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ABSTRACT

This research focused on how public gardens fit into the context of cultural identity. Given that cultural landscapes form an important part of our heritage and public horticulture institutions are cultural landscapes, the purposes of this research were:

- to analyze historic significance from an international and domestic perspective through literature and interviews;
- to analyze the factors affecting a manager’s decision to use historic significance in his or her decision making; and
- to investigate how specific organizations use historic significance in decision making.

After the review of literature both international and domestic, the research was conducted in three phases. First, interviews were conducted with leaders of eight (8) principal historic landscape and garden advocacy organizations in the United States. Next, a quantitative online survey was developed based on The Theory of Planned Behavior to measure existing attitudes and beliefs of 425 directors and managers of American Public Garden Association members (APGA) regarding the role of historic significance in their decision making process. Finally, case study visits were made to
three historic cemeteries to investigate the factors affecting historic significance in their decision making.

The advocacy interviews reiterated the multiple factors that influence how the United States sees its cultural landscape resources in terms of specific missions of specific groups who champion their vision. For the future of these cultural landscape resources, the best recommendation would be to increase partnerships to facilitate education and cooperation beneficial to all. With diminishing federal funds, more of these partnerships will be needed to advance the education of both the public and directors of public gardens about the importance of the role of public gardens as cultural resources (Birnbaum, 2009). The quantitative survey conducted with members of the APGA confirmed that when directors have an attitude that values historic significance, and those around them reinforce that value, then they are more likely to build expertise and funding to support those efforts. The case studies confirmed those findings.

Public gardens are positioned to lead the way to merge the joint resources of natural and cultural values, to see themselves as “custodians of cultural resources as compared to collections of plants” (Birnbaum, 2009). Historic gardens are in a unique place to combine environmental and cultural resources into one location as just such destinations. In the era of diminishing resources when public institutions are being asked to justify their missions tied to budgets, public gardens with historic significance can use this environmental component to increase their value as destinations for not
only cultural resources but environmental education and recreation. Not only can they preserve historic sites and plants collections, but they can serve as locations for public focus on both the past and the future.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the United States declared its independence from Great Britain and thus began its cultural and historic heritage, Americans have developed an appreciation for the significance of preserving artifacts of that heritage. Whether that preservation focused on buildings, locations, or specific material items, individuals began to realize the value of the rich tapestry that was created from the legacy of the past. This duty to protect and preserve reflects the irrereplaceable nature of such a legacy, and acknowledges that if it is destroyed or abandoned, the story will be lost (Tyler, 2000).

Internationally, a tradition of advocacy for preservation developed early in countries such as England, France, and Italy (Miller, 2000). However, in the United States, preservation efforts did not gain national attention until 1906 when the first preservation legislation was passed with the Antiquities Act, legislation focused primarily on the preservation of prehistoric ruins and artifacts. Subsequently, in 1916, the National Park Service was established as the administrative agency responsible to the Secretary of the Interior, and in 1935 The Historic Sites Act established policy for
the first federal programs for preservation efforts, again focused on historic buildings and objects.

It was not until the 1960s that landscapes came to be fully considered in the historic preservation discussion in the United States; the 1965 designation of Central Park as a National Historic Landmark is an important early example. Under the control of the National Park Service, The National Register of Historic Places was established in 1966. When this concept became part of the larger *cultural landscape* definition, previously termed *historic landscapes* gained much more momentum in the preservation discussion in the 1990s. Not until 1996 did guidelines created by the National Park Service confirm the intent to value places of historic significance identified as *cultural landscapes*. This was accomplished by clarifying the *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes* that are used to determine their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. How then do public horticulture institutions fit into this framework?

**Definition of Terms**

According to Moydell, “Public horticulture is a profession; it is the art and science of cultivating plants in spaces for public use and enrichment” (2006). For the purpose of
this research, public horticulture institutions as defined by Anella are “private or publicly owned gardens or landscapes intended for public use” (Moydell, 2006). These institutions are generally described as one of the following types: arboreta, botanical gardens, college and university gardens, conservatories, display gardens, historical landscapes and sites, nature gardens, and specialized collections (APGA, 2009).

By definition of the National Park Service, a cultural landscape is “a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife and domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values (Birnbaum, NR Brief 36).” Of the four general types of cultural landscapes, public horticulture institutions are specifically defined as historic designed landscapes, which by definition, are:

- a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist, according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition.
- The landscape may be associated with a significant person(s), trend, or event in landscape architecture; or illustrate an important development in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes (Birnbaum, NR Brief 36).

The meaning of “significant” in the preceding definition of historic designed landscape, however, is less straightforward. According to the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes, within the National Register, there are four criteria
for achieving historic significance (NR Bulletin 15). Historic significance is defined as “meaning or value ascribed to a cultural landscape based on the National Register criteria for evaluation. It normally stems from a combination of association and integrity.” Significance is ultimately established through a combination of a landscape’s historic context and integrity (NR Bulletin 16A).

The Role of Public Horticulture Institutions

As previously defined, gardens are cultural landscapes (Birnbaum, NR Brief 36). However, because of the living, changing nature of landscapes, they present unique challenges from a preservation management point of view. Therefore, standard models and methods used to establish significance for buildings are not applicable to public horticulture institutions. While an understanding of these definitions and guidelines is important, managing something dynamic demands an understanding of the holistic nature or “whole character” of the landscape. Diverse values are associated with a culturally significant landscape at a particular place and time, and evaluation of those values may change over time (Mason, 2004).

Unfortunately, the role and extent of public horticulture institutions in historic landscape (now cultural landscape) preservation is not clearly documented (Miller, 2000). Whether driven by public historians, landscape architects, or horticulture
professionals, these diverse groups represent just as many diverse professional organizations that advocate for historic gardens, each with a different focus. The American Public Garden Association, The Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, The Garden Conservancy, The National Park Service and its programs, The Library of American Landscape History, and The Cultural Landscape Foundation are all advocates for cultural landscape preservation. As the number of non-profit cultural and historic landscape organizations grows (U.S. Summary Report, 2007) and leaders look for ways to better tell their story, it seems that agreement about the place of horticulture institutions becomes even more fragmented (Miller, 2000).

This fragmentation becomes apparent when considering the focused approach of, for example, Australia, New Zealand, England, and Canada. Each has a centralized organization responsible for identifying and protecting cultural landscapes, with the authority to create clear definitions, criteria, and guidelines. While the U.S. government will likely never emulate the practices of the aforementioned countries, much can be learned from international models in an increasingly global environment. Unlike most countries, cultural landscape preservation activities in the United States take place largely in the private sector (Tomlin, 1999).
Research Objectives

Given that cultural landscapes form an important part of our heritage and public horticulture institutions are cultural landscapes, the purposes of this research are:

- to analyze historic significance criteria from Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and England for comparative benchmarking to United States to better understand the global landscape preservation framework
- to interview principle advocacy groups in the United States to determine ways in which public horticulture institutions can be active members in the cultural landscape management field
- to analyze the factors affecting a manager’s decision to use historic significance in his or her decision making
- to investigate how specific organizations use historic significance in decision making

In the words of eminent British historian W.G. Hoskins, “the (man-made)…landscape itself, to those who know how to read it right, is the richest historical record we possess (Hoskins, 1955).” Public horticulture institutions are the quintessential man-made landscapes. As they are positioning themselves as centers of plant conservation, sustainability, and community development, the concept of societal stewardship is at the forefront (Gough and Accordino, 2012). This research is intended to assist public
horticulture institutions in better understanding the importance of stewarding the valuable cultural landscape resources for which they are responsible.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The preservation of cultural resources within the international community has a deep tradition based both on the hundreds of years in their historic past and their governmental and political structures. Similarly, the fields of public horticulture and historic preservation both have deep and well-documented beginnings in the United States (Hosmer, 1981; Murtagh, 1988; Tyler, 2000). Reviewing the history that has led to the current programs and policies used internationally and in the United States (US) is crucial in understanding the status of cultural landscape preservation efforts. Initially, it is important to note that historic preservation is a US-centered term. Across the international community, heritage preservation is generally used to describe the movement under which cultural landscapes are considered to reside. For the purpose of comparison, in this research, the international discussion of cultural landscape preservation will be limited to the specific programs and policies of England, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada with an explanation of the role of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in policies for those countries.
Section 1: Preservation of Cultural Landscapes and the International Community

England/UK

When considering the vast history of England and the United Kingdom (UK) as a whole, the role of landscapes in the religious and political lives of the people becomes apparent. As early as the Middle Ages, monasteries were home to a variety of designed garden spaces. Serving purposes from culinary to aesthetic, these monastic gardens were frequently used for meditation, a “symbolically charged space” (Noble, 197). Common features such as fountains and statuary were frequently found, as evidenced by historical accounts and by their remains today. During Elizabeth I reign in 1603, England experienced a “Golden Age” where formal gardens were part of the scenery of her palaces as celebrations of art and architecture. Later historical periods in 18th century England saw both landscape and picturesque gardens become part of all castles and fine palaces that housed the royalty and aristocracy. In feudal England, the social structure of serfs and later servants made it possible to maintain such large formal landscapes. In fact, many of the formally recognized garden styles were identified and developed throughout English history. These rich and varied landscapes became an integral part of the historic locations where they reside and as such are preserved along with the built structures.
In the UK, two organizations control the preservation of cultural landscapes. The preservation movement formally began in 1882 with the passage of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act as the first heritage protection legislation in Parliament. In 1893, an Inspector of Ancient Monuments was appointed to serve as the state’s first official heritage protection officer. As in most preservation efforts, the focus centered on buildings. Concern over the lack of government attention to other resources led to the creation of The National Trust in 1895, founded by three Victorian philanthropists who were concerned about the impact of uncontrolled development and industrialization. The Trust was designed to act as a guardian for the nation in the acquisition and protection of threatened coastline, countryside and buildings, hence a much wider focus designed to include landscapes. It now manages over 612,000 acres of countryside in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, plus more than 700 miles of coastline and more than 200 buildings and gardens of outstanding interest and importance. These properties are held in perpetuity, and the majority are open to visitors. The trust is a registered charity and completely independent of the government. The Trust does not establish criteria for its properties, instead relying on the guidelines set forth by English Heritage, the second organization, which is discussed below (Our Past, The National Trust, 2009).

Subsequently, piecemeal legislation controlled segments of activity in the UK, but not until 1983 did the government centralize its heritage efforts in the National Heritage
Act with the creation of English Heritage. English Heritage is the government's statutory adviser on the historic environment and reports to Parliament through the Secretary for Culture, Media, and Sport. It is officially known as the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. English Heritage is funded, in part, by the government and in part from revenue earned from its historic properties and other services. English Heritage works in partnership with the central government departments, local authorities, voluntary bodies and the private sector to conserve and enhance the historic environment, broaden public access to the heritage, and increase people's understanding of the past (Who we are: English Heritage, 2008). As English Heritage states, “The British are and always have been a nation of gardeners” throughout England in historic parks and gardens. Such places are “important, distinctive, and much cherished” and as such “we have a duty to care for them” (Heritage Protection: The Register of Parks and Gardens, 2008).

English Heritage manages the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The Register is intended to safeguard the features and qualities which make the landscapes of national importance by drawing attention to them and encouraging those who own them to treat them with “due care.” Registration requires the authorities to take into account the historic interest of the site when making decisions by consulting English Heritage regarding those decisions (Heritage Protection: The Register of Parks and Gardens, 2008).
In general, the garden must be more than 30 years old, but whether a park or garden merits registration is based on much more clear assessment criteria established by English Heritage. Eligibility for the register is based around documentary research and field survey which attempts to classify and date each park according to set criteria.

The Eligibility for Historically Significant Gardens status in England include:

- Parks and gardens with a main phase of development prior to 1750 even when only a small part is still evident.
- Sites with a main phase of development dating to between 1750 and 1820 where enough of the park or garden’s landscape survives to reflect the original design.
- Sites with a main phase of development between 1820 and 1880 which is deemed important and survives relatively intact.
- Sites with a main phase of development between 1880 and 1939 where this is of high importance and survives intact.
- Sites with a main phase of development laid out between the Second World War, but are more than 30 years old, where the park or garden is of exceptional importance.
- Sites influential in the development of taste whether through repute or literary references.
- Sites which are early or representative examples of a style of layout, or type, or the work of a landscape architect of national importance.
- Sites with an association with significant people or historical events.
- Sites with strong group values, as with some Listed Buildings.

