propositions on how to assess these values and how they inform decisions concerning heritage. Hence, as values influence almost everything in society, a third factor z was not evident in the findings. However, as this same influence made the event y that leads to x such a comprehensive event, the analysis of pattern matching was split up in several coherent patterns. For example is the economical value assessment different from an intrinsic value assessment. Nevertheless, seen in connection with each other these and other patterns will give a complete representation of cause and effect in the Atlungstad case study.

The third test is external validity and is concerned with whether or not the case study's findings are generalisable (Yin 2003). In other words: will the findings from the case study in Atlungstad be transferable to other similar case studies? As mentioned before, one case study does not form the basis for general generalisation, but instead relies on analytical generalisation which means that the researcher investigates the findings in a broader theoretical context (Yin 2003). With the assessment of values as the theoretical basis for the Atlungstad case, the results can be valid in other cases in the sense that the experience derived from the analysis can be similar although the results will be different.

The fourth and last test is reliability. The objective with this test is to ensure that if a later researcher were to follow the procedures and descriptions from the case study in Atlungstad, he or she would come to the same findings and conclusions (Yin 2003). To make sure this is possible the researcher must describe all the steps taken that lead to the conclusions. For the case study in Atlungstad the procedures are documented in this chapter in such way that it would be possible to do the same case over again.

However, with limited space to give thick descriptions of every step taken during the study, the researcher admits that it will be difficult to do an entirely similar case study in Atlungstad again.

This research had one major challenge: the identification of which and how values were used in the process of developing a golf course in cultural landscapes. By identifying this, it would also be possible to see how these values affected the understanding and presentation of the cultural heritage in the area. This has been achieved by following a research design which gives access to the explanations of this challenge while at the same time ensuring that the conducted research is valid and reliable. However, the analysis of values will to a certain degree rely on the unique situation that took place between the researcher and the respondent and more importantly the interpretation of results by the researcher. Even though these interpretations are based on theoretical propositions, the researcher's own values will affect the analysis. This is not necessarily a negative factor, because such interpretations can also give a contribution to and enrich existing knowledge.

5 Summary of results

This chapter will give a summary of the findings from the research in Atlungstad. The main source of evidence which will be referred to in this chapter is four interviews with the key persons from the golf course development. Summaries of these interviews are available in the appendices.

The research from the case study in Atlungstad revealed that there were obvious differences in the perception of heritage. These differences were mainly identified when discussing perceptions of landscape, the issue of setting and the process of change. However, on some issues, like the potential generated by a golf course, all the respondents acknowledged and even argued for the possible benefits the golf course could create for cultural heritage in the area. This was to a certain degree expected, but it showed the complexity of processes concerned with radical change in cultural landscapes.

5.1 *Cultural landscape*

The interviews from the Atlungstad case study revealed rather different approaches to cultural landscape and the management of them. The respondent from the municipality perceived a cultural landscape as man made, always changing and influenced by different times and needs. Therefore the golf course was a natural change and development in the landscape. At the same time he emphasised that it is important to preserve the landscape, and that this had been done according to the right procedures in Atlungstad by carrying out excavations. One of the proposers of the golf course also responded in a similar way. He saw the golf course as a natural continuing and development for the area. Moreover, he pointed out that the landscape, as it is today with the golf course, look more alike the landscape that was thirty years ago. This is because the golf course has opened up the landscape down to the lake, making it appear as it was when animals were grazing. Before the development of the golf course, this area had become overgrown. The respondent from the cultural heritage department in the county council agreed on this, and said that if you leave out the people on the golf course it still looked like an agricultural landscape. However,

this did not mean that the county council was positive to the golf course development. According to the respondent, the county council considered to raise an objection based on the fact that this was a landscape of great value. Since cultural landscapes are a shared responsibility between the county council (cultural heritage) and the county governor (environmental protection), this however became problematic. This was due to the county governor's wish to focus on the protection of farmland instead of the protection of cultural landscape.

5.2 Golf and cultural heritage

Although not being a part of the process in Atlungstad, the interview with the representative from the Norwegian Golf Association revealed a growing interest in the interplay between golf courses and cultural heritage. With the establishment of a partnership between the association and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage, the Norwegian Golf Association hopes to address the issues arising when developing a golf course in cultural landscapes. The respondent emphasised that in such processes it is a problem that the municipalities do not include golf courses in their area development plans, like they do with other sports grounds like football stadiums. Thus, the location of golf courses is not always based on what is best for the municipality, but on the individual land owner's preferences. Furthermore, the respondent from the Norwegian Golf Association claimed that the Scottish authorities were more pragmatic in their handling of golf course development projects. As an example he mentioned that in Scotland golf courses are considered to increase the biodiversity, while in Norway this is considered to be the other way around. However, the attitude and approach towards golf course developments in Norway also depend on the policy from current the government. This was revealed as all of the respondents strongly assumed that the golf course in Atlungstad never would have been approved by today's government. The policy of the centre-left government of today and the centre-right government which governed when the golf course in Atlungstad was approved is according to the respondents so different that it would have affected individual decisions.

5.3 Cultural heritage project in Atlungstad

Although the county council was negative to the development of the golf course in Atlungstad, the same golf course is now acknowledged as a unique feature of the landscape. The respondent from the county council stated that when the decision was taken, they had to change focus and look at how they could make use of the heritage in the area in a best possible way. Today this has resulted in a project which aims to build on and restore the local heritage to provide experiences for the tourists and the local community. This is a project which would not have been initiated without the development of the golf course, admitted the respondent from the county council. This is also important for the respondent from the municipality, as he claims that only a focus on cultural heritage would not have generated as much profit as the golf course will do. He hopes the development of the golf course will give a boost to the area and make it attractive for housing development, business development and the tourist industry. In relation to this the respondent from the golf association pointed out that on many golf courses there are more non-golf activity than it was before the course was developed. This is because the golf clubs have arranged foot paths in the area in addition to the parking, toilet and restaurant facilities that come with a golf course. The respondent from the golf developers also argued that golf courses increase access to the area in which they are developed. However, he strongly disliked the tendency to make claims for every ones' benefit as soon as somebody proposed a development. His point was that it had not been any such claims before the golf course development, so why now?

5.4 Setting

The radical changes in the landscape caused by the golf course would also affect the setting in which the distillery in Atlungstad has to be understood. Prior to the approval of the development, this claim came from both local activists and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage. The Directorate for Cultural Heritage advised against the golf course development on the basis of preservation of the cultural environment (Riksantikvaren 2003). For the cultural heritage authorities it was important that one of the best preserved distilleries in Norway could be experienced together with the elements that explain its location and history. Both the respondent

from the municipality and the golf course developer disagreed to the importance of this setting. The former argued that the landscape would not change that much as the landscape would still be open like it was when the crops could be seen adjacent to the distillery. Furthermore he argued that the golf course would not destroy the valuable cultural landscape designated by the county council, but rather enrich it. The latter pointed out that the distillery no longer gets its supplies from the farmland next to it and that the golf course development is a natural continuation for a distillery which no longer is the basis for activity and a lively social environment.

5.5 *The public*

All of the respondents agreed that the local land owners' will to restore and make use of their property and buildings for farm tourism; letting; pubs; and conference venues was due to the golf course development, as this was expected to make the area more attractive. Most of these land owners plan to present their products in a historical context. This willingness is especially important for the cultural heritage project initiated by the county council. The respondent from the county also admitted that this willingness from the stakeholders is crucial, and that it probably would have been difficult to attain such willingness without the golf course in the area as a visitor attraction.

In relation to the main stakeholder group, the public, all the interviews revealed that no major assessment of their views had been carried out concerning the development in Atlungstad. Nevertheless, the respondents made qualified assumptions of how the golf course development plan was received amongst the public. These assumptions were rather concurrent and stated that the farmers were negative on the basis of protection of farmland, especially in the beginning of the process, and that the local community as a whole was positive and excited although quite a few in this group also were sceptical for the same reason as the farmers.

6 Analysis of results

The analysis of this research is divided into two sections. The first and main section is the interpretation of the results from the Atlungstad case study. This section focuses on five issues identified from the research findings and found relevant to the research question. The reasoning for this focus is that the understanding and presentation of heritage seemed to depend on the way these issues were perceived, namely landscape; change; setting; stakeholders; and sustainable development. In the second section, the analysis compares the understanding and presentation of heritage between Scotland and Norway. The views from Historic Scotland form the basis for this comparative analysis of heritage perspective.

6.1 *The Atlungstad case*

6.1.1 Landscape

Landscapes are dynamic and always changing, which can make a value assessment of a landscape even harder than that of an ancient monument. As the landscape changes, the values and qualities attached to it, will do the same (Crang 1998). Thus some of the respondents from the Atlungstad case study saw the golf course development as part of a dynamic and always changing landscape, while the county council which had designated the landscape to be of great cultural value, saw the same development as destructive. Nevertheless, the county council found it difficult to argue for the preservation of this landscape on the basis of cultural identity, because how land is perceived is subjective. This is problematic because the landscape is not only perceived as the physical landscape, but also, and even more importantly, as a reflection of peoples' beliefs, traditions and practices (Crang 1998). According to the county council, the elements that really define a cultural landscape are very complicated to apply in decision making processes. The European Landscape Convention is trying to resolve this dilemma, by focusing on the public and the individual in the landscape. According to the Convention, the public should get the opportunity to participate when professionals, bureaucrats and politicians are discussing and assessing the values of a landscape and deciding its future (Council of Europe 2000b). Furthermore key procedures should be in place to ensure that this

participation occurs. The county council, as the regional cultural heritage authority, agreed that the European Landscape Convention recommendations would be emphasised in their future work. While this does not solve the problem of conflicting ratings and different perceptions of landscape and landscape management, at least it will enable discussion where the intangible arguments can be put forward, which make a landscape a cultural landscape.

Another important issue of landscape change is appearance. In the Atlungstad case the involved parties agreed that a golf course would make the landscape look more similar to how it was thirty years ago. According to the respondent at the county council the landscape in Hedmark has become overgrown because of a decrease in grazing animals. She therefore agreed that it was desirable to open up the landscape in Atlungstad, but not with a golf course on farming land. Thus although Norway has a very strict legislation for the protection of farmland (St.meld. nr. 29 1996-1997; St.meld. nr. 19 1999-2000) it does not necessarily mean that the landscape is equally well protected. While this argument about farming land use is first and foremost a discussion on the production of food supplies which is not applicable in this research, it highlights that an overgrown landscape may be as undesirable as a golfing landscape. One represents a slow, almost unnoticeable change while the other represents sudden change. This speed of change it is argued can influence acceptance of change. From a heritage perspective the key word is change, and how it relates to cultural heritage. This is because change, and especially sudden and radical change, often is the catalyst for preservation awareness.

6.1.2 Change

The Atlungstad case study is a good example of how change can generate awareness of cultural heritage. As admitted by the respondent at the county council, the second project which aims to create cultural, social and economic benefits on the basis of cultural monuments and environments in Atlungstad would probably not have been initiated without the first project; the proposed golf course. This shows that landscape change in many cases can benefit cultural heritage, as a by product of that change.

The respondent at the county council agreed that in future cases they would look more at the positive opportunities than solely at the negative impacts of change. However,

this process can be complicated because in any decision making which involves several stakeholders with different and competing values and views, each stakeholder may evaluate the proposed change from their own stakeholder interest. In such cases it is often left to the politicians to take a more holistic picture of the situation. From a heritage point of view this means that the positive aspects of change, which in Atlungstad will be increased accessibility; public awareness; and the economic impacts leading to a willingness to focus on heritage by the landowners, can not be a part of the cultural heritage authority's evaluation. According to Hewison and Holden's (2006) model of three types of value in a public value framework, the aspect left out of this evaluation would be the instrumental values of heritage, confirming their description of heritage professionals as driven by the intrinsic values, while politicians are most interested in the instrumental values.

In terms of value, Mason (2005) refers to cost – benefit analyses and economical impact studies as important tools for the decision makers, but claims that these methods have a drawback because they do not account for and compare the effects of using money on something else. The impact study that was carried out in relation to the golf course development in Atlungstad analysed the impacts of the proposed golf course (Asplan Viak 2001), but other opportunities like a heritage based project were not considered. One of the proposers of the golf course in Atlungstad described such analysis as triggered not by the desire to do something else but because the golf course was not wanted. Whilst some might argue that it would be wrong to include other opportunities in an already proposed project, it is this inclusion that is essential in relation to cultural heritage, because change necessitates decisions on what should be preserved for future generations and what should not. This is also supported by the argument that heritage assets should be treated differently from other assets and goods because their sense of irreplaceability (Eftec 2005). Nevertheless, in many cases decisions are not taken before a change is proposed, but after it has been discussed. In Atlungstad the result of such discussion was a golf course in co-existence with a heritage project. However, it is the pre-decision process and planning that is important: in this case, to what extent the values related with Atlungstad were identified, described, integrated and ranked (Mason 2002). The Atlungstad case showed that not every stakeholder was prepared to do a thorough value assessment because this would result in higher expenditure, and because of time constraints.

Thus one of the biggest challenges in decision making is to get different stakeholders to understand each others views and values.

6.1.3 Setting

Setting is defined as ‘the place or type of surroundings where something is positioned (..)’ (ODE 1998: 1702). In Atlungstad this something is the distillery, while the surroundings are the lake; a small river; and the crops. According to the Directorate for Cultural Heritage these three elements are essential to understand the history and location of the distillery, and the interaction it has had with the farming community (Riksantikvaren 2003). With the introduction of a golf course, the farm land will be replaced with fairways and greens. A circular from the Ministry of the Environment about area planning and golf courses strongly advise against the combination of golf courses and preservation-worthy cultural environments if the value of the historical setting is considerably reduced (Rundskriv T-2 2001). However, in his approval of the golf course, the Minister of the Environment, Børge Brende, did not take the view that this site was preservation worthy. However, the conducted interviews in the case showed very differing views of the importance of setting. The respondent from the county council supported the views from the Directorate for Cultural Heritage while both the proposer of the golf course in Atlungstad and the respondent from the municipality strongly disagreed. The main argument against the importance of the setting was that over the years the use of the distillery had changed due to reduced activity, thus the significance of the setting had also changed. These arguments highlight differences in the perception of what constitutes an authentic setting because on the one hand authenticity was understood as the genuineness of the concerned object and its surroundings while on the other hand it was understood as something disappearing along with the ‘closure’ of the social environment connected to the object.

By applying Ready and Navrud’s (2002) definition of heritage as a public good, the valorisation of the Atlungstad area regarding both setting and authenticity could have been done by identifying the use and non-use values. This could have identified how much the public appreciated the area and the original setting, and could thus have provided a supplement to the ‘expert’ interpretation of the area. The respondent at the

county council recognised that perception of setting is dependent on how and by whom the interpretation of validity is done. Moreover, it became evident that arguing on the basis of setting in the Atlungstad case was complex as the interpretations were very different. From a heritage perspective, when actual monuments or buildings are not directly affected in the development plans, promoting an understanding of the heritage perspective may also be problematic. However, adding the public value aspect in the Atlungstad case might have contributed to a better understanding for all the involved stakeholders as it would have presented a balanced view from those not having special interest in the area.

Looking at it from another stakeholders point of view, a golfer's, the research revealed that setting also is important for those playing on the golf courses. The nature experience is actually highly valued by those playing on Norwegian golf courses (Norges Golfforbund 2005). Therefore the Norwegian Golf Association values the qualities that heritage and cultural landscapes represent and in any development, try to ensure that these are visible for the players (Norges Golfforbund 2005). The respondents however refused to accept the idea that golf courses are currently located on the basis of the qualities of the cultural landscape, and emphasised the importance of location based on where people live instead. Nevertheless, these respondents agreed that elements which make a golf course special and unique are important to make it attractive for the golfers. In relation to cultural heritage this may result in two outcomes: firstly it may lead to a greater awareness and care for cultural heritage in golf course developments, and secondly it may create more demand to develop golf courses in spectacular landscapes and cultural landscapes of great value. This discussion of setting reveals how the stakeholders in such a process may utilise the same argument on the basis of very different interests, making the decision making process truly complex.

6.1.4 Stakeholders

According to Avrami et al. (2000) conservation work should be understood as a social process, where the aim is to come to some sort of agreement about the cultural significance of a heritage object among the different stakeholders. These stakeholders can be divided in three groups: the politicians and the policy makers; the public; and

the professionals in the heritage sector (Hewison and Holden (2006)). By applying this model to the Atlungstad case study it became evident that the golf course developers did not appear to belong to either of these groups. The interests and motives of the developers clearly stood out from the other stakeholder groups in the process in Atlungstad. Therefore, in processes involving change, this research would suggest to the creation of a fourth group, those initiating the possible change. Doing this will ensure that neither the developers' values nor the heritage professionals' values are mixed with the assessment of the public values.

When a radical change in the landscape is proposed, it is unlikely that the stakeholder groups will come to an agreement of the cultural significance of the heritage objects concerned. However, it is important that the different stakeholders' values are identified and evaluated. The research in Atlungstad revealed an absence in the inclusion of the public values in the decision making process. This may not necessarily be seen as a problem because the politicians de facto are deemed to represent the public. Moreover assessing public values, can be a time consuming and comprehensive task, which were key factors in their exclusion in this case study. Nevertheless, a public value approach in relation to heritage demands a different mindset than what has been common in the heritage sector, because it requires a focus on what the citizens value and why (Jowell 2006).

Although the public values were not formally assessed in Atlungstad, the values and attitudes of the neighbours to the golf course became evident as the plans were approved. The values expressed by these public stakeholders' matched Ready and Navrud's (2002) argument, which states that if a private provider preserves the cultural heritage as a private good, only those goods that are profitable will be protected. The Atlungstad case showed that the local neighbouring landowners saw the development as an opportunity to develop services based on cultural heritage. These would benefit and serve the expected visitors and guests coming to the area, as well as the private stakeholders. Thus, the golf course development was able to offer a heritage focus, because it was anticipated that it would generate economic benefits. The respondent from the county council agreed that the golf course had made the landowners around Atlungstad very positive to the county's ongoing heritage project because of the expected benefits that would accrue from this attraction.

6.1.5 Sustainable development

The Norwegian policy on cultural heritage focuses on the range of benefits that heritage can generate in local communities and towns (St.meld. nr. 16 2004-2005), and forms the basis for the cultural heritage project in Atlungstad. This policy concurs with Throsby's (2002) argument of sustainable development as a facilitator for bringing together the conservation and economic agendas, because they both make decisions based on the concern for future generations. For the heritage sector the idea of sustainable development is quite new (Clark 2006b). The respondent from the county council found that it was the economical benefits that people were first and foremost expecting. The benefits of creating awareness and passing on crafting skills and techniques, seen as more important by the cultural heritage authorities, was harder to measure and was therefore not as interesting as focusing on tourism, according to this respondent. This is interesting because it shows that the move towards thinking in terms of sustainable development can create a disproportionate balance between cultural and economical values. Furthermore it confirms Throsby's (2006) claims about the difficulties of measuring the intrinsic values of heritage.