As with Listed Buildings, parks and gardens are graded on a scale. Grade I are internationally significant sites that are the most important and constitute around 10% of the total site number. Historically important gardens are Grade II and constitute about 30% of the total site number; the remaining gardens are of regional or national importance and are Grade II registered.
English Heritage recently completed a report entitled *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* (2008) interpreting the Heritage Protection Bill designed to provide an improved legislative framework for managing change in the historic environment in the 21st century. Six high level principles support detailed policies and guidance about decision-making on a wide range of problems. These Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance include:

- The historic environment is a shared resource.
- Everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment.
- Understanding the significance of places is vital.
- Significant places should be managed to sustain their values.
- Decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent.
- Documenting and learning from decisions is essential.

These principles are intended primarily for use by English Heritage, in guiding both the management of its own estate and its advice to others concerned with managing the historic environment. As Dr. Simon Thurley, Chief Executive of English Heritage, states in the preface to these policies:

The pace of change in this age of technological revolution and globalization has brought a new urgency to our response to the changing world in which we live, but the principles and dilemmas are not new in themselves. English Heritage has been practicing them for a number of years but by writing it down for everyone to see, we are seeking to be more open and accountable. People will be able to understand our decisions more easily and become more familiar with the systematic approach in debating and deciding the outcome (Conservation Principles, 2008).
Australia

The history of Australia provides a vastly different context than other countries. Known as the “wide brown land” to her own people, the harsh, largely barren country was occupied by Aboriginals until 1788 when the first British colony was established. Subsequent colonies were added throughout the 1800’s largely uprooting the aboriginal peoples who had lived there for 50,000 years (Gardener, 14). Only recently has the influence and heritage of the aboriginal peoples been recognized and respected. That continues to be a challenge in Australian preservation policy regarding historic sites, especially those with indigenous roots.

As with England, Australia’s heritage preservation efforts are led by a governmental agency and a charitable advocacy based organization. Not until the 1970s did Australia pass significant legislation with the Australian Heritage Commission Act of 1975, which saw recognition of the importance of the natural and historic environment. Labeled “the National Estate”, these were places of importance for their aesthetic, historic, scientific, or social significance for future generations (Clarke and Johnston, 2000). The law established the Australian Heritage Commission as the principal adviser to the Australian Government on heritage matters under the oversight of the Minister for the Environment, Water, Heritage, and the Arts.
The document which defines the basic principles and procedures for Australian heritage in The Burra Charter, adopted in 1979 at a meeting of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) held in Burra, Australia. It adapted the ICOMOS Venice Charter guidelines to be more useful to Australia. The entire charter is in Appendix A. Guidelines for the interpretation of the Charter contain specific definitions for historic value. The definition regarding historic resources summarizes the Australian heritage philosophy:

A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic figure, event, phase or activity. It may also have historic value as the site of an important event. For any given place the significance will be greater where evidence of the association or event survives in situ, or where the settings are substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of subsequent treatment (Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance, 1988).

In 1999, additional environmental and national heritage legislation in Australia was passed as the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. Subsequent amendments led to the Australian Heritage Council Act of 2003, which renamed the overseeing body as the Australian Heritage Council (Roles of the Australian Heritage Council). The Council assesses nominations for the National Heritage List, the Commonwealth Heritage List, and the List of Overseas Places of Historic Significance.
to Australia. The Council also maintains the Register of the National Estate. Anyone can nominate a place with outstanding heritage values to the National Heritage List, which is a list of places with outstanding natural, indigenous or historic heritage value based on the qualities or values of the place that make it outstanding. However, a nomination must meet one or more of nine criteria.

- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's natural or cultural history
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of Australia's natural or cultural history
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's natural or cultural history
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of
  - a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or
  - a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia's natural or cultural history
- the place has outstanding heritage value to the nation because of the place's importance as part of Indigenous tradition
As well as assessing a place against criteria for its heritage value, the Council is also required to apply a “significance threshold,” a test that helps the Council judge the level of significance of a place's heritage value by asking “how important are these values”? To reach the threshold for the National Heritage List, a place must have “outstanding” heritage value to the nation. This means that it must be important to the Australian community as a whole. To determine whether a place has “outstanding” heritage values, it is compared to other, similar types of places. This allows the Council to determine if one place is “more” or “less” significant compared to other similar places, or if it is unique. The degree of significance can also relate to the geographic area, a place's significance locally, regionally, nationally or internationally (Australian Heritage Council).

A second community-based, non-governmental organization, The National Trust of Australia is committed to promoting and conserving Australia's indigenous, natural and historic heritage through advocacy and custodianship of heritage places and objects. It was established in New South Wales in 1945 to raise community consciousness of widespread destruction of the built and natural heritage in Sydney. The National Trust movement quickly spread across Australia with the other states establishing National Trust offices throughout the 1950s and 1960s. The Australian Council of National Trusts (ACNT), formed in 1965, represents the interests of the
National Trust at the federal level. Collectively, the organization owns or manages over 300 heritage places, the majority held in perpetuity (About the National Trust, 2009).

New Zealand

While New Zealand and Australia both share British colonization and aboriginal beginnings, the geography and history of New Zealand have unique features that contribute to preservation policies today. Early settlers composed of Polynesians and Maori both are estimated to have arrived between 950 and 1130 A.D. In 1769, James Cook was the first European explorer, although the French explorer Surville claimed the same time period. Armed conflicts with the fierce Maori warriors led Britain to withdraw its troops in 1870, leaving a British Commonwealth even today. Just as in Australia, the Maori or “local people of the land” did not receive the recognition of their ancestral homeland initially. However, today that recognition is a principal part of preservation policy.

The organization primarily responsible for heritage preservation in New Zealand is the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT), or Pouhere Taonga, was established as a charitable trust by an Act of Parliament in 1954 and has become New Zealand's leading national historic heritage agency. Today it is seen as the guardian of
Aotearoa, or New Zealand's (historic) heritage. It is governed and managed as a crown entity under the Crown Entities Act 2004, with its powers and functions prescribed by the Historic Places Act 1993. It is governed by a joint Board of Trustees and a Maori Heritage Council charged with overseeing the special interest of New Zealand’s indigenous tribes (Introduction, NZHPT, 2008).

The Trust’s mission is to promote the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand. The NZHPT believes the conservation of this heritage enables New Zealanders to develop a greater understanding of their history and identity and that part of this heritage is lost forever each time an historic place is irrevocably changed (Introduction, NZHPT, 2008).

New Zealand, like Australia, saw most of its heritage legislation passed in the 1970s, including the Protected Objects Act in 1975, the Reserves Act in 1977, the Conservation Act in 1987, the Resource Management Act in 1991, and the Historic Places Act in 1993, which all form the basis for current established policies. As part of this heritage initiative, New Zealand identifies a National Register of Historic Places. Acceptance into the register is based upon broad categories, which include: aesthetic, archeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, technological, or traditional value. Historic places are divided into two categories. Category I status is given to places of ‘special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value’; Category II status recognizes places of ‘historical or
cultural heritage significance or value’ (Rarangi Taonga: The Register of Historic Places, 2008).

The Department of Conservation (DOC) is the central government body responsible for conservation of national and historic heritage on Crown conservation land managed by the government. Thirty percent of New Zealand’s total area is controlled by the DOC (Conservation: New Zealand).

Just as with Australia, the ICOMOS has a substantial influence in New Zealand. Heritage policy is summarized in the 1996 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Significance (Appendix B). Because of the strong influence of indigenous heritage of the Maori, a special section in that document concerns the commitment to leave decision making regarding indigenous historic resources to the people at the tribal level. A second document written in 2004 entitled Policy for Government Department’s Management of Historic Resources clarifies conservation policies and reemphasizes the intent to respect indigenous sovereignty (Appendix C).
Canada

Similarly to Australia and New Zealand, Canada has been occupied by First Nations indigenous peoples and Inuits for some 10,000 years, the huge expanse of land that comprises Canada and the wide variety of its people has created what Canada terms a “mosaic” (Gibbon, 1938). Conflicting cultures and cultural concepts of nationality have created tensions that make it difficult to create a sense of collective identity. This has been demonstrated by the continuing struggles with Quebec’s desire to have provincial sovereignty. Just as in Australia and New Zealand, the native populations largely had their cultural resources ignored or destroyed as the lands of indigenous cultures were regarded as “impediments to growth and prosperity” (First Nations in Canada, 2013). Respect for these cultural resources is a continuing challenge in policy in Canada.

Canadian heritage preservation is led by two primary groups, one governmental and one charitable. While there were private initiatives as early as 1882, not until the 20th century were there organized national efforts. Early initiatives included the creation of the Royal Society of Canada’s Committee for the Preservation of Scenic and Historic Places in Canada (1900), the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (1919), the Commission des biens culturels du Québec (1922) and British Columbia's laws to protect Native artifacts (1925). This period also saw the rise of activist conservation groups such as the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, founded in 1932.
A key turning point in related history occurred when the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (1951) advocated broadening the scope of heritage to include architecture. Until that time, buildings and sites were generally not thought to have heritage value unless associated with great historical figures or events. The federal government responded to the Commission's recommendation by passing the Historic Sites and Monuments Act (1953), which was amended in 1955 to permit designation of architecturally significant buildings as national historic sites. Even so, at the end of the 1960s only a few dozen national architectural commemorations had been made and no province had clear criteria for defining heritage property.

In 1976, Canada signed the declaration of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (the World Heritage Convention), committing to protect world heritage sites within Canada. In 1985, the Historic Sites and Monuments Act and the Museums Act became law, followed by the Department of Canadian Heritage Act in 1995, and Parks Canada Agency Act in 1998.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage designates sites, persons and events of national historic significance. Recommendations are made to the Minister by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, a statutory advisory group on historical matters composed of representatives from all the provinces and territories. Any aspect of Canada’s history may be considered for designation of national historic significance.
when a place, person, or event will meet one or more criteria (Criteria, Guidelines, and Specific Guidelines, 2004).

In November 1994, the Historic Sites and Monuments Board added recommendations to define parks and gardens of national significance. The criteria for a park or garden to be considered of national significance include:

- The excellence of its aesthetic qualities
- Unique or remarkable characteristics of style(s) or type(s) which speak to an important period or periods in the history of Canada or of horticulture
- Unique or remarkable characteristics reflecting important ethno/cultural traditions which speak to an important period or periods in the history of Canada or of horticulture
- The importance of its influence over time or a given region of the country by virtue of its age, style, type, etc.
- The presence of horticultural specimens of exceptional rarity or value
- Associations with events or individuals of national historical significance
- The importance of the architect(s), designer(s), or horticulturist(s) associated with it

The Board stated, however, that it expected the case for national commemoration of any garden or park would not rest solely on one of the eight guidelines adopted, except in the most unusual circumstances. In general, with respect to guidelines #7 and #8 it would be more appropriate to recognize gardens and parks whose national significance derived from their associative values with individuals (architects/designers) or events of national significance through commemoration of the individuals or events themselves at the garden or park in question (Specific Guidelines: Place.3.10, 1994).
Until 2003, Canada had no formal register of historic places. Administered by Parks Canada, a registry process began through the Historic Places Initiative. An online database consisting of about 3000 listings as of mid-2013, it does not connote national significance, but merely serves as a resource to identify properties that may have either local or provincial significance. It implies no specific criteria of its own but relies on criteria established by other bodies, “reflecting the community-based approach to heritage conservation in Canada” (Ricketts, 2006).

In 2003 Parks Canada published the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, a pan-Canadian benchmark for heritage conservation. It is designed to provide a guide for decision-making for historic places (Appendix D).

The Heritage Canada Foundation, known simply as Heritage Canada, is a registered charity and principal advocacy group in the country. Established in 1973, its mission is to encourage the protection and promotion of the built, natural, historic, and scenic heritage of Canada. It has campaigned on various initiatives to update and fill gaps in Canadian heritage policies and laws (About Heritage Canada, 2008).

**ICOMOS**

Until the end of the 19th century, architectural heritage was the focus of most of the laws regarding the protection of historic buildings. Preservation groups and associations existed in many countries, but their scope never went beyond national
borders. Cultural internationalism after World War I was demonstrated with the creation of the League of Nations, and after World War II with the creation of the United Nations and UNESCO. The Athens Conference (1931) on restoration of historic buildings and the Athens Charter at the fourth Assembly of the International Congresses on Modern Architecture (1933) both represented a major step by introducing the concept of international heritage for the first time in history (History of ICOMOS).