If this tendency persists, the cultural heritage policy may move away from having cultural significance at the heart of its conservation work, which is argued for in the Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2000). The findings from the research in Atlungstad suggest that this tendency may arise as a result of the reasonable simplicity of assessing economic values and benefits, against the difficulties of measuring and assessing cultural significance. Thus, sustainable development, which can be understood as a more holistic approach to conservation work, may be problematic in relation to cultural heritage as long as the tools and methods for assessing the cultural values are not fully developed and implemented. As mentioned, sustainable development demands a more holistic approach from the heritage professionals, but at the same time it also demands that other stakeholders take the same holistic approach and acknowledge the cultural significance of heritage. This is one of the key challenges, because if this is not implemented, developmental decisions taken will not be based on values and views that are acknowledged by all the involved parties.

There are different methods to assess the different values of heritage, however, some values are more complicated to measure than others. Although none of the methods suggested in the literature chapter were utilised in the Atlungstad case study, the values, many of which were competing, still became evident. The challenge was to rank these competing values and prioritise their relative importance. A sustainable development approach is meant to be a tool for such a process, but in the end it turned out that it was the subjective and political stands that cast the deciding vote for the future of Atlungstad.

6.2 *Scotland - Norway*

From the interviews at Historic Scotland, the research revealed quite similar situations in Scotland and Norway regarding golf course developments. This was rather surprising since golf has a much longer history in Scotland. Nevertheless, some differences were identified. In Scotland the Scottish Golf Environment Group is an initiative led by Scottish Natural Heritage, the Scottish Golf Union and The Royal and Ancient Golf Club of St Andrews to encourage environmental awareness (Scottish Golf Environment Group 2006). The group is among others sponsored by Historic Scotland and offers advice on new golf course developments and course management. As this is an initiative from both the golf clubs and the heritage authorities it can provide a platform for balanced views and guidance in a way not yet possible in Norway.

However, one of the respondents from Historic Scotland did not experience that there was a great awareness of cultural heritage and contentment with the regulations and policy concerning cultural heritage amongst the golf course developers. The reason for this was believed to be the costs of excavations which, as in Norway, are the developer's responsibility. This is interesting as it is the exact opposite of how the respondent from the Norwegian Golf Association experienced the situation in Scotland. He believed that the Scottish system was much more pragmatic and solution based than in Norway.

The respondents from Historic Scotland indicated that it is not uncommon for the council to comprise, in part, of local business persons and indeed of persons of other

equally focused interest areas. Although there are safeguards in the system to avoid personal interests interfering with the judgements, there can be other aspects interfering with the judgements in the planning committee. One of the respondents from Historic Scotland indicated that Scotland to a certain extent was dependent on the American tourists, making the planning committees approve the design and development of 'American' golf courses. According to the respondent these designs are not always desirable as they can alter the landscape radically. The case study in Atlungstad identified a similar situation, where the municipality emphasised the benefits accruing from the golf course development more than the cultural heritage issues. Thus, the expected benefits of these developments could threaten cultural landscapes and its heritage both in Norway and Scotland and is due to the economic values being emphasised in favour of the cultural values.

In the evaluation of these economic and cultural values, one of the respondents from Historic Scotland stressed the importance of setting because cultural landscapes are intangible heritage through peoples' perceptions of it. Nevertheless she admitted that intangible heritage is not prioritised in the same way as tangible heritage since the issue of setting only is a material consideration in the planning process. In addition the European Landscape Convention is not yet ratified by United Kingdom (Council of Europe 2006). This indicates that, as in Norway, cultural landscapes are not being preserved on the basis of setting in the sense of peoples' valuation of the landscape.

Furthermore, the respondents stated that Historic Scotland would not take possible benefits arising from a development into account, such as increased awareness of existing heritage or the willingness to focus on heritage by local landowners. Thus, if involved in similar cases as Atlungstad, Historic Scotland will only evaluate the 'direct' effect the development has on the concerned heritage. The respondents argued that it is not their responsibility to evaluate 'the big picture', because this would only make the decision making process more complicated. This is dissimilar to the development in Atlungstad, where the county council stated that such aspects were going to be a part of the evaluation in the future.

From the interviews at Historic Scotland and the Atlungstad case it is interesting to see that the development of methods for evaluation is going in different directions.

While the Norwegian authorities are beginning to assess the wider implications of development in relation to heritage, the Scottish heritage authorities are firmly restricting its evaluations to values attained by the heritage professional on the basis that the wider evaluations are for the decision makers – the politicians. Nevertheless, the research identified that in general the approach to the handling of golf course developments and the issues arising are quite similar although the sport has different positions in the two countries.

7 Conclusion

The aim of this research dissertation was to investigate how changes in landscape and landscape management affect the understanding and presentation of heritage. To answer this question, the research needed to assess the values which form these understandings and presentations. As expected, the values connected to heritage are different and competing, especially in processes of change. Furthermore these values are complicated in the respect that they are hard to measure and often individual. However, theory suggests several methods of assessing the values of heritage, which enables a measurement of the benefits of heritage and an evaluation of heritage goods contra other developments.

The case study research did not identify the use of such methods of value assessment in the decision making process in Atlungstad. Nevertheless the values outlined in the theory matched with the pattern of values that was found during the research. The main finding from the research was that change necessitates a valuation from every involved individual. This means that when a change is proposed in the landscape, the stakeholders, both consciously and unconsciously, forms an opinion of the landscape as it is and the landscape as it is proposed to be. This is interesting because these opinions may not have been there before and thus makes 'change' a way to value heritage. In a perfect world this valuation would have taken place before the change was proposed, making the decision making process much less complicated. However, as the case study revealed, this is not the reality and therefore it requires valuation methods and tools that will work in a process of change.

In relation to this the analysis pointed out that the perception of landscapes and the issue of setting was essential in the Atlungstad case. Looking isolated at the landscape could suggest that the preservation of it was not the best solution as it was overgrowing and probably would continue to do so if a golf course had not been developed. This is interesting because it implies that the best way of preserving a landscape is not always to protect it as it is. However, when including the issue of setting in to the discussion, it becomes more complicated. From a heritage perspective some of the heritage assets in Atlungstad are taken out of their context

and therefore lose their value because of the golf course development. Regarding both the perception of landscapes and the issue of setting the counter argument is the golf course as a natural continuation of history. This revealed that different stakeholders will use the same argument when they are championing different interests. Thus, there is a need to add the developers as a stakeholder group in addition to Hewison and Holden's (2006) three stakeholder groups (the politicians, the heritage professionals and the public). Most importantly this will ensure that the public values will not be mixed with neither the heritage professionals' nor the developers' values. The public is the biggest stakeholder group in processes like the one in Atlungstad, and this is also emphasised by the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe 2000b). Assessing the public values can provide a balanced view and new knowledge about the concerned landscape and its heritage (Riley and Harvey 2005), which will be of great value in the decision making process. However, the only approach which involves a holistic view that balances the needs of today with the predicted needs of tomorrow is sustainable development (UNECE 2005). From a heritage perspective this can be problematic because it will demand an evaluation which also counts for aspects not directly concerned with heritage. As the analysis pointed out, this becomes a problem since the methods of assessing economic values are more developed than the methods of assessing cultural values.

In Scotland and from Historic Scotland's point of view, the heritage authorities should only be focusing on the professional's assessment of values. This is because Historic Scotland believes that once each stakeholder has done its evaluation, it is up to the decision makers to look at the wider impacts and effects. As the case study in Atlungstad revealed, the county council was inclined to examine the possibilities and the total effect of the development on the concerned heritage in the future. Such evaluations need to investigate the benefits of a development in a wider perspective by considering both the advantages and disadvantages in relation to heritage. The research identified that although golf course developments have a longer history in Scotland than in Norway, the issues arising in such processes are still quite similar. This is an indication of how complicated these processes are, and that it is a truly challenging work to attain the best approach.

7.1 Contribution to wider debate

The debate of values in relation to heritage is complex. This is mostly because values are strongly connected to subjective and individual interests and views. However, when decisions concerning change and heritage are taken, these values have to be evaluated and ranked allowing for the best possible decision. This research has showed that it is the processes of proposed change that necessitates such evaluations. These processes which involves competing values and interests, requires methods that can be implemented in such situations. Existing theory suggests several methods, but they need not only to be capable of assessing the values of heritage, but also do the same in a process of change. This research has identified the importance of doing comprehensive evaluations of heritage when change is proposed, because these evaluations are informing the decisions of what is to be preserved for future generations and what is not.

7.2 Policy recommendations

Norwegian heritage policy focuses today on the social, cultural and economic benefits of heritage. This is following a trend that focuses more on what heritage generates for the public. Heritage is seen in relation to other aspects of the society and is perceived as the basis for sustainable development in the rural communities and the cities (St.meld. nr. 16 2004-2005). The case study in Atlungstad identified that such focus, although applied after the development was approved, has created a greater awareness of the heritage in the area. Yet, this has happened at the expense of the heritage's authenticity according to the experts. Based on its findings, this research will recommend that an assessment of the benefits and values of heritage in relation to the wider implication on society is the best strategy for a heritage policy. By taking this approach, all the values described in the literature chapter, ranging from expert opinions to public views, can be assessed. For this to work, it will require the policy makers, stakeholders and developers to acknowledge the significance of heritage and the value assessments that is needed when a change is proposed in a cultural landscape or on heritage assets. To attain such an understanding the methods for value assessment must be implemented and developed, especially those concerning cultural values.

7.3 Further development – future research

With the increasing influence and implementation of the European Landscape Convention, the topic discussed in this research will become more relevant to heritage and its policy. This research is only based on one case study and can therefore be subject to criticism because the lack of generalisation that it can claim. The comparative study on Scotland and Norway may also be criticised for not collecting multiple sources of evidence from Scotland. However, the research was designed to fit with the time available and therefore needed to be limited on some areas at the expense of an opportunity for broad generalisations. As this research can be seen as a starting point, it would recommend further research on the relationship between heritage values and change, and whether or not the different types of change have an impact of the forming of heritage values. It is in the processes regarding change that important decisions concerning heritage are taken. Thus, it is necessary to acquire further knowledge on how these processes work; the most suitable strategies for value assessments; and methods for ranking the assessed values.

This research dissertation set out to explore how changes in landscape and landscape management affect the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage. It found that values inform these understandings and presentations, and that change itself alters and forms values. How change affects the understanding and presentation of cultural heritage will therefore depend on the assessment of values and how they are implemented in the decision making process.

Howard (2003) argues that heritage clearly is a problem since different people attach different values to it. Indeed this is correct, but this is also what makes cultural heritage special and unique, because it is able to tell different stories to different people.

Bibliography

Asplan Viak (2001) *Atlungstad Golfbane i Stange, Konsekvensutredning – del 2: Hovedrapport* ‘Atlungstad Golf Course in Stange, Impact Study – part 2: Main Report’, Asplan Viak

Australia ICOMOS (2000) *The Burra Charter: the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*, Australia ICOMOS Incorporated. Available from <http://www.icomos.org/australia/images/pdf/BURRA_CHARTER.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Avrami, E., R. Mason and M. de la Torre (2000) *Values and Heritage Conservation: Research Report*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. Available from <http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/valuesrpt.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Benson, J. F. and Roe, M. H. (2000) ‘The scale and scope of landscape and sustainability’ in Benson, J. F. and Roe, M. H. (Ed.) *Landscape and sustainability*, London: Spon Press

Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*, New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Byrne B. (2004) ‘Qualitative interviewing’ in Seale, C. (Ed.) *Researching Society and Culture*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Clark, K (Ed.) (2006a) *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: Proceedings of the London Conference 25-26 January 2006*, English Heritage. Available from <<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Public-Value.pdf>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Clark, K (2006b) 'From significance to sustainability' in Clark, K (Ed.) *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: Proceedings of the London Conference 25-26 January 2006*, English Heritage. Available from <<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Public-Value.pdf>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Council of Europe (2000a) *Definitions of the terms used in the European Landscape Convention*, Available from <http://www.coe.int/t/e/cultural_co-operation/environment/landscape/presentation/6_content/02definitions.asp#topofpage> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Council of Europe (2000b) *The European Landscape Convention*, Council of Europe. Available from <<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Council of Europe (2006) *European Landscape Convention, CETS No.: 176*, Available from <<http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=176&CM=8&DF=&CL=ENG>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Crang, M. (1998) *Cultural geography*, London: Routledge

Eftec (Economics for the Environment Consultancy) (2005) *Valuation of the Historic Environment*, London: Economics for the Environment Consultancy. Available from <<http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/5AB09B16-A7FD-47A1-8F6E-6EAC4EA9CB15/0/fullReport.pdf>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

English Heritage (2004) *People and Places: A response to Government and the Value of Culture*, English Heritage. Available from <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Peopleandplaces_booklet.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Graham, B., G. J. Ashworth, J. E. Tunbridge (2000) *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*, London: Arnold

Green, B. and Vos, W. (2001) 'Managing old landscapes and making new ones' in Green, B. and Vos, W. (Ed.) *Threatened landscapes: Conserving Cultural Environments*, London: Spon Press

Hedmark Fylkeskommune (2006) *Welcome to Hedmark County Council*, Available from <http://www.hedmark.org/dt_english.aspx?m=45> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Hewison, R and Holden J. (2006) 'Public value as a framework for analysing the value of heritage: the ideas' in Clark, K (Ed.) *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: Proceedings of the London Conference 25-26 January 2006*, English Heritage. Available from <<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Public-Value.pdf>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Historic Scotland (2006) *About Historic Scotland*, Available from <<http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/aboutus.htm>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Hobson, E. (2004) *Conservation and Planning: changing values in policy and practice*, London: Spon Press

Howard, P. (2003) *Heritage: Management, Interpretation, Identity*, London: Continuum

Jowell, T. (2006) 'From consultation to conversation: the challenge of Better Places to Live' in Clark, K (Ed.) *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: Proceedings of the London Conference 25-26 January 2006*, English Heritage. Available from <<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Public-Value.pdf>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Kelly, G., G. Mulgan and S. Muers (2002) *Creating Public Value: An Analytical Framework for Public Service Reform*, London: Strategy Unit, Cabinet Office. Available from <http://www.strategy.gov.uk/downloads/files/public_value2.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Kvale S. (2001) *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju* 'The qualitative research interview', Oslo: Gyldendal AS

Mason R. (2002) 'Assessing Values in Conservation Planning: Methodological Issues and Choices' in de la Torre, M. (Ed.) *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research Report*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. Available from <http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Mason R. (2005) *Economics and Historic Preservation: A guide and review of the literature*, Washington DC: The Brookings Institution. Available from <http://www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20050926_preservation.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Moore, M. (1995) *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press

norge.no (2006) *Fylkesmennene* 'The county governors', Available from <<http://www.noreg.no/samkart/default.asp?kart=05>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Norges Golfforbund (2005) *Anleggspolitisk dokument* 'Policy document for golf course development', Norges Golfforbund

ODE (Oxford Dictionary of English) (1998) *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ready, R. C. and Navrud, S. (2002) 'Why value cultural heritage?' in Navrud S. and Ready R. C. (Ed.) *Valuing Cultural Heritage. Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited

Riksantikvaren (2003) *Golfbane på Atlungstad – Stange kommune – Hedmark fylke* 'Golf course in Atlungstad – Stange municipality – Hedmark county', Riksantikvaren

Riksantikvaren (2006) *Directorate for Cultural Heritage in Norway is:*, Available from <http://www.riksantikvaren.no/english/About_us/Directorate_for_Cultural_Heritage/> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Riley, M. and Harvey D. (2005) 'Landscape Archaeology, Heritage and the Community in Devon: An Oral History Approach', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 11, 4: 268-288

Rundskriv T-2 (2001) *Om arealplanlegging og golfbaner* 'About land-use planning and golf courses', Miljøverndepartementet

Ryen, A. (2002) *Det kvalitative intervjuet. Fra vitenskapsteori til feltarbeid* 'The qualitative interview. From the philosophy of science to field work', Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Scottish Golf Environment Group (2006) *The Initiative*, Available from <http://www.sgeg.org.uk/the_initiative.htm> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

St.meld. nr. 16 (2004-2005) *Leve med kulturminner* 'Living with our Cultural Heritage', Miljøverndepartementet

St.meld. nr. 19 (1999-2000) *Om norsk landbruk og matproduksjon* 'About Norwegian agriculture and food production', Landbruks- og matdepartementet

St.meld. nr. 29 (1996-1997) *Regional planlegging og arealpolitikk* 'Regional planning and land-use policy', Miljøverndepartementet

Stang, C. (2000) *Hedmark Frøforretning og Brenneri A/S, 1958 – 1999: Det de brant for* 'The history of Hedmark Frøforretning og Brenneri A/S, 1958 – 1999', Brumunddal: Hedmark Frøforretning og Brenneri A/S

Throsby, D. (2001) *Economics and culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Throsby, D. (2002) 'Cultural Capital and Sustainability Concepts in the Economics of Cultural Heritage' in de la Torre, M. (ed.) *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research Report*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. Available from <http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Throsby, D. (2006) 'The value of cultural heritage: what can economics tell us?' in Clark, K (Ed.) *Capturing the Public Value of Heritage: Proceedings of the London Conference 25-26 January 2006*, English Heritage. Available from <<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Public-Value.pdf>> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

de la Torre, M. and Mason, R. (2002) 'Introduction' in de la Torre, M. (Ed.) *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage: Research Report*, Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute. Available from <http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/assessing.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

UNECE (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe) (2005) *UNECE Annual Report 2004-2005*, New York and Geneva: United Nations. Available from <http://www.unece.org/pub_cat/topics/annual_report_2004-2005.pdf> [Accessed August 28th, 2006]

Yin, R. K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Appendix 1:

Summary of Interview - Stange municipality

Interviewer: Magnus S. Holte

Date: 7th June 2006

My first reaction when I was introduced to the plans was positive. But there have been different opinions in the municipal council, so there has never been complete agreement. However, there has been a majority in favour of the development of a golf course.

The county governor was very critical to the plans as it would occupy agricultural areas. We did not come to an agreement with them and after several mediation attempts the county governor uphold his objection - taking the case to the Ministry of the Environment where the Minister of the Environment, Børge Brende, finally approved the municipal council's resolution.

Although the county council also has the opportunity to raise an objection, it never did. The county council was never as negative as the county governor. As mentioned the county governor found the protection of farmland more important than the need of a golf course on Hedmarken (Hedmarken = four municipalities in the area where the golf course was planned).

Politically the Centre Party, which historically is a 'protection of farmland Party', was split whilst the Socialist Left Party was against all the way.