In 1957, in Paris, the First Congress of Architects and Specialists of Historic Buildings recommended that the countries that still lacked a central organization for the protection of historic buildings provide for the establishment of such an authority and, in the name of UNESCO, that all member states of UNESCO join the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) based in Rome. In 1964, the Second Congress of Architects and Specialist of Historic Buildings met in Venice and adopted 13 resolutions, which became known as the Venice Charter, and created the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Appendix E). Intended as a society of international professionals, it works in conservation and protection of cultural heritage places (Mission of ICOMOS).

Today there are over 7000 members in 110 countries. In 1982, the ICOMOS met in Florence, Italy to issue another charter document targeting historic gardens. Known as the Florence Charter, it contains definitions and descriptions of historic gardens and
principles for their maintenance, conservation, restoration, and reconstruction (Appendix F).

Section 2: Preservation of Cultural Landscapes in the United States

The Evolution of the Historic Preservation Movement

The preservation movement in the United States resulted largely from patriotic and/or nationalistic motives to preserve historic artifacts. Early preservation efforts originated with organized citizen groups or their resulting efforts passed through churches, universities, and cities (Murtagh, 1988). Generally, the leaders of the cause were ministers, women, teachers, and artists (Barthel, 1996). The successful restoration of Mount Vernon that began in 1853, led by Ann Pamela Cunningham, serves as the leading example of the early movement. Its stated purpose was to, “inspire in future generations the patriotism and notable characters of the Founding Fathers” (Barthel, 1996).

The first piece of federal legislation designed to protect historic buildings and monuments was The Antiquities Act of 1906. It was a response to the destruction of prehistoric sites in the Southwest, giving the US government authority to preserve historic artifacts on lands controlled by the government. It was not until 1916 that The
National Park Service (NPS) was created by the Department of the Interior and was charged with the conservation of historic objects as well as regulation and use of monuments (Murtagh, 1988).

Soon after the rise of federal assistance came the restoration efforts at Monticello (Fitch, 1990), followed by Colonial Williamsburg in 1928, which was sponsored by John D. Rockefeller (Barthel, 1996). Both illustrate the increasing concern for the historic built environment (Murtagh, 1988). In fact, it has been said that Colonial Williamsburg marked a distinct change in the organization and focus of the movement when its restoration, “had become the most concentrated pool of preservation expertise in the country, frequently consulted by other private groups and the Park Service itself” (Murtagh, 1988).

In 1933, The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Program began to provide architectural documentation for historic buildings (Hosmer, 1981). This record established professional standards in recording techniques and made possible the inclusion of frequently ignored nonresidential buildings (Murtagh, 1988). Also in 1933, President Roosevelt issued an Executive Order #6166 reorganizing all federally owned national parks, monuments, military parks, cemeteries, memorials, and capital parks into one central system. This act also expanded the National Park Service definitions to include the nation’s first national historic sites. In 1935, the first national policy of preserving historic buildings and significant sites was articulated by The
Historic Sites and Building Act. This legislation facilitated the continuing identification and survey of historic buildings to be conducted every ten years (Barthel, 1996) and enabled increased preservation planning (Murtagh, 1988). This act would serve as the basis for the National Register of Historic Places.

Government support for preservation activity stopped during World War II, which brought expressed concern from preservationists (Barthel, 1996) and frustration from the National Park Service (Murtagh, 1988). Not until the charter of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1949 was the importance of the preservation movement re-established (Murtagh, 1988). However, in 1954, the Supreme Court decision in Berman vs. Parker laid the foundation for the use of “aesthetic value” as a basis for government intervention, a fact that aided preservation as well. In it, Justice Douglas stated,

> The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive...The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well balanced as well as carefully patrolled (Cullingworth 1997, 103).

This precedent supported preservation in the first major preservation case in 1978 in Penn Central Transportation Co. vs. City of New York. It became the basis to legitimize historic ordinances (E. Michigan Univ., 2008b).
1966 is perhaps the most important year in the preservation movement in the United States when The National Historic Preservation Act established The National Register of Historic Places, listing individual designations of buildings and sites. Additionally, the Department of Transportation Act protected historic sites from new transportation projects, and The National Museum Act established the significance of museum resources (Murtagh, 1988).

In the 1971 Executive Order #11593 by President Richard Nixon, responsibilities were delegated to government agencies for protection and enhancement of the cultural environment (Murtagh, 1988). Perhaps more significantly, properties on the National Register became eligible for federal tax incentives with the Tax Reform Act of 1976, and in 1981 the Economic Recovery Tax Act provided a 25% tax incentive for rehabilitation (Murtagh, 1988). Subsequently, those tax incentives have since changed in the past 32 years.

In 1976, the Secretary of the Interior designed the standards for Historic Preservation Projects, which have been used by State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and the National Park Service to review projects receiving federal funds in a consistent manner. In 1992, the standards were revised to include all historic resource types included in the National Register and retitled The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. In 1996, the standards were expanded to include The Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes as part of that larger
context and apply to all types of cultural landscapes, including historic designed landscapes, historic sites, ethnographic landscapes, and historic vernacular landscapes (Appendix G). In 2007, The National Trust for Historic Preservation called for legislation to strengthen the financial resources available federally to assist in all these categories.

In any discussion of the governmental role in preservation, it is important to note that the United States Constitution does not grant the federal government power over land use regulations. That responsibility falls on each state or territory. Therefore, the National Historic Preservation Act created a framework for the cooperation between the levels of government that must work together to protect historic resources. To provide leadership for such resources, each state appoints a State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to maintain the state inventory and provide a network with the federal government.

**Definition:** What is an **historic/cultural landscape**?

Developing a cross discipline, working definition of a historic landscape among the preservation movement is problematic. Many attempts have been made across various disciplines, such as geography, history, landscape architecture, and anthropology (Stephenson, 2007). As Tishler states, “the term ‘landscape’ is commonly accepted in
a natural context, but defining the landscape in historic/cultural terms is a complex matter…”(1979). Other attempts have been made by The National Trust’s Goals and Programs of 1973, which stated:

The historic and cultural rural landscape is that part of rural America that exemplifies its regional historic and cultural patterns and values. Villages, market towns, county seats, farms and countryside are equal parts of it. It includes what people do as well where they live, what they ate, how they travel and how they live (Tishler, 1979).

Since 1992, The National Park Service (Birnbaum, 1992) has used the term cultural landscape defined as:

A geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.

Any attempt to define “landscape” in its role in historic preservation should include an understanding of the landscape’s past, its present, and future uses, and implications for the interpretation of its place (Buggey, 1998). Such a definition must take into consideration the physical, tangible, and measurable elements; the relational elements; and the human and natural practices that compose the landscape (Stephenson, 2007).

**The Role of the Cultural Landscape**

The history of preservation in the United States has predominately focused on buildings and monuments (Tyler, 2000). While appreciation has increased for
vernacular structures (Fitch, 1990), the comprehensive effort for the conservation of the entire environment surrounding such structures is a broader scope. As such, the preservation of historic landscapes has “no single momentous precedent,” nor were there “preservation champions who were able to influence national thought and action” (Miller, 2000). Perhaps the most significant change during the 1930s came when landscape architects began to influence restoration of landscapes in important historic environments, such as Colonial Williamsburg (Tishler, 1979).

Before 1954, historic preservation efforts had no standard philosophy at the national level, and as Miller points out, until the 1970s no standard method was used to evaluate existing historic landscapes for preservation (Miller, 2000). The only organized movements were by the Trustees of Reservation, founded in 1891, who successfully preserved significant New England gardens, and the growth of the Garden Clubs of America in the early 1900s (Miller, 2000). However, Tishler (1979) advocated, “an important component for much of the very character of the historic environment is the landscape itself”.

As Buggey (1998) acknowledges, “Landscapes emerged in North America as a new area of interest of historic preservation interest in the 1970s”. While the 1970s emphasis was largely cosmetic, the emphasis shifted to restoration in the 1980s, focusing on more practical knowledge and expertise, particularly through historical and archaeological research (Buggey, 1998). This effort was enhanced by a growing
number of expert scholars and professionals. In the 1990s, the movement progressed to mainstream historic conservation with a significant shift by the National Park Service to recognize the importance of cultural landscapes (Buggey, 1998).

Most experts believe that the importance of landscape preservation will continue to grow in its role in educational programming, advances in technology will improve access to this information, and the increased interest by communities will change the approaches in decision making and planning by professionals in the field (Buggey, 1998). The Garden Conservancy and The Cultural Landscape Foundation, founded in 1989 and 1998, respectively, illustrate organizations whose missions demonstrate the continued growth of such landscape preservation efforts.

In 2000, the National Park Service established the Historic American Landscapes Committee (HALS) to record historic landscapes in the United States through drawings, written histories, and photographs, setting guidelines in consultation with the American Society of Landscape Architects (Heritage documentation programs, 2008). This project is archival in nature, and designed to provide a history of the locations regardless of their survival. This project is relevant to this thesis research as it is the most recent and most focused program of the U.S. government regarding historic landscape preservation.
Criteria Standards Used For Establishing Historic Significance

In the United States the definition and criteria for historic significance is the work of the National Park Service. For a place to be deemed significant it must meet one of four criteria. They are listed in the Criteria for Evaluation for the National Register of Historic Places.

These criteria state that the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history, or
- That are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past;
- That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- That have yielded or may likely yield information important in history or prehistory.

Criteria Considerations

In addition to the four criteria for evaluation and the seven elements aspects of integrity, seven criteria considerations are listed for those places that ordinarily would not be eligible for the registry. Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, graves of historical
figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories listed below in the Criteria Considerations for the National Registry that include:

- A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or
- A building or structure removed from its original location but which is primarily significant for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building associated with his or her productive life; or
- A cemetery that derives its primary importance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or
- A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.

It should be noted that all of these documents were not created with landscapes in mind, rather with districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects in mind. How then do they apply to cultural landscapes? In 1996, the standards were expanded to include The Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes (Appendix H) as part of that
larger context and apply to all types of cultural landscapes. These include historic designed landscape, historic site, ethnographic landscape, and historic vernacular landscape.

Parks and gardens most often reside within the definition of a designed historic landscape. These landscapes take many forms which can generally be described as one of the following:

- small residential grounds
- estate or plantation grounds (including a farm where the primary significance is as a landscape design and not as historic agriculture
- arboreta, botanical, and display gardens
- zoological gardens and parks
- church yards and cemeteries
- monuments and memorial grounds
- plaza/square/green/mall or other public spaces
- campus and institutional grounds
- city planning or civic design subdivisions and planned communities/resorts
- commercial and industrial grounds and parks
- parks (local, State, and national) and camp grounds
- battlefield parks and other commemorative parks
- grounds designed or developed for outdoor recreation and/or sports activities such as country clubs, golf courses, tennis courts, bowling greens, bridle trails, stadiums, ball parks, and race tracks that are not part of a unit listed above
- fair and exhibition grounds
- parkways, drives, and trails
The Role of the Private Sector in Advocacy

Because private organizations have played such a huge role in the preservation and protection of cultural and historic landscapes, it is important to understand their history from the beginning and their role today.

The oldest formally organized horticultural society in the United States was formed as the Massachusetts Horticultural Society. It has provided information on horticulture and related sciences, educational programming, exhibitions and community outreach initiatives. MHS has successfully championed many important issues throughout its history, such as the introduction of food plants (Concord Grape, 1853), the garden cemetery movement (Mount Auburn Cemetery, 1831), the school garden movement (1880s), the adornment of Boston’s back alleys by establishing home gardens (1930s), the victory garden movement (1940s), and the garden history movement (1990) (History: Massachusetts Horticultural Society).

In 1891, the first Garden Club of America was founded in Georgia, and in 1929, the National Garden Club began with 13 states as charter members. Their mission is described as:

To aid in the protection and conservation of natural resources; to promote civic beautification and encourage the improvement of roadsides and parks, to encourage the establishment and maintenance of botanical gardens, arboreta and horticultural centers for the advancement of science, enjoyment and education of the public; to advance the study of gardening, landscape design,
environmental issues, floral design and horticulture and assist deserving students through college scholarships in these fields of endeavor; and to cooperate with other organizations furthering the interests of horticulture, conservation, environmental protection and beautification (About National Garden Clubs).