The local community was also split. In the beginning it was a great deal of opposition against the plans amongst the farmers in Vestbygda in Stange (where the golf course was to be developed), but also from other farmers. Generally in the population many saw this as an interesting project and acknowledged the need of a golf course in the region. - Both for the sport itself, but also as an attraction for housing development and business development.

Personally I think it was very important for the region to get such an attraction and sports grounds. The location was also good as it was near Mjøsa (lake) and would give a nice experience of the nature. The golf course would also be very attractive and amongst the better in Northern Europe, making it attractive for big events and tournaments. This could give extended effects for the whole region. For example it will give opportunities for bed and breakfasts on the surrounding farms, some which already started actually. An attractive golf course will also give the hotels in the area more visitors and thereby make many safe workplaces. Generally it is a way to import buying power to the district.

Many have argued that the unique cultural landscape of Vestbygda in Stange must be preserved in favour of the development of a golf course. But my perception is that a cultural landscape is man made and have changed and developed throughout generations, as opposed to natural landscapes which are 'presented' in the way that

they were created by nature itself. Cultural landscapes are landscapes in change influenced by different times and needs. But of course it is important to preserve them and there has been carried out excavations, so everything has been done according to the right procedures.

The fact that Vestbygda (Atlungstad is located in Vestbygda) in Stange is defined as cultural landscape of specific value in the county of Hedmark was a part of the decision making process, but I have always said that it will not destroy the 'value' of the landscape if we develop a golf course in the way it was designed. On the contrary it will enrich the cultural landscape. And in relation to the game and the biodiversity it was important to consider the consequences, but as I understand, this has been done.

During the process, this (cultural landscape) was not a big part of the discussion as the protection of farmland was the most important argument. But from the opponents all possible arguments have been brought forward.

I have the impression that the developers will treat the landscape and the distillery with respect and they have come to an agreement that will allow them to use parts of the distillery as a club house. I also have the impression that they will 'place' the golf course in a thoughtful way. To do this and to make the golf course attractive they have hired a famous golf course designer. So the professional side of this has been well taken care of.

Will it be possible to communicate the history of the area to other people than the golf players?

I can not see why that should be a problem.

In what way?

Those who know the history of the area must be able to communicate this independent of the golf course or in fact include the development of the golf course as this also becomes a part of the history of the cultural landscape.

I do not think the golf course will exclude those who do not play golf because there is a footpath in the area, and it was emphasised in the planning process that this should be protected. This was because we do not want to exclude people, and personally, although I am not a golf player, I think I will visit the area to see how it looks and what is going on there.

I do not think the landscape will change that much. Of course it will not be hard to see that it is a golf course, but the location in a traditional agricultural landscape will fit nicely together. Before the golf course it was a big and open agricultural field, and it will still be this way apart from the green fairways that will be instead of the crops. But the landscape and its surroundings will pretty much be the same, so I can not see a big conflict coming with these changes.

With a consciousness of the golf course as an attraction it can be possible to communicate the history of the landscape and its cultural heritage - with some creative thinking.

As far as I know Atlungstad distillery is one of the few remaining distilleries in Norway and is functioning as a reserve distillery, and will continue to be run this way

I think. But there is quite a big collection of objects that have been used in the distillery throughout time. In many ways it appears as a living museum although it does not have ordinary opening times. The owners want to save the collection although I do not know what plans they have. This can be interesting to see in relation to the traffic we will experience on the golf course. In addition to the club house it will also be possible to open a distillery museum to communicate the history, at least in the summer months.

As for the rest of the area, the excavations did not find very much. The remains that were found have also been found in the surrounding areas. There was nothing special found. So, an interpretation of this is not planned as far as I know.

Talking of the possible conflicts between culture and business, I am not sure whether there were any big conflicts in this case, although I understand there might be. But in a way the business interests through the golf sport 'won' this battle despite the resistance.

Although the county council did not raise a formal objection to the project, it laid down some regulations and premises on how the golf course should be developed and how the cultural heritage should be preserved.

It is difficult to say if this (developing a golf course) was the only way to create a sustainable development for the area, apart from continuing with farming. But it will enrich the area, and create possibilities for other farmers to start with other businesses than farming, such as tourism. It will have a positive effect on the farmers in the area. There is already one farmer which has invested money to be a part of this development.

I think the golf course will prove to create much more profit than what a focus on the cultural landscape and the cultural heritage would have produced. I think such a focus would have been much more difficult, and the golf course will give a boost for the area and the affected parties. But if the golf course will be closed down in the future, the land has to go back to farming.

In general I hope the area will be an attraction holding big tournaments which will lead to publicity and many visitors. This will be positive to the tourism industry in the region.

It is up to the owners to develop a museum in the distillery and present the history – the opportunity is there, because the collection of objects will not be moved. As it is now, we are not granting any money to the distillery, so if we receive an application to start a museum we would have to consider it individually.

Appendix 2:

Summary of Interview - Norwegian Golf Association

Interviewer: Magnus S. Holte

Date: 12th June 2006

I was on a field trip to Glasgow, Glasgow University and talked to people at the University and Historic Scotland. As far as I know, the legislation is pretty much the same in Norway and Scotland. The difference that I experienced is that they have a more pragmatic and solution based approach in Scotland, compared to Norway. As in Norway they (Scotland) are not allowed to bring any substance over archaeological remains before everything is registered and mapped out. The difference from Norway is that it takes much more to stop these kind of projects in Scotland although there have been found remains on the location.

We had a look at a very interesting case study from a golf course called St. Michael. By aerial photos and surface registration it could be established that there were quite a lot of remains from the Iron Age. On this location it has been built a golf course. The surrounding areas are farm land, where everything until one meter down in the ground has been lost. There are some very strict regulations to what the golf club is allowed to do. For example if the golf club want to plant a tree, they need to send an application to Historic Scotland first. It is also decided that they are not allowed to dig in the ground, meaning if they want to place a 'bunker', it must be put above ground level, adding new soil.

We have tried to work with the Directorate for Cultural Heritage to arrange seminars on a county level, but with little interest. Therefore we were glad when they contacted us to learn more about golf and golf courses.

In our organisation we have worked out a political document that gives us; the developers; and clubs guidelines on how to develop a golf course. This is good for us as it guides us when commenting on projects and plans.

We have several examples both from Norway and Scotland where identified cultural heritage is a part of the course. The Directorate for Cultural Heritage thinks this is problematic for the golf players, but actually it is the other way around. As a golf player you remember the courses that have a special character, for example because there is a Viking grave in the fairway. This grave might have been hidden before a golf course was developed on site, and now at least it is accessible for the golf players.

The golf players are interested in this. What we have seen is that we have to expand our knowledge on the relationship between cultural heritage and golf courses. This is a big challenge. We want to investigate the different ways to map out the existing cultural heritage in an area where a golf course is planned. Because this is a very expensive process today.

From our point of view, we do not want the establishment of too many golf courses. This will only harm the sport, and force some clubs to close down. But in the same time we want to build golf courses where people live. Therefore we supported the building of a golf course in Atlungstad. When you mention the crops that had to be seen in relation to the distillery – it is of course an interesting problem. But often the alternative is that the buildings will decay, and that the public do not have access to the area. As far as I know we never were negative to the plans in Atlungstad. I do not know any other projects where we have been negative either, in relation to complications with cultural heritage.

We have initiated a project with the university in Ås, where they are doing research on golf and cultural heritage and biodiversity. We do not want to be the owner of this project because it should be carried out by professionals that know these subjects. We also want to use the outcome, and it is easier to make it reliable when we are not the project owners.

As far as I know there are not many projects that have been rejected because of cultural heritage on the location. The only one I know of is the sister churches in Gran. This golf course was in first instance approved, but this was later appealed to the Ministry of the Environment, which in the end put a stop to the development. The reason for this was on the background of the cultural environment on the location.

The problem with the development of golf courses is that it in very many cases is initiated by land owners and not the municipality – meaning that the municipality do not put golf courses in their area development plan as they do with other sports grounds like football stadiums. Therefore, it is not always that the location of a golf course is evaluated on the basis of what is best for the municipality. This is a problem, as it is up to the land owners where golf courses are placed. The economical aspect of this is also problematic, as the golf courses the land owners want to develop often are big and of a high standard. What we want is golf activity. However, you do not need an 18 holes golf course for that. Nevertheless it is not economical viable to build anything smaller. We want to establish smaller training fields which can bring the sport forward, but of course, we are not against the development of golf courses.

Although we want to work for a greater knowledge of the relationship between cultural heritage and golf, we will never know if the land owners and developers will have the same interest as us. We will experience that the clubs will take short cuts, but as a whole I think they are interested in doing a good job. And many of the golf course designers are also interested in these issues. Our job is to create the right attitudes amongst the golf clubs. You know, often it is the money that ‘talks’, but as I said, I think very many want to do the right thing and look at cultural heritage as something valuable because this is something that will enrich the courses. I absolutely admit that we still have a long way to go, because one thing is what we as golf association say, another thing is what is carried out in ‘real life’.

As I told you, we are not in a position to neither say either yes or no to a golf project. The only thing we can do is to create the right attitudes in the golf clubs. But I must admit, we find it a bit strange when a field which has been farming land up until today, with no restrictions, suddenly requires an archaeological excavation when all we want to do is to ‘plant a rough’. These excavations are expensive, and the golf

clubs have limited budgets to deal with these kinds of things. People think that there is a lot of money in the golf sport, but that is not true. Very many of the golf clubs are struggling to get their budgets in balance. Of course there is no goal for the clubs to make big money, and if they do the money must go back to the players through a better course. For us it is hard to understand that the agricultural sector has totally different regulations regarding the restriction of the land-use of areas. As soon as you want to grow a green you need to carry out excavations first as opposed to farming – where you can plough the grounds without any restrictions. That is not always easy to understand.