Whether driven by public historians, landscape architects, or horticulture professionals, many diverse agencies advocate for historic gardens, each with a different focus. That diversity is perhaps best illustrated by examining their literature. For example, the American Public Garden Association (APGA), formerly known as the American Association of Botanical Gardens and Arboreta, was established in 1940 with a mission to support public gardens so the public might better appreciate plants (APGA, 2007). The Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation (AHLP) was founded in 1978 as an advocacy group to provide a communication forum for its diverse, interdisciplinary membership (AHLP, 2008). The Garden Conservancy was established in 1989, “as the first national organization devoted to garden preservation” (Garden Conservancy, 2008). It is a project driven group whose focus is on offering preservation services to individual gardens needing legal, financial, or horticultural support. The Cultural Landscape Foundation was founded in 1998. As the “only not-for-profit foundation in America dedicated to increasing the public’s awareness of the importance … of cultural landscapes,” this organization focuses on education, outreach, and technical support for professionals and organizations (Cultural Landscape Foundation, 2007).
It is important that the efforts of each of these organizations are well understood by representatives of public horticulture institutions and similar cultural resource managers as they promote their organizations.
Chapter 3
MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

Advocacy Interviews

Interviews were conducted with leaders of eight (8) principal historic landscape and garden advocacy organizations including: the American Public Garden Association, The Garden Conservancy, The Cultural Landscape Foundation, The National Park Service, The Alliance for Historic Preservation, The Library of American Landscape History, The Smithsonian Institute Horticultural Services Division, and The Frederick Olmstead Center for Historic Landscape Research Table 1. A list of interview questions can be found in Appendix H.

Table 1: Advocacy group directors interviewed about The Role of Historic Significance in Public Gardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Public Garden Association</td>
<td>Executive Director, Daniel Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Conservancy</td>
<td>Director of Preservation, Bill Noble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cultural Landscape Foundation</td>
<td>President, Charles Birnbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Park Service</td>
<td>Historian, Barbara Wyatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief of HALS, Paul Dolinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alliance for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>President, Cari Goetheus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Smithsonian—Horticultural Services Division</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Barbara Faust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviews will be taped and transcribed.
Survey of Role of Historic Significance In Decision Making

A. Philosophical Construct

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) was chosen to measure the existing attitudes and beliefs of directors and managers of public horticulture institutions regarding the role of historic significance in their decision making process. The TPB was initially proposed by Fishbein and Ajzen in 1975 as The Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980).

TPB proposes a model by which human action is guided. Three variables predict the intention to perform a specific behavior: attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. Attitudes are defined as the behavioral beliefs a person has regarding a behavior and the evaluation of those outcomes. This measures a person’s overall evaluation of the behavior. Subjective norms are defined as the normative beliefs a person has regarding the expectations of others and the motivation to comply with those expectations. This may be loosely phrased as social pressure to perform or not perform the behavior. Perceived behavioral control is defined as the control beliefs consisting of the presence of factors that facilitate or impede the performance of a behavior and the perceived power of those factors. This is summarized by the extent to which a person feels able to enact the behavior. These three factors lead to a behavioral intention. Intention is the antecedent of behavior and therefore indicates a willingness to perform the behavior in question. In general, the more favorable the
attitude and subjective norm, and the greater the perceived behavioral control, the stronger the intention to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Ajzen illustrates the model in the following:

**Figure 1: The Theory of Planned Behavior**

---

B. The Survey

1. The Pool

The membership of the APGA was chosen as the at-large pool for the survey. After eliminating those garden not in North America, gardens identifying themselves as *entertainment* or *zoological* were also eliminated, leaving a pool of 425.

2. Preparing the instrument

An electronic survey was prepared using Qualtrix as a software package since it is owned and maintained by the University of Delaware. The thirty-two (32) question
survey was designed to be completed in thirty (30) minutes with initial demographic information and five (5) questions for each of the principal variables of TPB: attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control. A seven (7) point Lichert scale was used and the questions were randomized with some scale reversal to eliminate participants completing the survey without considering each question. An opt-out question was placed after the initial demographics to allow gardens with no historic resource to exit the instrument at that point. The survey instrument can be found in Appendix I.

3. Testing the Validity of the Survey

Prior to launching the survey, ten garden directors of historic institutions were chosen to take it and comment on the items. Their responses were the considered before the instrument was finalized for distribution.

4. Incentives for Completion

One of the principal weaknesses of an electronic survey is the poor response rate generally associated with such instruments. Research has shown that token incentives ($5 or less) increase the likelihood that subjects will respond (Church, 1993). In the most recent work, the regression analysis found that pre-paid incentives produce an increase in response rate of 15% across all disciplines (Jobber et al, 2004). Therefore, the researcher asked for and received permission from Dr. Robert Lyons and Dr.
Robyn Morgan to send presidential dollar coins in the initial mailing before the launch of the electronic survey.

5. Administration of Survey

Ten (10) days before the launch of the electronic version, each participant was mailed a letter which also contained the incentive coin attached to a business card. All letters were addressed to the institutional contact provided to the 2008 APGA directory database. Generally, this was the director of the institution. The letter also provided an opportunity for the institution to correct an incorrect email address or to redirect the survey to someone other than the contact listed if desired. The initial letter is found as Appendix J.

The survey was launched on April 12, 2009 to be open for thirty (30) days. At the end of the first week and the second week, a reminder email was sent to those who had not completed the survey.

6. Data Collection

Upon the closing of the electronic survey, the data was analyzed for statistical significance related to the principal variables of TPB: attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control.
Case Studies

After reviewing the summaries of international significance criteria, advocacy interviews, and statistical data results, three (3) case study site visits were made to describe the factors affecting historic significance at specific institution. Historic cemeteries were chosen in order to have a clearer basis of comparison by using a similar type of institution. The three institutions chosen were Mt. Auburn Cemetery, Laurel Hill Cemetery, and Spring Grove Cemetery.

Mt. Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge, Massachusetts, was founded September 24, 1831, as America’s first “garden cemetery” or “rural cemetery” and is recognized as the beginning of America’s public parks and gardens movement. It was founded on seventy (70) acres and later extended to one hundred seventy (174) acres. Inspired by Pere Lachaise Cemetery in Paris, it was designed by Henry Alexander Scammell Dearborn. Important for both its history and its arboretum, Mt. Auburn has a collection of over five thousand (5000) trees. It was listed on The National Register of Historic Places in 1975 and designated a National Historic Landmark in 2003.

Laurel Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania is the second oldest “rural cemetery” in the United States. Founded in 1836, it was designed by architect John Notman. Comprised of eighty-one (81) acres, it soon became land locked by Fairmount Park. Soon after, in 1869, one hundred seventy-two (172) acres was
incorporated for a sister cemetery, West Laurel Hill. Both locations are historically important for both art and historical artifacts. West Laurel Hill was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1992 and Laurel Hill was listed as a National Historic Landmark in 1998.

Spring Grove Cemetery and Arboretum in Cincinnati, Ohio, is the second largest “rural” cemetery founded in 1844. Again influenced by Pere Lachaise Cemetery in Paris, Spring Grove was designed by Adolph Strauch. His influence is seen in the lakes, trees, and shrubs which reflected the “garden” cemetery concept he represented. The largest of the three case sites, Spring Grove is composed of seven hundred thirty three (733) acres of which 400 are maintained. It was recognized as a National Historic Landmark in 2007.

At each site, the directors or managers were asked the questions which appear in Appendix K.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

International Comparisons

Using the multiple charters, policies, guidelines and standards, a comparison of international criteria revealed many similarities in the way England, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada address historic significance of heritage resources. When reviewing England, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada for comparative benchmarking to United States to better understand the global landscape preservation framework, common characteristics emerged. While the benchmark dates used varied, whether specifically delineated (England) or marked by periods (Canada), all of the countries considered historic significance of heritage resources in terms of their value to geopolitical, natural or cultural history. They shared the sense of the importance of place in reflecting the values of their people. That was especially evident in Australia, New Zealand and Canada where indigenous, first nations played such a large role in building their cultural heritage. All shared the significance of important aesthetic values whether by recognized designers and architects or design intent. They shared the importance of preserving rare horticultural specimens or places with extreme ecological significance, not just buildings or physical objects. All of the countries considered in this research had standards or criteria by which to evaluate the importance of their cultural landscapes outlined in Table 2.
Table 2. International Criteria for Heritage Significance in England, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and gardens with a main phase of development prior to 1750 even when only a small part is still evident.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s importance in the place or pattern of Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important aesthetic values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of the excellence of its aesthetic qualities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with a main phase of development dating to between 1750 and 1820 where enough of the park or garden’s landscape survive to reflect the original design.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s possession of uncommon, rare, or endangered aspects of Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important archaeological values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of its unique or remarkable characteristics of style(s) or type(s) which speak to an important period or periods in the history of Canada or of horticulture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with a main phase of development between 1820 and 1880 which is deemed important and survives relatively intact.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s potential to yield information that will contribute to Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important architectural values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of its unique or remarkable characteristics reflecting important ethnocultural traditions which speak to an important period or periods in the history of Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with a main phase of development between 1880 and 1939 where this of high importance and survives intact.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of Australia’s natural or cultural places or a class of Australia’s natural or cultural environments.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important cultural values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of the importance of its influence over time or a given region of the country by virtue of its age, style, type, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with a main phase of development laid out between the Second World War, but are more than 30 years old, where the park or garden is of exceptional importance.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important historical values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of the presence of horticultural specimens of exceptional rarity or value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites influential in the development of taste whether through repute or literary references.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important scientific values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of its exceptional ecological interest or value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites which are early or representative examples of a style of layout, or type, or the work of a landscape architect of national importance</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural, or spiritual reasons.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important social values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of its associations with events or individuals of national historic significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with an association with significant people or historical events.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in Australia’s natural or cultural history.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important spiritual values.</td>
<td>A park or garden may be considered of national significance because of the importance of the architect(s), designer(s), or horticulturalist(s) associated with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites with a strong group value, as with some listed buildings.</td>
<td>The place has outstanding heritage value to the ration because of the place’s importance as part of Indigenous tradition.</td>
<td>The significance of historic heritage is assessed by the extent to which the place reflects important technological values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internationally, the movement for heritage preservation is much older and well established than in the United States. Compared to England, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, the United States has a less governmentally organized system of assigning significance. When the formal system of The National Historic Preservation Act established The National Register of Historic Places in 1966, there began to emerge some national standards focused on an examination of the properties age, integrity, and significance. Compared to international benchmarks of dates as early as 1750 (England), properties on the National Register must be at least 50 years old to be considered. The determination of significance centers around the events, activities, and developments that occurred at the site.

In 1992 the Secretary of the Interior expanded the focus of the National Register to include cultural landscapes with the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. However, public gardens did not come to be considered as part of the discussion of historically significant resources in this larger context of cultural landscapes until 1996 when the standards were expanded in Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes (Birnbaum, 1994). Public gardens illustrate more practical applications of the guidelines considering their organizational elements and character defining features which include:
• Change and continuity of the resource
• Relative significance in history
• Geographical context
• Use
• Archeological resources
• Natural systems
• Management and Maintenance
• Interpretation

Reviewing the international preservation movement demonstrates the relative youth of the United States preservation movement. The international community has long wrestled over philosophical understandings of the role of heritage preservation in passing along the cultural understanding of the past to future generations. In the United States, we are still searching to find that commitment. This is in large part due to our reluctance to establish strict governmental control over this process, which has led to the wide range of advocacy groups whose missions, while varied, center on the protection of those resources.

The Role of Advocacy Groups in the United States

It is clear that the National Park Service, specifically the National Register with its methods of inventorying, identifying, analyzing, and evaluating them for significance, has had the loudest voice in shaping how the US approaches preservation. In the 1970s and 1980s, the National Park Service was the “world leader” in helping define cultural landscapes (Goetchus, 2009). It is, therefore, not surprising that most of the
directors of the principal advocacy groups interviewed were employees of, or contractors with the NPS at some point in their careers. In fact, the Frederick Olmsted Center for Historic Preservation is the preservation management arm of the NPS.

Charles Birnbaum, founder of The Cultural Landscape Foundation, was the principal author of the NPS Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Places

However, in the past 5-7 years, the NPS has been ignored by those who are thinking more globally about the role of culture in historic landscapes (Goetchus, 2009). These groups were created between 1989 and 2000 to raise awareness and provide support for these resources in the US. They represent efforts by passionate professionals to carry out their respective missions, all of which center around preservation of cultural resources and education for those who care for them or to whom they will belong in the future. Each approaches that mission in individual ways, but a core group of people share the vision. One group may champion a particular aspect, but the respect between them was apparent. Most are predominantly run by volunteer boards. They are all part of the cultural landscape discussion.