There is now a project going on in Kaupang, probably the place in Norway with the most Viking remains. One of the arguments there is that a golf course will attract more people to the area. But I do not know of any golf course that has been developed in a specific area because of the rich cultural heritage. There is probably more likely that you try to make something out of it if anything is discovered. As an example they in some places hand out a leaflet to the players as they go out telling them what they can ‘see’ in the landscape.

If we look at the golf courses that have been open for a couple of years, there is actually more non-golf activities around the course than before the course was built. This is because the clubs have been clever at arranging foot paths and similar facilities in the area. For example parking facilities, toilets and restaurants. I do not know of any places where the development of a golf course has excluded people from the area. On the contrary it attracts more people all year round. Golf courses can also be used for cross country skiing in the winter.

I think an interpretation of the cultural heritage located on the course will be interesting for those who are not members of the club. Cultural heritage can enrich the golfing experience although I do not think anyone will drive 300 km to see a Viking grave. When we have surveys asking what is the most positive things about playing golf, the nature experience and the ‘experience’ itself is one of the most common answers. I definitely think it is enriching and that people can learn from it. This goes for the cultural heritage that was not accessible and probably unknown before the golf course was developed. If there is a situation where a golf course project will occupy existing cultural heritage that is already known and accessible, it is not good. Then the course has to be re-designed to make it a best possible solution for everybody. I have never heard of any places where this situation has occurred.

You know, there is not any sport in the world that has so un-standardised courses as golf. Everything can be adjusted to what the landscape it is developed in requires. The philosophy of golf is to ‘play the course as it is and the ball as it lies’. Therefore golf courses are very flexible when it comes to planning where special considerations have to be made.

Actually golf courses can make our cultural heritage more accessible in many places. However, this may lead to a wear and tear on the cultural heritage that is not desirable. So, the challenge is to find the right balance, although in most of these cases the alternative is to let the heritage stay unknown and inaccessible.

The establishment of golf courses in cultural environments may also lead to the creation of cultural, social and economic benefits which can contribute to maintain the cultural heritage in the area. Look at Swilkin Bridge in St. Andrews; it would never have survived without the golf course. This is the world's most famous cultural monument. It was used by the shepherds. If that area had become an agricultural area, that bridge would never have survived.

The industrial and commercial development in the area around a golf course development is very important for the golf club to stay alive. So the clubs absolutely need to think about this as well. It would of course have been desirable that the plans for every golf course project would be sent to the golf association on a very early stage. Then we could have checked that all the necessary considerations had been made. Unfortunately we are not in that position, since everything is decided on a municipal level. All these projects should have carried out a small impact study in a very early stage to see the effects and implications. Today these impact studies are carried out, but much later in the process. I think the Brits have another approach on this issue than we have, but they also have most of their heritage above ground. Most of ours is below ground as far as I know.

I do not think the municipalities want to take any short cuts regarding the regulations concerning the cultural heritage regulations. I think it is rather the other way around. What we want to do is to establish collaboration with the government to tell them what a golf course can be, because we think that a combination of golf and cultural heritage is possible in most places.

Some of the golf courses, especially in Scotland, are almost unrecognisable as a golf course, if it had not been for the flag poles on the greens. The courses are very nicely located in the landscape. Those who have never been to a golf course think you need to 'rearrange' everything in the landscape. In Scotland they have done this since 1500, which is a big difference. Gary Fry, a professor at the university in Ås, was a bit surprised because in Britain golf courses are used as an argument to increase the biodiversity, as opposed to Norway where it is the other way around.

It is the approach that you have in your project that we often feel is left out, and that many people do not know what a golf course is.

There is a golf course designer that has studied at the University of Edinburgh, Paal Midtvaage. He has developed a project for a golf course in Sande in Vestfold, Norway, which the College of Agricultural Engineering see as the 'perfect' planning process. He has set up groups of stakeholders from different fields, for example the local history group etc.

As I said before, one of the most significant differences between Scotland and Norway is the pragmatic and solution based approach they have in Scotland.

Appendix 3:

Summary of Interview - Initiator Atlungstad Golf Course

Interviewer: Magnus S. Holte

Date: 19th June 2006

The idea for this golf course started in 1989 -90. I and my son were training (golf) on the grazing lands close to our home, and it hit me that this would be a great golf course. However, my friends; colleagues; and relatives told me to forget it because of the protection of farmland. So I went to Stange municipality in 1993. The mayor was very positive from day one. He saw the opportunity for development in the area and for the municipality in general. But we had a lot of bad publicity. I would guess that out of 10 articles in the newspapers, 9 of them were negative, although I got a lot of support privately.

The local community was split in their views on the golf plans. The farmers' opinions were negative, which is understandable. I would probably have had the same opinion if I were a farmer without any interest in golf. But some farmers were golfers and supported the project, and that was important for the process. In general I think the public meant that it was not right to develop a golf course in such a nice farmland. Although I never used the argument, golf courses can be brought back to farmland quite easily – you are not actually building anything on the land.

We had some meetings for the public regarding the project. These were arranged by the labour party.

The process prior to the Ministry's approval of our plans was long and filled with obstacles. But it would have surprised me a lot if our project would not have been approved. Although, I do not think the government we have today would have approved such plans. I am actually quite certain they would not. That is mostly because the Centre party (often seen as the farmers' party) and Socialist Left party is in the government together with the Labour party, and both are opponents to this kind of development. But Børge Brende, the Minister of the Environment at that time, understood the potential, and for that we are very happy.

During the process in front of the approval to develop the golf course, it definitely was the protection of farmland that was the main argument. The land owner was not one of the most 'keen' farmers. He likes to do other things: he is for example running a horse riding centre on his farm. However, at the same time, although not as visible as the arguments on protection of farmland, came the cultural heritage debate. I think there were some people reacting to something I said on a meeting once, can not remember exactly what. This made them think that we would not take any considerations and be totally irresponsible regarding the conservation of the distillery and so on. Although negative, I think they finally realised that there was going to be a golf course, and started to look at the possibilities instead. Maybe they also realised that we are humble and want to treat our heritage respectfully.

What I do not like in these kind of processes is that as soon something becomes a public good, then suddenly everyone wants a share. Out of nothing there becomes a need to claim access for everyone in an area that was not accessible at all before the development. For example; the foot path that goes through the area was suddenly suggested to be re-routed down to the lake. This would have been a disaster for the animals and the biodiversity. Fortunately this did not happen.

Regarding the distillery, the authorities will not just sit still and let us do whatever we want. We have an agreement with the owners to hire the northern parts of the distillery for a club house. If we look at the landscape, our designer Paul Thomas has tried to keep the identity of it – both consciously and unconsciously. He has designed a golf course that is challenging and beautiful. In fact, the cultural landscape as it is today (with the golf course), is much more similar to the landscape that was thirty years ago. This is because we have opened up down to Mjøsa (lake). The landscape had become overgrown because there was no grazing there anymore, the animals were gone.

If there still would have been activity on the distillery every day, I can see that it would have been wrong that golfers came to ‘take over’ the place. But with as little activity as today, I can only see positive aspects of someone coming in and actually use the building. Instead of leaving the houses empty, we can create activity again. Everyone knows that it is not healthy for a house to be ‘empty’. The condition of the building is not as good as we would have wanted, but this is the responsibility of the authorities. I think we have proved that we do not intend to exploit this area ruthlessly. Golf is a social sport and it is a positive development. The distillery and its history are not going to be wiped away by the golfers - that is not possible. I do not see the changes in the landscape as a problem either, because the distillery does not get its supplies from the farmland next to it. The only difference is that you do not have the crops next to the distillery. Except from that everything is the same. I see this as a natural continuing and development for the distillery and the area, and I can not understand those who do not see this.

The excavation that needs to be done in such a project is always on the expense of the developers. As I see it, that is not a good arrangement. During this process I have stated my discomfort with this – although I do not know if it will help. I understand that we have to work with the authorities in these cases, but this sector is very strong. The cultural heritage sector has power that goes beyond the prime minister and the government.

Atlungstad golf had no wish to do these excavations, but of course we understand that it had to be done. The bill was sent to us – to the developers, something which I am not very happy with. This should have been paid by the authorities, because if something is found it belongs to the state. It could have been understandable if these findings had belonged to the land owner or those hiring the land, which is the case in some other countries. The state should pay these bills, no matter where or what. I think everyone will agree on that. We paid approximately one million Norwegian kroner (£ 90000) for the excavations in Atlungstad.

I see myself as interested in culture and our cultural heritage. But I do not understand why it is so important to treat every coal pit that they find with such care, because

there are thousands of them in Hedmark. It might be that I do not understand these things. I can not say that I think of our cultural heritage every day, but I appreciate that old things are taken care of preserved. They did not find anything in Atlungstad except from a few mounds of stone, but they were not in conflict with the course, so that was ok. However, when they were done excavating, they were done. They just asked us to let them know if we found anything. When everything was settled with the excavations we could do as we wanted. I think Norway has something to learn from other countries when it comes to ‘making’ something out of the heritage they have.

The accessibility of this area before the golf course was quite poor. The public was not allowed down to the distillery because it was an industrial area. And the alley that goes down to Mjøsa (lake) and two cottages were also inaccessible before. They were overgrown, but now the cottages are being restored and made accessible for the public. The cottages are owned by the land owner, and he is the one restoring them. I do not know if he will get any financial support from the authorities to do this work. But because of the golf course, they have now got a new significance in the cultural landscape and a potential to be used in some way. The foot path was open for the public, and will still be open. All in all this development has created greater accessibility for the public.

It is possible that some golf clubs find it important to promote themselves not only through the course itself, but also through the cultural landscape and the cultural heritage that can be seen and experienced there. For me this is not important. I see greens and fairways, unless the surroundings are nice – as in Atlungstad where I can experience Mjøsa (lake) on some holes. That will of course enrich the total experience. Most of all I see golf as a sport – It is a game! I am not sure if am comfortable to promote a golf course with ‘something else’ in addition. Of course you can inform people, but if it is important I am not sure.

Golf can be a very social sport – a family sport. I think this development is more under way in Sweden than in Norway. Personally I am more concerned with how the course is and the challenges it gives me as a player. But it is possible I am not representative because I have been cooperating with the designer on this course and have played many other courses. However, golf has other aspects like the social element which is of great importance for many players and for the sport.

I do not know if or what plans that exists for the distillery, but I hope it will continue to be some activity there. There is a small collection of objects in the building that is kind of a small museum, although not regularly open for the public. If they close down the distillery and take away all the machinery and stuff it would loose a great deal of its value as I see it. Much of the history would be lost if that happens. The golf club does not need more space in that building than what we got at the moment. There are possibilities for the distillery, and I hope that it will be accessible for the public in a way that shows its history and how it was. I would have welcomed a museum there.

If there had been no golf course I do not think a focus on the cultural landscape and the cultural heritage would have been enough to create social, cultural and economical benefits in this area. All this became important as we started to develop the golf course in 2003. There would not have been any projects or plans concerning cultural heritage without the development of this golf course. No restoration – nothing. Maybe

something (plans) would have turned up, but I doubt it. I think we should be glad that it was a golf course and not something else that was developed in to that area. For example a camping site or a huge marina. That would not have been good; it would have been too much people; a lot of people and only focus on economical profit. And I am pretty sure that a plan for a camping site would have got approval much earlier than we got with the golf course.

Golf courses need to be placed where people live, or they will not survive. They can be brought back to what they were earlier if the course is closing down. I can only see positive aspects of this development.

As far as I know there has been no talk of the possible ‘consumption’ of the cultural heritage that exists in the area. This might have been said by those who do not want any development here – those who want this area to be as it has always been. The golf course project has been a ‘spark’ to the awareness concerning the distillery. The distillery has been there all the time, but there has been no focus on the maintenance of it and its cultural significance. I am sure that it would not have happened anything before the building was starting to fall apart. And maybe I would have thought it was best to leave it as it was if I was not a golfer myself – it is probably as simple as that.

We will support any development with focus on the cultural heritage within this area. First and foremost it is the distillery that is the ‘culture’ in Atlungstad. The golf course is there, and the surroundings are mostly forest. We want to take care of the area through ‘careful use’ – and that is a key word; treat the surroundings with respect and caution. We do not want to turn everything upside down in the distillery – we would not be allowed either. And that is good. I think county council is quite happy that we are moving in to the distillery.

From the moment we moved in to this area, it became open to the public. The only restriction is that you can not just go out on the golf course as you like. This was also questioned during the process. It was argued that the area would not be open for everybody. We answered that it would be open for everyone, except from the course itself. It was not open for the public to wonder around on the farmland and crops before either. Nobody does that. With the golf course there will be public access to the distillery and its surrounding area. I think we will see a development for this area in the following years. Everything will not be ready this summer.

Appendix 4:

Summary of Interview - Hedmark county council

Interviewer: Magnus S. Holte

Date: 21st June 2006

From the beginning we were very sceptical to develop a golf course in a cultural landscape, designated by the county council to be of great value. Actually we were surprised that it even was suggested. We meant that this area had a great potential, without a golf course. But, we also acknowledged that it would be good to open up the area and make it more accessible for the public. Until today it has only been the foot path that runs through the area, whilst the area around the distillery has been closed. There have been signals from the owners of the distillery that the production was likely to stop in the coming years, but we want and wish the distillery still to be running, because in a cultural heritage perspective this is more interesting than a closed down distillery containing a museum.

Our job is to map out and register any possible cultural heritage. An impact study was carried out in Atlungstad, and we were absolutely considering raising an objection. Such objection was to be based on the fact that this was a cultural landscape of great value. But we got the impression from Børge Brende, the Minister of the Environment, that he wanted the development of this golf course and other golf courses. We had talks with several ministries, but when the decision is made there is not much you can do.

We were prepared to raise an objection, but because cultural landscapes are the responsibility of both the county council and the county governor, it made it difficult. The county governor was not interested in raising an objection on these premises. It also made it more difficult that although Stange Vestbygd was defined as a cultural landscape of great value in the county, the Ministry of the Environment did not come to the same conclusion on a national level. We were told by the Ministry that since this particular landscape was not chosen on a national level, it would be much more difficult to 'win' with an objection based on the great value of the landscape.

Finally, when the decision to develop the golf course was made, we contacted the golf club and the land owner to see what plans they had. There was a lot of cultural heritage in the area and we wanted to 'control' the use if it. That goes for several of the buildings, both the distillery and on the farm. We also want the landscape to be visible from Mjøsa (lake), as it was before. We want to cooperate with the county governor to do this.

Looking back, I think we maybe could have done a more thorough examination on cultural heritage from 'our time', in addition to the excavations. Today we would have thought more of the potential of this area if the golf course was developed. But this was difficult, because at that time we were pretty sure that the golf course was not going to be developed.

People say that you quite easily can bring back a golf course to farming, although I am not convinced about that. But I think this golf course development has given a 'boost' to the other farmers in the area. It has made the farmers more aware of the potential on their farm, for example the restoration of old buildings etc. for hire. As I see it, a new dimension has been brought to the landscape by this development. But talking of cultural landscapes and whether or not a golf course at all should be placed in such an area is a major dilemma. For example it still looks like an agricultural landscape if you detract the people playing on the golf course. A cultural landscape is supposed to be a living landscape, but if you look at the county of Hedmark it is becoming overgrown. In regard to agricultural landscapes it is desirable to keep them open and improve the arrangements with animals grazing.

It is quite exiting, because this landscape (in Atlungstad) is kind of a Norway in miniature when looking at the development within the agricultural sector. There is a possibility to communicate the development of the agricultural sector as the farms in this area always have been in front of the modernisation.

The main challenge when dealing with projects like the one in Atlungstad is to make sure that the processes are good and that everything is examined and mapped out. You also need to be aware of the different stakeholders. It requires that you act diplomatic and that you do not get too influenced by your subjective opinions and values.

In Norway the owner or builder is responsible for the expenses of excavations. As I see it there are two aspects of this. When the municipality through an area development plan wants to search for remains etc., I think it is wrong that these expenses fall to the land owner. But when it is a land owner or builder that wants to develop a golf course and destroy and radically change the landscape, it is nothing more sensible than the fact that they should pay for these expenses. This could also be of great value for them, as it maps out what possible resources that exist in the area. But I think an understanding of this from the golf players is still in ahead. Of course I understand that people react to the sometimes quite high expenses related to these excavations.

I think the 'concept' of landscapes is very important because it influences us. For example I do not think it is strange that those coming from Hedmark are calm and steady people (the landscape in Hedmark is flat and open), while the people coming from the west of Norway are more aggressive and temperamental (the landscape in west of Norway is steep and hilly).

Actually Hedmark is the county with the most different landscapes in Norway despite of the fact that there is no coastline here.

I hope and believe that this development can contribute to an increased awareness of the qualities that lies within this area. Not everyone was very positive to this development, but now there is a strong will amongst some of the farmers to protect and enrich what is there. That is why we are now running a project to create cultural, social and economical benefits in the area. What makes this project unique is actually the golf course, although we did not want it developed. Now, when the golf course is there we need to focus on what factors may contribute to strengthen our cultural heritage and facilitate for preservation in an area that otherwise would have decayed.

Of course this is one of our dilemmas; that we probably would not have seen these possibilities and started to focus on preservation without the development of the golf course. A development like this is also encouraging and gives a boost to the land owners that we depend on, which is an important aspect of it as well.

At first, when I heard about these plans I thought; oh no, this will make some of the old buildings and the shoreline inaccessible. But instead we now see the possibility to restore these buildings.

It is difficult to argue for the protection of cultural landscapes on the basis of identity in relation to landscapes, because this type of argumentation is almost the same as deciding what is pretty and what is ugly. What we try to do is to put the cultural heritage in connection to the landscape. It is also strongly connected to economic potential. If there is an economic potential in an area, it will be much easier to persuade people about protection and preservation.

You will always need to find a good balance between cultural heritage interests and business development interests. This balance must be found from case to case, as they vary a lot. If we were to follow the legislation without taking into account our and others' judgements, every building and remains should have some kind of a protective cover. However, that is a major encroachment in the landscape. So you get a conflict between cultural heritage and cultural landscapes as well. We need to realise that not everything needs to be handled as a 'scheduled monument'. The legislation does not say much about landscapes, but now we got the European Landscape Convention which we are instructed to use more actively in the cases we are involved in.

There was not a need for a golf course in Atlungstad to get the tourism going, but it would probably have been a longer and more complicated process to achieve this without the golf course. Hypothetically, a development in Atlungstad with only a focus on the existing cultural heritage would have required a strong focus on the distillery and what experiences it could have offered. But again you are dependent on the landowners and their desire to protect their privacy and so on. However, the area is quite accessible today with the foot path and a horse riding centre on one of the farms. There is definitely a potential to create an attractive outdoor area. We are also hoping to get it accessible from Mjøsa (lake).