Charlie Pepper, Assistant Director of The Frederick Olmsted Center was interviewed on April 2, 2009, in his office in Boston, MA. The Olmsted Center contracts with national parks and historic sites to formulate Cultural Landscape Reports to research graphically and narratively the history of their site in order to protect their significant resources and to lead park managers through the process of rehabilitation. All of the
other aspects, not only all the theory associated with determining significance and planning for management of historic significant properties, but also all of the other aspects of property management issues—serving constituent groups, serving friends groups, serving users, public events, resource protection, environmental concerns have to be considered. It is the Center’s job not only to take the historic significance of preservation management approach but to take it with all the other things and integrate it that a site manager needs to deal with. They are also actively involved in partnerships with other advocacy groups and with educational programs for high school students. One such program named Branching Out helps young people explore landscape management first hand.

Cari Goetcheus, president of The Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation, was interviewed by phone on April 1, 2009. The Alliance is an organization primarily built to provide a communication platform for those interested in historic landscapes. By hosting national conferences as forums for professionals the Alliance works as an advocacy tool to share ideas, provide professional development opportunities, and host website resources. They view themselves as a “national communication/education umbrella” (Goetchus, 2009), bringing together professionals from preservation, landscape architecture, and horticulture.
Bill Noble, Director of Preservation for The Garden Conservancy was interviewed by phone on April 2, 2009. The Garden Conservancy’s mission is “preserving exceptional American gardens for education and enjoyment of the public” (Noble, 2009). Taking the theory of preservation and applying it to the actual practice of maintaining an historic garden presents unique challenges. The Garden Conservancy works with individual gardens either through their database or through those recommended to them. They evaluate the ability of the garden and the site to adapt itself to public visitation and to everything that is needed for a garden to thrive as a public garden. Recently, the mission has changed slightly to focus on preserving individual gardens of various types of significance. They also have an education component, primarily through the Open Days program.

Dan Stark, former Executive Director of The American Public Garden Association was interviewed in person on March 11, 2009. The Association’s mission is to “advance public gardens as a force for positive change in their communities through national leadership, advocacy, and innovation” (APGA). They are not an accrediting agency, thus any identification of gardens as historic is voluntary. Therefore, when discussing the number of APGA gardens with historic resources who may not choose to self-identify, the organization faces a challenge. How does the APGA help institutions recognize their role as historic properties as it relates to their communities (Stark, 2009)? The APGA is focused on environmental stewardship in their respective
communities and plant conservation at the national level. Various subsections of APGA focus on subsets of garden types, i.e. display, arboretum, etc., including one that focuses specifically on historic properties. Educational outreach is frequently conducted in partnership, for example Plant Conservation Day in cooperation with the American Zoological Association.

Charles Birnbaum, President of The Cultural Landscape Foundation, was interviewed by phone on April 8, 2009. The Foundation views itself as the “only not-for-profit foundation in America dedicated to increasing the public’s awareness and understanding of the importance and irreplaceable legacy of its cultural landscape” (TCLF). As founder and president, Charles Birnbaum’s credentials with his 15 years at the NPS make it a formidable force that undertakes national issues. Birnbaum maintains that the other organizations do not have advocacy as their mission, rather they have education. The TCLF takes an active position in issues, frequently being involved in litigation to protect cultural resources. Their mission does include multiple educational outreach programs both for students and preservation professionals as well as an information repository of the nation’s designed landscape heritage (What’s Out There) in a searchable database. It is not a membership organization. Instead, their goal is to produce national awareness of the importance of America’s cultural heritage and to lead efforts to document and protect it. Coming
from the governmental sector, he founded TCLF to raise visibility for heritage resources.

Staff from three different governmental groups associated with historic landscapes were interviewed. Barbara Wyatt, historian with the National Register who focuses primarily on nominations of National Historic Landmarks (NHL), was interviewed in person on February 11, 2009. Since the National Register is the governmental arm of advocacy, her job is to respond to nominations that come through the state historic preservation offices (SHPO) in reviewing them to determine their eligibility. The National Register does provide educational workshops for the state office staffs. While their principal job is to provide the guidelines and act as the accrediting body for submissions, their staff has an important role in the preservation movement. Barbara is a member of the Alliance for Historic Landscape Preservation and provides her expertise to their conferences.

Next, Barbara Faust, Assistant Director of Horticulture of the Smithsonian Gardens was interviewed in person on March 16, 2009. Her job is primarily to review any project within the Smithsonian system that involves horticultural resources. During the course of the interview, the level of bureaucracy involved in decision making at the Smithsonian, e.g. the approval of 13 different agencies, is cumbersome and difficult. She indicated that the Smithsonian mission has remained unchanged for 150 years and continue to provide direction in decision making to all of their agencies.
The last interview was an offshoot of interviews with the other advocacy groups and governmental agencies. All suggested a meeting with staff from the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS), part of the National Park Service. Since 2000 their work has been to record historic landscapes in the United States for posterity. Paul Dolinsky, Chief of HALS, was interviewed in person on March 16, 2009. He is passionate about the importance of the project since many of the historic landscapes will not survive physically, the documentation for the future is crucial to cultural history for the future.

Quantitative Survey Results

The electronic survey was sent to 430 APGA members on April 12, 2009. 147 gardens responded, for a 34.2% response rate. Demographic data gave multiple factors about the gardens size, budgets, and management experience as well as their recognition at the local, state, or national levels. Seventy eight percent are small gardens with budgets of less than $1 million; 10% choose to identify themselves as historic landscapes or sites; 67% of their directors have been in management for 10 years or more; 50% of their directors have been at the surveyed institutions for 10 years or more; 35% have been in their current positions for 10 years or more; 39% are listed on the National Register of Historic Places but 80% have been recognized as significant at the local or state level. Correspondingly, 87% have documentation for
their historic significance. The complete demographic responses appear in Tables 3-10 below.

Table 3: Operating Budgets of Surveyed Gardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
<th>Actual (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small - operating budget less than $1 million</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - operating budget between $1 and $2 million</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large - operating budget more than $2 million</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Gardens Identified by APGA Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretum</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Garden</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botanical Garden</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Landscape &amp; Site</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University Garden</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Garden</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collection</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Garden</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Years of Management Experience of Surveyed Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Number of Years Employed at the Institution by the Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Number of Years in Current Position by Directors of Surveyed Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Percent Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Surveyed Institutions Listed on the National Register of Historic Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Surveyed Institutions Listed as Significant at State or Local Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Surveyed Institutions Who Have Significance Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) was used for this survey to predict the intention of a behavior, for this research specifically “to support historic significance in decision making”. Using a 1-7 Likert scale with 7 being the most positive response, 17 questions were asked regarding the behavior. The results indicated that two of the three variables were statistically significant—attitude and subjective norm, both at the
0.01 level. This indicated that directors whose attitudes value historic significance for a variety of reasons, i.e. it is worthwhile, brings visitors and is a key to the strategic plan, use it to make decisions for their institutions. Secondly, if those individuals who matter to them, i.e. colleagues, superiors, and visitors, value it, they will intentionally use it when making decisions for their institutions. Their perceived behavioral control guides them to have the support, both with staff and expertise, and the control to make decisions using historic significance.

The specific statistical correlations are found in Tables 11-13 below as they were identified by the specific questions in the survey.

Table 11: Factor 1--Attitude Regarding Historic Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Worthwhile</td>
<td></td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will bring visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Key to strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
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Table 12: Factor 2—Subjective Norm Regarding Historic Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Important people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff supports</td>
<td>.193*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Colleagues</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Superior believes</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.228*</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Visitors think is integral</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 13: Factor 3--Perceived Behavioral Control Regarding Historic Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expertise</td>
<td>.345**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have the staff</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My superior supports</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have the control</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Case Study Results

Case studies were conducted in the spring of 2013 at four historic cemeteries, all over 150 years old. These organizations were intentionally selected because of their similar resource type as cultural landscape to better allow comparisons on how they use historic significance in decision making. All of the cemeteries are part of the rural cemetery movement which was based on the romanticism surrounding nature and death, patterned after cemeteries in England and France. Taking control of burials away from the church, these cemeteries typically were established around views at the outskirts of cities. They were seen as green space park areas with careful planning and design.

The first rural cemetery in the United States, also recognized as the prototype, was Mt. Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, MA, founded in 1831 by the Massachusetts Horticultural Society. While still an active cemetery, current burials are selectively handled to be sure the sites and markers are sensitive to their historic character. Mt. Auburn is strictly a cemetery since the state of Massachusetts does not allow cemeteries to operate funeral homes on their premises.
January 31, 2013, was spent meeting with eight staff members at Mt. Auburn, beginning with Dave Barnett, President and CEO. Semi-structured interviews and tour of the grounds were conducted with the following people:

- Candice Currie, Director of Planning and Sustainability
- Dennis Collins, Horticultural Curator
- Gus Fraser, Director of Preservation and Facilities
- Meg Winslow, Curator of Historical Collections
- Paul Walker, Superintendent of Grounds
- Bree Harvey, Vice President of Cemetery and Visitor Services
- Mike Albano, Executive Vice President and CFO

Throughout the day, it became more evident that the staff at Mt. Auburn operates with the same vision. All mentioned their master plan as a meaningful working document, relating how it drives every aspect of their organization. They have the vision, the expertise, the staff, and the support of their community.

An unexpected finding was that this vision, which appeared to be solid from the interviews, was not always so. In fact, only in the last twenty years has the organization shared this cohesiveness. Their master plan dates from 1994 when a precipitating event forced the board to address the institution’s historic character. In the late 80s, the perimeter fencing was deteriorating and needed to be replaced. The
board’s solution was a chain link material, which caused a citizen uproar.

Preservation groups gathered, work was stopped and the project re-evaluated. That led to the hiring of a new president who initiated a new master plan, the one that guides them today. The current Director, Dave Barnett, had horticulture and historic landscape experience, which brought historic significance into decision making.

The second rural cemetery, Laurel Hill Cemetery, was built in Philadelphia in 1836. Its sister cemetery, West Laurel Hill, was added in 1869 to accommodate expansion. Historically, they share the same owner and designer, Scottish architect John Notman. Still an active cemetery, in its modern business plan they manage a number of funeral homes as part of their organization, one of them on the grounds.

January 22, 2013, was spent with four staff members beginning with Pete Hoskins, president of Laurel Hill. Semi-structured interviews and tour of the grounds were conducted with the following people:

- Stephen Pastore, Operations Manager
- Peter (Bill) Doran, Superintendent
- Gwen Kaminski, Director of Development and Program

While the cemeteries had a master plan, just as with Mt. Auburn, it was not a living document. Hoskins indicated for his organization, using the historic significance in
decision making is very much a balance between managing a modern business and preserving their cultural resources. With a much smaller staff, they have more diverse responsibilities. Hoskins, however, has moved aggressively to try to supplement the expertise needed to make decisions about historic significance by forming a historic landscape committee comprised of Dave Barnett from Mt. Auburn and Paul Meyer, Executive Director of the Morris Arboretum.

As with Mt Auburn, West Laurel Hill had an event that refocused their organization in a meaningful way. In the 1990s, a project was designed to open a new section of the cemetery for Jewish burials. The newly hired Hoskins immediately stopped the project due to its impact on the cultural landscape. It was subsequently re-designed to be more sensitive to the surroundings.

Spring Grove was established in 1844 on 733 acres in Cincinnati, OH, by a master designer Adolph Strauch who is best known for his “lawn plan”. 450 acres are currently developed. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2006. Just as with Spring Grove it acquired other cemeteries including Oak Hill in 1910 in Glendale, OH. Both are managed by the same administration. Both are active cemeteries with funeral homes as part of their operations.
January 24, 2013, was spent with four staff members of Spring Grove beginning with president Gary Freytag. Semi-structured interviews and tour of the grounds were conducted with the following people:

- Gerald D. Wantz, Executive Vice President of Operations and COO
- Brian Heinz, Horticultural Supervisor
- Aaron Kash, Horticulturist

Freytag has been president for ten years and was brought in from business to update their business operations. Their previous COO, Tom Smith, had recently retired after he was with the cemetery forty years and really oversaw all of the work in the cultural landscape. Widely respected in historic cemeteries and horticulture, he was part of the reason for name change to Spring Grove Cemetery and Arboretum in 1987 to recognize their plant collection. As part of his work, new cultivars had been developed, following a long and abundant horticultural history by the ground superintendents. Wantz had previously been president of Lake View Cemetery in Cleveland, OH, another historic cemetery, so he was brought in for his experience and expertise in historic landscapes. Other staff do not have his experience.

As with Mt. Auburn and West Laurel Hill, Spring Grove had an event that led to a renewed focus on the preservation of their historic resources. While not designated a National Historic Landmark until 2006, they were aware of landscape guidelines of
Adolph Strauch in making decisions. However, they demonstrated their commitment to preservation when the Dexter Mausoleum, privately owned and designed in 1869, needed attention. As a registered National Historic Landmark on its own, Spring Grove realized the importance of it as part of the cultural landscape. The organization stepped in and spent the money when there was no family active in the area to protect it. This speaks to the role of using historic significance in decision.