I think the local community were pretty positive, they thought the development was exiting. Of course it was the issue concerning the protection of farmland, but all in all people were positive. As far as I know the local community did not participate much in the process.

From a cultural heritage point of view, the golf course development in Atlungstad has not resulted in the loss of valuable cultural heritage. But in relation to the landscape there are of course big changes. However, in some cases this may also lead to a better protection, as we hope will be the result in Atlungstad. We also hope to be better on interpretation – put up some signs and make some brochures. We need to be better on active management, because that is something we have not been so aware of until now. It is of course better that some of our cultural heritage becomes accessible to the golf players instead of being totally inaccessible.

Until now we have not investigated if the impact of tourists and golf players in the area will cause damage. It is a bit too early to say, and as far as I know a golf course is not *that* busy. We have looked a little bit at impact of people coming from the sea side and how we can control such traffic.

The use of cultural heritage to create social, cultural and economical benefits has 'just' been introduced. Until now there has been a focus on outdoor activities and tourism to achieve this. Although tourism probably is one of the best ways for people to make a living, there are of course other ways as well. We are interested in focusing on the quality of traditional building techniques and local producers. We would have liked to establish an awareness of the qualities that lie within our cultural heritage.

People often think of the economical benefits as the most important regarding heritage, but for me it is just as important to create awareness and competence. The problem is that it is much harder to measure the results of these kinds of benefits. For example the craftsmen have a lot of competence that would be most valuable to pass on to the next generation.

The programme (Grants programme from the Directorate for Cultural Heritage) from whom we have applied for grants has three main premises: physical investments; communication and interpretation; and economical benefits. It also emphasises the synergy effects that should take place as a result of the project. Thus, the programme's aim is to create a 'natural' awareness in the public related to cultural heritage and business development.

There is a distinct difference between some of the counties in Norway. For example: Telemark – often associated with national romanticism and traditions. Hedmark on the other side, has been quite modern. This is visible in the agricultural sector, but also in how we live. In Telemark the family possessions like furniture, art etc. are being passed on to the next generation. In Hedmark, they wanted to repaint the furniture and always be updated on the trends in the society. It is a totally different way of living with different values, and with a different respect of the things that are old. In Hedmark many of the bigger farms have not been in the family for a long time, because it often happened that they gambled it away. Again, Telemark is the total opposite: the farms have been in the family for many generations.

The main objective with the project involving the cultural heritage in the area around Atlungstad is to restore buildings and create activity. Moreover it is to get the industrial and commercial sector to look at cultural heritage in another way – get people to cooperate, not work individually. That goes especially for the farmers in the area. The aim is also to make this an attractive conference location. But as I see it the most important thing is to develop this area for the local community and make it a nice outdoor area where people are aware of the cultural heritage.

As for the distillery it is important to create activity, I think a museum is not enough to attract people. We need something more – facilities among other things. But we are hoping the owners will be interested in developing the place further. They have stated that is one of the distilleries they want to preserve. For example it would have been interesting to start selling some of the products that were made here a long time ago.

The most important thing to do when you start a cultural heritage project like this is to involve the stakeholders. We had a meeting with the municipality to 'root' the idea in their organisation. They are very important as they know the local conditions much better than we do. We also plan to meet different interest groups and organisations to see how we can cooperate. In addition we need a project coordinator who can make this project move forward and take care of the financial side of it. We also want to meet the affected land owners, both individually and together, to see what possibilities we have got. It is necessary to examine the existing cultural heritage in and around Atlungstad to evaluate which parts of it that need to be prioritised.

The question of accessibility to a fragile building or object is of course difficult. But I mean that some 'consume' of this object or building is better than leaving it totally inaccessible. In these cases we have to do something about the awareness regarding preservation of our cultural heritage. In the case Atlungstad, most of the existing heritage is restorable. The biggest threat I see, is the development of holiday cottages. If these cottages are built inside the cultural landscape, you will not be able to 'read' the area's history and social structures from the landscape.

Appendix 5:

Summary of Interviews and mail correspondence - Historic Scotland

Interviewer: Magnus S. Holte

Date: 27th July 2006

The Scottish Golf Environment Group exists to encourage golf clubs to protect the natural heritage on their courses. It evolved out of the Scottish Golf Course Wildlife Group. Historic Scotland sits on its Steering Group. The Scottish Golf Environment Group encourages golf courses to produce management plans for heritage. Historic Scotland can provide advice to owners/occupiers of scheduled monuments regarding their management.

It is only possible to schedule monuments with national importance in Scotland. Historic Scotland is bound by the terms of the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*, which states that "the Secretary of State may on first compiling the Schedule or at any time thereafter include therein any monument which appears to him to be of national importance".

Most scheduled and unscheduled sites are in private ownership and are, in that sense, the responsibility of the owners. Unscheduled monuments are considered within the planning process. Local authority archaeologists are consulted as part of the planning process, according to guidance set down in *National Planning Policy Guideline 5 – Archaeology and Planning, Planning Advice Note 42 – Archaeology - the Planning Process and Scheduled Monument Procedures* and *Planning Advice Note 43 – Golf Courses and Associated Developments*.

For Scheduled Ancient Monuments, there is generally a presumption in favour of their preservation *in situ*. Historic Scotland actively encourages owners and occupiers to manage sites well and enhance their condition, where this is need to preserve a site. Listing is carried out under the *Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997*. Not all listed buildings are of national importance and therefore listed buildings have degrees of flexibility in adaptive re-use.

Scheduling can be done prior to a planning process, but scheduling is not part of the planning process; it stems from a completely separate piece of legislation. Historic Scotland would not normally schedule monuments that are the subject of a live planning consent or a current planning application, as we may be considered liable for the payment of compensation. Each site is, however, considered on its own merits.

Once planning applications are in the public domain, they are available for consultation by the public. The planning authority has to address any view which represents a "material consideration" within the planning system. Any member of the public can record their views with the planning authority and the latter judge whether the view is material to the decision process according to the planning legislation and guidance.

Cultural tourism represents one of Scotland's main sources of revenue and the public are generally aware of this. There is a significant level of internal tourism, and investment in the information associated with cultural heritage monuments. One of the respondents claimed that Scotland is quite dependent on the American dollar and therefore adapts to satisfy American tourists. For example: the development of American design golf courses which not always are desirable as they alters the landscape radically.

Historic Scotland is within the planning process as a statutory consultee and often as a neighbour. Notification to Historic Scotland of any planning application affecting the site of a scheduled monument is required under Article 15(1) of the *Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992*. A planning consent will have conditions imposed by the local authority and developers have to abide by those conditions.

Developers cannot ignore the issue of cultural heritage, as it is a material consideration during the planning process. However, the extent of surviving archaeological remains may come as a surprise.

Historic Scotland can only work within the terms of existing legislation and guidance. How one designates monuments and how one manages them within the context of golf course development varies between Scotland and Norway. Many golf courses in Scotland are very old; cultural heritage may not have been a concern at the time they were developed. Many of them are a significant part of the cultural heritage themselves, and may be on the Inventory of Gardens and Designed Landscapes, which is maintained by Scottish Natural Heritage.

In some instances Historic Scotland see the development of a golf course as a better solution than other development in relation to protection of heritage, but these circumstances are specific: although construction of a course can be very damaging to the environment, both natural and cultural, good management of a golf course can offer a better level of conservation than arable farming, where deep ploughing may occur. However, under Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform, this difference ought to disappear. Remember that it is the local authority that grants or refuses planning permission for a development, not Historic Scotland.

Historic Scotland is an Executive Agency and is bound by the terms of current government policy and existing legislation. Nevertheless, one of the respondents felt that, in general, the historical and aesthetic values of heritage are perceived as the most important in Scotland. Moreover, the respondent felt that the intangible heritage attached to a monument often is not interpreted. In relation to cultural landscapes this was important, because these landscapes can be seen as intangible heritage through the values and perceptions people attach to them.

Historic Scotland would not argue that the developers in Scotland are discontent with the regulations and legislation for cultural heritage. However, one of the respondents had experienced that many developers were unsatisfied with the cultural heritage authorities. The reason for this was thought to be the huge expenses of excavations which are the responsibility of the developer. These expenses can be problematic for

the developers as they come in a time where there is yet no income from the golf course.

The planning service will make recommendations to the Council's planning committee but the committee is free to come to its own decision. The Scottish Ministers have the right to contest committee decisions that run counter to national policy. It is not uncommon for the council to comprise, in part, of local business persons and indeed of persons of other equally focused interest areas. However, there are safeguards in the system to help council members avoid their personal interests interfering with their judgements in the planning committee.

Historic Scotland's role is to promote and protect the historic environment. Its role in the planning process is not to take into account the economic benefits for heritage of a particular development, although these benefits can create increased awareness and willingness to focus on heritage by land owners. The decision of the planning committee, or the Scottish Executive, will be based on a balance of all the various material considerations.

Historic Scotland does consider setting, as it is a material consideration in the planning process. The Archaeological Areas section, Part 2 of the AMAA Act 1979, is not enforced in Scotland. However there are numerous powerful landscape designations derived from Natural Heritage legislation. Within the planning process (again we must stress that the AMAAA 1979 is not a planning mechanism) the impact on setting is a material consideration. The aim of Historic Scotland is not to stop development; we are interested in sustainable development that avoids or mitigates adverse impacts on the historic environment.

The respondents were not aware of any planned golf course development that has been stopped on the basis of cultural heritage.