Spring Grove is unique in that it is largest historic cemetery in America. It will be an active cemetery for another century. Also, because of its overall size, the boundary of the NHL designation only includes a historic core of 345 acres. That core is managed with sensitivity to its historic significance. Other still active areas are not bound by the same criteria.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Approximately 20 federal laws recognize the principles of historic value and significance in the United States (Williamson, 1987). However, as a democracy, the U.S. has always been reluctant to make prescriptive laws about individual properties. In fact, the 14th amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees “constitutional liberties against encroachment by governmental action” (Brennan, 1977). While the National Park Service’s programs and publications provide a detailed theoretical basis for preservation of historic resources, buildings are much easier to categorize than landscapes (Miller, 2000). This is compounded by the multidisciplinary nature of this discussion filled with historians, landscape architects, preservationists, horticulturists, and interested public, each of whom has a particular point of view (Miller, 2000). A review of both international and domestic literature regarding historic preservation of cultural landscapes illustrates that premise, as does our data from the advocacy interviews and case studies.
Findings

1. The survey of APGA members confirmed that when directors have an attitude that values historic significance, and those around them reinforce that value, then they are more likely to build expertise and funding to support those efforts.

2. Case studies confirmed the critical role of leadership and management in using historic resources in decision making.

Public gardens are positioned to lead the way to merge the joint resources of natural and cultural values, to see themselves as “custodians of cultural resources as compared to collections of plants” (Birnbaum, 2009). According to Birnbaum, “…the green movement gives us unparalleled opportunities.” As a recent study on the role of sustainability in public gardens states, “A public garden’s mission is inherently aligned with the environment…” (Sustainability Index for North American Gardens, 2013). Today more than ever, people are aware of the fragile nature of our environment and are looking for ways to actively share in protecting and conserving it. Conserving for future generations is gaining value. However, “despite its benefits to society, cultural heritage is increasingly threatened economically” (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002).
The term “cultural destination” has become a force in today’s economy (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002). Historic gardens are in a unique place to combine environmental and cultural resources into one location as just such destinations. In the era of diminishing resources, public institutions are being asked to justify their missions as they relate to budgets. Public gardens with historic significance can use this environmental component to increase their value as destinations for not only cultural resources but environmental education and recreation. Not only can public gardens preserve historic sites and plant collections, but they can serve as locations for public focus on both the past and the future.

Some historic gardens have already embraced this diverse mission. For example, Monticello is advertising its “botanic laboratory of ornamental and useful plants from around the world” (Monticello, 2014). The Historic Landscapes Section of the APGA defines its role as a group that “seeks to promote the importance of historic landscapes to all professionals in the public garden community and to encourage agreement about one big idea—that every public garden is or will be historic in some way, either now or in the future” (APGA Garden Professional Sections, 2014).

The data gained in this research emphasized the complicated web that is cultural landscape preservation. In the 1960s, cultural landscape was not even a term that professionals or the general public knew. From the work of prominent cultural geographers Carl Sauer and J.B. Jackson, the importance of cultural landscapes
became defined and articulated. In Sauer’s words, “The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is its agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result” (Sauer, 1963).

A cultural landscape perspective can be an essential underpinning for all historic preservation projects (Longstreth, 2008). As it became a recognized resource type, from the 1990s through 2000s, specific professionals and organizations in the United States were formed for a variety of missions within historic preservation.

Data from our research seems to indicate that while once fragmented, today a wide variety of opportunities is available in historic preservation across disciplines. There are various landscape architecture programs that specialize in landscape preservation, most commonly as certificates of specialization in cultural landscapes. These include programs at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Boston Architectural College, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of Pennsylvania. Students or professionals all have resources to increase understanding and awareness of preservation of cultural landscapes through public and private organizations. The field is robust and growing.
Recommendations

1. Increase Partnerships.

   The advocacy interviews reiterated the multiple factors that influence how the
United States views its cultural landscape resources in terms of specific
missions of specific groups who champion their particular vision. For the
future of cultural landscape resources, the best recommendation is to increase
partnerships to facilitate education, cooperation, and funding.

   Some of the specific group projects, such as the searchable database of heritage
resources known as What’s Out There by The Cultural Landscape Foundation,
are already underway with over 1500 entries (The Cultural Landscape
Foundation, 2014). Some of the groups, such as The Alliance for Historic
Landscape Preservation, see themselves
as a “national forum communication umbrella” (Goetchus, 2009). Some
partnerships are already underway. For example, The American Public Garden
Association has built Plant Conservation Day with partnerships (Stark).

   With diminishing federal funds directed to preservation efforts, more of these
partnerships will be needed to advance the education of both the public and
directors of public gardens about the importance of the role of public gardens as cultural resources (Birnbaum, 2009). The APGA is in the primary position to help facilitate such partnerships for its members by serving as clearing house for opportunities for cooperation between gardens and advocacy groups to promote their environmental and cultural resources both through education and awareness.

2. **Increase education for directors about their important role in historic preservation.**

The importance of this topic was dramatically confirmed by the fact that in 2004, 120 members of the APGA identified themselves as “historic gardens”; however, in 2010, only 56 did so (APGA, 2010). Our data seems to indicate that marked change is largely the result of a lack of understanding of the definition of cultural landscapes and the role of public garden directors as cultural curators. The directors did not choose to identify their historic resources as an identifying characteristic of their organization.

In fact, public gardens sometimes shun consideration of historic significance in their strategic plans because they believe that doing so would somehow limit their flexibility (Wyatt, 2009). Education is the key. For example, becoming a
National Historic Landmark brings increased visibility and opportunities for grants not available to those without the designation. Instead of being a financial liability, the designation becomes an asset (Birnbaum, 2009).

The APGA is in the primary position to provide professional development opportunities to its member directors to help them better understand the context of their role as curators of cultural landscapes. As this understanding grows, so will the opportunities to reach out to other partners and to integrate historic preservation into their institutional missions. All of this begins with education of the directors regarding the importance of their historic resources for their own institutions and for future generations. The APGA should pursue an active role in this effort.

3. **Increase the commitment of leadership and management to historic preservation of resources.**

    All the rural cemeteries visited in the case studies had historic resources at least 150 years old. That alone did not cause them to become the exemplary organizations that they are today. Instead, for most of them, their commitment to preserving their heritage was encouraged by a defining event that directed
them to focus their planning around those resources and to choose to use their historic significance in decision-making. The examples of Mt. Auburn’s fencing, Laurel Hill’s design of a new cemetery section, and Spring Grove’s preservation of a significant private mausoleum all were catalysts for change. It takes a commitment by leadership and management to develop strategic plans that include historic preservation and implement them both with staff and resources.

Directors of public gardens should make it their goal to include the importance of protecting their cultural resources as part of their mission. They must identify and plan to steward their historically significant elements if it is to happen. Once they have done so, they need to market and educate patrons emphasizing the value of their cultural resources. Failing to do so will allow valuable cultural resources to be threatened by the passing of time through lack of value and care by those who should be stewards of them.

The message has to go out to all about the value of our cultural resources. The importance of the role of stewardship falls on us.

The wish to preserve evidence of the works of our ancestors is a very deep-seated characteristic. Experiencing their works, being able to walk about within what they designed and created, enables us to get into their minds in a way that the study of documents alone can never do (Anthony, 1996).
As Stewart and Buggey said, “Gardens are living monuments” (1975). Both governmental and private sector groups must continue to raise visibility for the importance of cultural landscape preservation. Coming together we can do that. The APGA and public garden directors are uniquely positioned to be leaders in this effort to protect and preserve their natural and cultural resources.
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Appendix A

THE BURRA CHARTER 1999
The Burra Charter
(The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance)

Preamble
Considering the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1964), and the Resolutions of the 5th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Moscow 1978), the Burra Charter was adopted by Australia ICOMOS (the Australian National Committee of ICOMOS) on 19 August 1979 at Burra, South Australia. Revisions were adopted on 23 February 1981, 23 April 1988 and 26 November 1999.

The Burra Charter provides guidance for the conservation and management of places of cultural significance (cultural heritage places), and is based on the knowledge and experience of Australia ICOMOS members.

Conservation is an integral part of the management of places of cultural significance and is an ongoing responsibility.

Who is the Charter for?
The Charter sets a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places of cultural significance, including owners, managers and custodians.

Using the Charter
The Charter should be read as a whole. Many articles are interdependent. Articles in the Conservation Principles section are often further developed in the Conservation Processes and Conservation Practice sections. Headings have been included for ease of reading but do not form part of the Charter.

The Charter is self-contained, but aspects of its use and application are further explained in the following Australia ICOMOS documents:

- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy;
- Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports;

What places does the Charter apply to?
The Charter can be applied to all types of places of cultural significance including natural, indigenous and historic places with cultural values.

The standards of other organisations may also be relevant. These include the Australian Natural Heritage Charter and the Draft Guidelines for the Protection, Management and Use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Places.

Why conserve?
Places of cultural significance enrich people's lives, often providing a deep and inspirational sense of connection to community and landscape, to the past and to lived experiences. They are historical records, that are important and tangible expressions of Australian identity and experience. Places of cultural significance reflect the diversity of our communities, telling us about who we are and the past that has formed us and the Australian landscape. They are irreplaceable and precious.

These places of cultural significance must be conserved for present and future generations.

The Burra Charter advocates a cautious approach to change: do as much as necessary to care for the place and to make it usable, but otherwise change it as little as possible so that its cultural significance is retained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Explanatory Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 1. Definitions</strong>&lt;br&gt;For the purposes of this Charter:&lt;br&gt;<strong>1.1 Place</strong> means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.</td>
<td>The concept of place should be broadly interpreted. The elements described in Article 1.1 may include memorials, trees, gardens, parks, places of historical events, urban areas, towns, industrial places, archaeological sites and spiritual and religious places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Cultural significance</strong> means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the place itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related places and related objects. Places may have a range of values for different individuals or groups.</td>
<td>The term cultural significance is synonymous with heritage significance and cultural heritage value. Cultural significance may change as a result of the continuing history of the place. Understanding of cultural significance may change as a result of new information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Fabric</strong> means all the physical material of the place including components, fixtures, contents, and objects.</td>
<td>Fabric includes building interiors and sub-surface remains, as well as excavated material. Fabric may define spaces and these may be important elements of the significance of the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Conservation</strong> means all the processes of looking after a place so as to retain its cultural significance.</td>
<td>The distinctions referred to, for example in relation to roof gutters, are:&lt;br&gt;• Maintenance — regular inspection and cleaning of gutters;&lt;br&gt;• Repair involving restoration — returning of dislodged gutters;&lt;br&gt;• Repair involving reconstruction — replacing decayed gutters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 Maintenance</strong> means the continuous protective care of the fabric and setting of a place, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves restoration or reconstruction.</td>
<td>It is recognised that all places and their components change over time at varying rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.6 Preservation</strong> means maintaining the fabric of a place in its existing state and retarding deterioration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 Restoration</strong> means returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Reconstruction means returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric. New material may include recycled material salvaged from other places. This should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Adaptation means modifying a place to suit the existing use or a proposed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Use means the functions of a place, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Compliant use means a use which respects the cultural significance of a place. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Setting means the area around a place, which may include the visual catchment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Related place means a place that contributes to the cultural significance of another place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Related object means an object that contributes to the cultural significance of a place but is not at the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Associations mean the special connections that exist between people and a place. Associations may include social or spiritual values and cultural responsibilities for a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Meanings denote what a place signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses. Meanings generally relate to intangible aspects such as symbolic qualities and memories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Interpretation means all the ways of presenting the cultural significance of a place. Interpretation may be a combination of the treatment of the fabric (e.g. maintenance, restoration, reconstruction); the use of and activities at the place; and the use of introduced explanatory material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation Principles**

**Article 2. Conservation and management**

2.1 Places of cultural significance should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place.

2.3 Conservation is an integral part of good management of places of cultural significance.

2.4 Places of cultural significance should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

**Article 3. Cautious approach**

3.1 Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

The traces of additions, alterations and earlier treatments to the fabric of a place are evidence of its history and uses which may be part of its significance. Conservation action should assist and not impede their understanding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>Changes to a place should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 4. Knowledge, skills and techniques</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Conservation should make use of all the knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the study and care of the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the conservation of significant fabric. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 5. Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Conservation of a place should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Relative degrees of cultural significance may lead to different conservation actions at a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 6. Burra Charter Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The cultural significance of a place and other issues affecting its future are best understood by a sequence of collecting and analysing information before making decisions. Understanding cultural significance comes first, then development of policy and finally management of the place in accordance with the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>The policy for managing a place must be based on an understanding of its cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Policy development should also include consideration of other factors affecting the future of a place such as the owner's needs, resources, external constraints and its physical condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 7. Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Where the use of a place is of cultural significance it should be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 A place should have a compatible use.

The policy should identify a use or combination of uses or constraints on uses that retain the cultural significance of the place. New use of a place should involve minimal change, to significant fabric and use; should respect associations and meanings; and where appropriate should provide for continuation of practices which contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

**Article 8. Setting**

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate visual setting and other relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place. New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Aspects of the visual setting may include use, siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and materials. Other relationships, such as historical connections, may contribute to interpretation, appreciation, enjoyment or experience of the place.

**Article 9. Location**

9.1 The physical location of a place is part of its cultural significance. A building, work or other component of a place should remain in its historical location. Relocation is generally unacceptable unless this is the sole practical means of ensuring its survival.

9.2 Some buildings, works or other components of places were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of relocation. Provided such buildings, works or other components do not have significant links with their present location, removal may be appropriate.

9.3 If any building, work or other component is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate location and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

**Article 10. Contents**

Contents, fixtures and objects which contribute to the cultural significance of a place should be retained at that place. Their removal is unacceptable unless it is: the sole means of ensuring their security and preservation; on a temporary basis for treatment or exhibition; for cultural reasons; for health and safety; or to protect the place. Such contents, fixtures and objects should be returned where circumstances permit and it is culturally appropriate.

**Article 11. Related places and objects**

The contribution which related places and related objects make to the cultural significance of the place should be retained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 12. Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, interpretation and management of a place should provide for the participation of people for whom the place has special associations and meanings, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities for the place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 13. Co-existence of cultural values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-existence of cultural values should be recognised, respected and encouraged, especially in cases where they conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 14. Conservation processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation may, according to circumstance, include the processes of: retention or reintroduction of a use, retention of associations and meanings, maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation; and will commonly include a combination of more than one of these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 15. Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1 Change may be necessary to retain cultural significance, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a place should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| |
| 15.2 Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit. |

| |
| 15.3 Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of conservation. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit. |

| |
| 15.4 The contributions of all aspects of cultural significance of a place should be respected. If a place includes fabric, uses, associations or meanings of different periods, or different aspects of cultural significance, emphasising or interpreting one period or aspect at the expense of another can only be justified when what is left out, removed or diminished is of slight cultural significance and that which is emphasised or interpreted is of much greater cultural significance. |

| |
| For some places, conflicting cultural values may affect policy development and management decisions. In this article, the term cultural values refers to those beliefs which are important to a cultural group, including but not limited to political, religious, spiritual and moral beliefs. This is broader than values associated with cultural significance. |

| |
| There may be circumstances where no action is required to achieve conservation. |

| |
| When change is being considered, a range of options should be explored to seek the option which minimises the reduction of cultural significance. |

| |
| Reversible changes should be considered temporary. Non-reversible change should only be used as a last resort and should not prevent future conservation action. |
| Article 16. Maintenance  
*Maintenance is fundamental to conservation and should be undertaken where fabric is of cultural significance and its maintenance is necessary to retain that cultural significance.* |
| --- |
| Article 17. Preservation  
*Preservation is appropriate where the existing fabric or its condition constitutes evidence of cultural significance, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.* |
| Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use. The process should always be applied:  
- where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it should not be altered;  
- where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 26 to 28.  
New work (e.g. stabilisation) may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 22. |
| Article 18. Restoration and reconstruction  
*Restoration and reconstruction should reveal culturally significant aspects of the place.* |
| Article 19. Restoration  
*Restoration is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the fabric.* |
| Article 20. Reconstruction  
20.1 *Restoration is appropriate only where a place is incomplete through damage or alteration, and only where there is sufficient evidence to reproduce an earlier state of the fabric. In rare cases, reconstruction may also be appropriate as part of a use or practice that retains the cultural significance of the place.*  
20.2 *Restoration should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional interpretation.* |
| Article 21. Adaptation  
21.1 *Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place.*  
21.2 *Adaptation should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.*  
Adaptation may involve the introduction of new services, or a new use, or changes to safeguard the place. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 22. New work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.1</strong> New work such as additions to the place may be acceptable where it does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.2</strong> New work should be readily identifiable as such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 23. Conserving use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing, modifying or reinstating a significant use may be appropriate and preferred forms of conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 24. Retaining associations and meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.1</strong> Significant associations between people and a place should be respected, retained and not obscured. Opportunities for the interpretation, commemoration and celebration of these associations should be investigated and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.2</strong> Significant meanings, including spiritual values, of a place should be respected. Opportunities for the continuation or revival of these meanings should be investigated and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 25. Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural significance of many places is not readily apparent, and should be explained by interpretation. Interpretation should enhance understanding and enjoyment, and be culturally appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 26. Applying the Burra Charter process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.1</strong> Work on a place should be preceded by studies to understand the place which should include analysis of physical, documentary, oral and other evidence, drawing on appropriate knowledge, skills and disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.2</strong> Written statements of cultural significance and policy for the place should be prepared, justified and accompanied by supporting evidence. The statements of significance and policy should be incorporated into a management plan for the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.3</strong> Groups and individuals with associations with a place as well as those involved in its management should be provided with opportunities to contribute to and participate in understanding the cultural significance of the place. Where appropriate they should also have opportunities to participate in its conservation and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New work may be sympathetic if its size, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and material are similar to the existing fabric, but imitation should be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These may require changes to significant fabric, but they should be minimised. In some cases, continuing a significant use or practice may involve substantial new work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For many places associations will be linked to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results of studies should be up to date, regularly reviewed and revised as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of significance and policy should be kept up to date by regular review and revision as necessary. The management plan may deal with other matters related to the management of the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 27. Managing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1 The impact of proposed changes on the cultural significance of a place should be analysed with reference to the statement of significance and the policy for managing the place. It may be necessary to modify proposed changes following analysis to better retain cultural significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.2 Existing fabric, use, associations and meanings should be adequately recorded before any changes are made to the place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 28. Disturbance of fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.1 Disturbance of significant fabric for study, or to obtain evidence, should be minimised. Study of a place by any disturbance of the fabric, including archaeological excavation, should only be undertaken to provide data essential for decisions on the conservation of the place, or to obtain important evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2 Investigation of a place which requires disturbance of the fabric, apart from that necessary to make decisions, may be appropriate provided that it is consistent with the policy for the place. Such investigation should be based on important research questions which have potential to substantially add to knowledge, which cannot be answered in other ways and which minimises disturbance of significant fabric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 29. Responsibility for decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organisations and individuals responsible for management decisions should be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 30. Direction, supervision and implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent direction and supervision should be maintained at all stages, and any changes should be implemented by people with appropriate knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 31. Documenting evidence and decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A log of new evidence and additional decisions should be kept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 32. Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.1 The records associated with the conservation of a place should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2 Records about the history of a place should be protected and made publicly available, subject to requirements of security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 33. Removed fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant fabric which has been removed from a place including contents, fixtures and objects, should be catalogued, and protected in accordance with its cultural significance. Where possible and culturally appropriate, removed significant fabric including contents, fixtures and objects, should be kept at the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article 14. Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources should be provided for conservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Words in italics are defined in Article 1.*
Appendix B

NEW ZEALAND CHARTER FOR CONSERVATION OF PLACES OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE (Revised 2010)
ICOMOS New Zealand Charter
for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value

Revised 2010

Preamble

New Zealand retains a unique assemblage of places of cultural heritage value relating to its indigenous and more recent peoples. These areas, cultural landscapes and features, buildings and structures, gardens, archaeological sites, traditional sites, monuments, and sacred places are treasures of distinctive value that have accrued meanings over time. New Zealand shares a general responsibility with the rest of humanity to safeguard its cultural heritage places for present and future generations. More specifically, the people of New Zealand have particular ways of perceiving, relating to, and conserving their cultural heritage places.

Following the spirit of the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter - 1964), this charter sets out principles to guide the conservation of places of cultural heritage value in New Zealand. It is a statement of professional principles for members of ICOMOS New Zealand.

This charter is also intended to guide all those involved in the various aspects of conservation work, including owners, guardians, managers, developers, planners, architects, engineers, craftspeople and those in the construction trades, heritage practitioners and advisors, and local and central government authorities. It offers guidance for communities, organisations, and individuals involved with the conservation and management of cultural heritage places.

This charter should be made an integral part of statutory or regulatory heritage management policies or plans, and should provide support for decision makers in statutory or regulatory processes.

Each article of this charter must be read in the light of all the others. Words in bold in the text are defined in the definitions section of this charter.

This revised charter was adopted by the New Zealand National Committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites at its meeting on 4 September 2010.

Purpose of conservation

1. The purpose of conservation

The purpose of conservation is to care for places of cultural heritage value.

In general, such places:

(i) have lasting values and can be appreciated in their own right;
(ii) inform us about the past and the culture of those who came before us;
(iii) provide tangible evidence of the continuity between past, present, and future;
(iv) underpin and reinforce community identity and relationships to ancestors and the land; and
(v) provide a measure against which the achievements of the present can be compared.

It is the purpose of conservation to retain and reveal such values, and to support the ongoing meanings and functions of places of cultural heritage value, in the interests of present and future generations.
Conservation principles

2. Understanding cultural heritage value

Conservation of a place should be based on an understanding and appreciation of all aspects of its cultural heritage value, both tangible and intangible. All available forms of knowledge and evidence provide the means of understanding a place and its cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance. Cultural heritage value should be understood through consultation with connected people, systematic documentary and oral research, physical investigation and recording of the place, and other relevant methods.

All relevant cultural heritage values should be recognised, respected, and, where appropriate, revealed, including values which offer, conflict, or compete.

The policy for managing all aspects of a place, including its conservation and its use, and the implementation of the policy, must be based on an understanding of its cultural heritage value.

3. Indigenous cultural heritage

The Indigenous cultural heritage of tangata whenua relates to whanau, hapu, and iwi groups. It shapes identity and enhances well-being, and it has particular cultural meanings and values for the present, and associations with those who have gone before. Indigenous cultural heritage brings with it responsibilities of guardianship and the practical application and passing on of associated knowledge, traditional skills, and practices.

The Treaty of Waitangi is the founding document of our nation. Article 2 of the Treaty recognises and guarantees the protection of kino rangatiratanga, and so empowers kaitiakitanga as customary trusteeship to be exercised by tangata whenua. This customary trusteeship is exercised over their taonga, such as sacred and traditional places, built heritage, traditional practices, and other cultural heritage resources. This obligation extends beyond current legal ownership wherever such cultural heritage exists.

Particular maturanga, or knowledge of cultural heritage meaning, value, and practice, is associated with places. Maturanga is sustained and transmitted through oral, written, and physical forms determined by tangata whenua. The conservation of such places is therefore conditional on decisions made in associated tangata whenua communities, and should proceed only in this context. In particular, protocols of access, customary, ritual, and practice are determined at a local level and should be respected.

4. Planning for conservation

Conservation should be subject to prior documented assessment and planning.

All conservation work should be based on a conservation plan which identifies the cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance of the place, the conservation policies, and the extent of the recommended works.

The conservation plan should give the highest priority to the authenticity and integrity of the place.

Other guiding documents such as, but not limited to, management plans, cyclical maintenance plans, specifications for conservation work, interpretation plans, risk mitigation plans, or emergency plans should be guided by a conservation plan.
5. Respect for surviving evidence and knowledge

Conservation maintains and reveals the authenticity and integrity of a place, and involves the least possible loss of fabric or evidence of cultural heritage value. Respect for all forms of knowledge and existing evidence, of both tangible and intangible values, is essential to the authenticity and integrity of the place.

Conservation recognises the evidence of time and the contributions of all periods. The conservation of a place should identify and respect all aspects of its cultural heritage value without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

The removal or obscuring of any physical evidence of any period or activity should be minimised, and should be explicitly justified where it does occur. The fabric of a particular period or activity may be obscured or removed if assessment shows that its removal would not diminish the cultural heritage value of the place.

In conservation, evidence of the functions and intangible meanings of places of cultural heritage value should be respected.

6. Minimum intervention

Work undertaken at a place of cultural heritage value should involve the least degree of intervention consistent with conservation and the principles of this charter.

Intervention should be the minimum necessary to ensure the retention of tangible and intangible values and the continuation of use integral to those values. The removal of fabric or the alteration of features and spaces that have cultural heritage value should be avoided.

7. Physical investigation

Physical investigation of a place provides primary evidence that cannot be gained from any other source. Physical investigation should be carried out according to currently accepted professional standards, and should be documented through systematic recording.

Invasive investigation of fabric of any period should be carried out only where knowledge may be significantly extended, or where it is necessary to establish the existence of fabric of cultural heritage value, or where it is necessary for conservation work, or where such fabric is about to be damaged or destroyed or made inaccessible. The extent of invasive investigation should minimise the disturbance of significant fabric.

8. Use

The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose.

Where the use of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that use should be retained.

Where a change of use is proposed, the new use should be compatible with the cultural heritage value of the place, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value.
9. Setting

Where the setting of a place is integral to its cultural heritage value, that setting should be conserved with the place itself. If the setting no longer contributes to the cultural heritage value of the place, and if reconstruction of the setting can be justified, any reconstruction of the setting should be based on an understanding of all aspects of the cultural heritage value of the place.

10. Relocation

The on-going association of a structure or feature of cultural heritage value with its location, site, curtilage, and setting is essential to its authenticity and integrity. Therefore, a structure or feature of cultural heritage value should remain on its original site.

Relocation of a structure or feature of cultural heritage value, where its removal is required in order to clear its site for a different purpose or construction, or where its removal is required to enable its use on a different site, is not a desirable outcome and is not a conservation process.

In exceptional circumstances, a structure of cultural heritage value may be relocated if its current site is in imminent danger, and if all other means of retaining the structure in its current location have been exhausted. In this event, the new location should provide a setting compatible with the cultural heritage value of the structure.

11. Documentation and archiving

The cultural heritage value and cultural heritage significance of a place, and all aspects of its conservation, should be fully documented to ensure that this information is available to present and future generations.

Documentation includes information about all changes to the place and any decisions made during the conservation process.

Documentation should be carried out to archival standards to maximise the longevity of the record, and should be placed in an appropriate archival repository.

Documentation should be made available to connected people and other interested parties. Where reasons for confidentiality exist, such as security, privacy, or cultural appropriateness, some information may not always be publicly accessible.

12. Recording

Evidence provided by the fabric of a place should be identified and understood through systematic research, recording, and analysis.

Recording is an essential part of the physical investigation of a place. It informs and guides the conservation process and its planning. Systematic recording should occur prior to, during, and following any intervention. It should include the recording of new evidence revealed, and any fabric obscured or removed.

Recording of the changes to a place should continue throughout its life.
13. Fixtures, fittings, and contents

Fixtures, fittings, and contents that are integral to the cultural heritage value of a place should be retained and conserved with the place. Such fixtures, fittings, and contents may include: 
carving, painting, weaving, stained glass, wallpaper, surface decoration, works of art, equipment and machinery, furniture, and personal belongings.

Conservation of any such material should involve specialist conservation expertise appropriate to the material, where it is necessary to remove any such material, it should be recorded, retained, and protected until such time as it can be reinstated.

Conservation processes and practice

14. Conservation plans

A conservation plan, based on the principles of this charter, should:
(i) be based on a comprehensive understanding of the cultural heritage value of the place and assessment of its cultural heritage significance;
(ii) include an assessment of the fabric of the place, and its condition;
(iii) give the highest priority to the authenticity and integrity of the place;
(iv) include the entirety of the place, including the setting;
(v) be prepared by objective professionals in appropriate disciplines;
(vi) consider the needs, abilities, and resources of connected people;
(vii) not be influenced by prior expectations of change or development;
(viii) specify conservation policies to guide decision making and to guide any work to be undertaken;
(ix) make recommendations for the conservation of the place; and
(x) be regularly revised and kept up to date.

15. Conservation projects

Conservation projects should include the following:
(i) consultation with interested parties and connected people, continuing throughout the project;
(ii) opportunities for interested parties and connected people to contribute to and participate in the project;
(iii) research into documentary and oral history, using all relevant sources and repositories of knowledge;
(iv) physical investigation of the place as appropriate;
(v) use of all appropriate methods of recording, such as written, drawn, and photographic;
(vi) the preparation of a conservation plan which meets the principles of this charter;
(vii) guidance on appropriate use of the place;
(viii) the implementation of any planned conservation work;
(ix) the documentation of the conservation work as it proceeds; and
(x) where appropriate, the deposit of all records in an archival repository.

A conservation project must not be commenced until any required statutory authorisation has been granted.
16. Professional, trade, and craft skills

All aspects of conservation work should be planned, directed, supervised, and undertaken by people with appropriate conservation training and experience directly relevant to the project.

All conservation disciplines, arts, crafts, trades, and traditional skills and practices that are relevant to the project should be applied and promoted.

17. Degrees of intervention for conservation purposes

Following research, recording, assessment, and planning, intervention for conservation purposes may include, in increasing degrees of intervention:

(i) preservation, through stabilisation, maintenance, or repair;
(ii) restoration, through reassembly, reinstatement, or removal;
(iii) reconstruction; and
(iv) adaptation.

In many conservation projects a range of processes may be utilised. Where appropriate, conservation processes may be applied to individual parts or components of a place of cultural heritage value.

The extent of any intervention for conservation purposes should be guided by the cultural heritage value of a place and the policies for its management as identified in a conservation plan. Any intervention which would reduce or compromise cultural heritage value is undesirable and should not occur.

Preference should be given to the least degree of intervention, consistent with this charter.

Re-creation, meaning the conjectural reconstruction of a structure or place; replication, meaning to make a copy of an existing or former structure or place; or the construction of generalised representations of typical features or structures, are not conservation processes and are outside the scope of this charter.

18. Preservation

Preservation of a place involves as little intervention as possible, to ensure its long-term survival and the continuation of its cultural heritage value.

Preservation processes should not obscure or remove the patina of age, particularly where it contributes to the authenticity and integrity of the place, or where it contributes to the structural stability of materials.

i. Stabilisation

Processes of decay should be slowed by providing treatment or support.

ii. Maintenance

A place of cultural heritage value should be maintained regularly. Maintenance should be carried out according to a plan or work programme.

iii. Repair

Repair of a place of cultural heritage value should utilise matching or similar materials. Where it is necessary to employ new materials, they should be distinguishable by experts, and should be documented.
Traditional methods and materials should be given preference in conservation work.

Repair of a technically higher standard than that achieved with the existing materials or construction practices may be justified only where the stability or life expectancy of the site or material is increased, where the new material is compatible with the old, and where the cultural heritage value is not diminished.

19. Restoration

The process of restoration typically involves reassembly and reinstatement, and may involve the removal of accretions that detract from the cultural heritage value of a place.

Restoration is based on respect for existing fabric, and on the identification and analysis of all available evidence, so that the cultural heritage value of a place is recovered or revealed. Restoration should be carried out only if the cultural heritage value of the place is recovered or revealed by the process.

Restoration does not involve conjecture.

i. Reassembly and reinstatement

Reassembly uses existing materials and, through the process of reinstatement, returns it to its former position. Reassembly is more likely to involve work on part of a place rather than the whole place.

ii. Removal

Occasionally, existing fabric may need to be permanently removed from a place. This may be for reasons of advanced decay, or loss of structural integrity, or because particular fabric has been identified in a conservation plan as detracting from the cultural heritage value of the place.

The fabric removed should be systematically recorded before and during its removal. In some cases it may be appropriate to store, on a long-term basis, material of evidential value that has been removed.

20. Reconstruction

Reconstruction is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material to replace material that has been lost.

Reconstruction is appropriate if it is essential to the function, integrity, intangible value, or understanding of a place, if sufficient physical and documentary evidence exists to minimise conjecture, and if surviving cultural heritage value is preserved.

Reconstructed elements should not usually constitute the majority of a place or structure.

21. Adaptation

The conservation of a place of cultural heritage value is usually facilitated by the place serving a useful purpose. Proposals for adaptation of a place may arise from maintaining its continuing use, or from a proposed change of use.
Alterations and additions may be acceptable where they are necessary for a compatible use of the place. Any change should be the minimum necessary, should be substantially reversible, and should have little or no adverse effect on the cultural heritage value of the place.

Any alterations or additions should be compatible with the original form and fabric of the place, and should avoid inappropriate or incompatible contrasts of form, scale, mass, colour, and material. Adaptation should not dominate or substantially obscure the original form and fabric, and should not adversely affect the setting of a place of cultural heritage value. New work should complement the original form and fabric.

22. Non-intervention

In some circumstances, assessment of the cultural heritage value of a place may show that it is not desirable to undertake any conservation intervention at that time. This approach may be appropriate where undisturbed constancy of intangible values, such as the spiritual associations of a sacred place, may be more important than its physical attributes.

23. Interpretation

Interpretation actively enhances public understanding of all aspects of places of cultural heritage value and their conservation. Relevant cultural protocols are integral to that understanding, and should be identified and observed.

Where appropriate, interpretation should assist the understanding of tangible and intangible values of a place which may not be readily perceived, such as the sequence of construction and change, and the meanings and associations of the place for connected people.

Any interpretation should respect the cultural heritage value of a place. Interpretation methods should be appropriate to the place. Physical interventions for interpretation purposes should not detract from the experience of the place, and should not have an adverse effect on its tangible or intangible values.

24. Risk mitigation

Places of cultural heritage value may be vulnerable to natural disasters such as flood, storm, or earthquake, or to humanly induced threats and risks such as those arising from earthworks, subdivision and development, buildings work, or wilful damage or neglect. In order to safeguard cultural heritage value, planning for risk mitigation and emergency management is necessary.

Potential risks to any place of cultural heritage value should be assessed. Where appropriate, a risk mitigation plan, an emergency plan, and/or a protection plan should be prepared, and implemented as far as possible, with reference to a conservation plan.
Definitions

For the purposes of this charter:

Adaptation means the process(es) of modifying a place for a compatible use while retaining its cultural heritage value. Adaptation processes include alteration and addition.

Authenticity means the credibility or truthfulness of the surviving evidence and knowledge of the cultural heritage value of a place. Relevant evidence includes form and design, substance and fabric, technology and craftsmanship, location and surroundings, context and setting, use and function, traditions, spiritual essence, and sense of place, and includes tangible and intangible values. Assessment of authenticity is based on identification and analysis of relevant evidence and knowledge, and respect for its cultural context.

Compatible use means a use which is consistent with the cultural heritage value of a place, and which has little or no adverse impact on its authenticity and integrity.

Connected people means any groups, organisations, or individuals having a sense of association with or responsibility for a place of cultural heritage value.

Conservation means all the processes of understanding and caring for a place so as to safeguard its cultural heritage value. Conservation is based on respect for the existing fabric, associations, meanings, and use of the place. It requires a cautious approach of doing as much work as necessary but as little as possible, and retaining authenticity and integrity, to ensure that the place and its values are passed on to future generations.

Conservation plan means an objective report which documents the history, fabric, and cultural heritage value of a place, assesses its cultural heritage significance, describes the condition of the place, outlines conservation policies for managing the place, and makes recommendations for the conservation of the place.

Contents means moveable objects, collections, chattels, documents, works of art, and ephemera that are not fixed or fitted to a place, and which have been assessed as being integral to its cultural heritage value.

Cultural heritage significance means the cultural heritage value of a place relative to other similar or comparable places, recognising the particular cultural context of the place.

Cultural heritage value/s means possessing aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, commemorative, functional, historical, landscape, monumental, scientific, social, spiritual, symbolic, technological, traditional, or other tangible or intangible values, associated with human activity.

Cultural landscapes means an area possessing cultural heritage value arising from the relationships between people and the environment. Cultural landscapes may have been designed, such as gardens, or may have evolved from human settlement and land use over time, resulting in a diversity of distinctive landscapes in different areas. Associated cultural landscapes, such as sacred mountains, may lack tangible cultural elements but may have strong intangible culture or spiritual associations.

Documentation means collecting, recording, keeping, and managing information about a place and its cultural heritage value, including information about its history, fabric, and meanings; information about decisions taken; and information about physical changes and interventions made to the place.
**Fabric** means the physical material of a place, including subsurface materials, structures, and interior and exterior surfaces including the patina of age, and including textures and fittings, and gardens and plantings.

**Hapu** means a section of a large tribe of the *tangata whenua*.

**Intangible value** means the abstract cultural heritage value of the meanings or associations of a place, including commemorative, historical, social, spiritual, symbolic, or traditional values.

**Integrity** means the wholeness or intactness of a place, including its meaning and sense of place, and all the tangible and intangible attributes and elements necessary to express its cultural heritage value.

**Intervention** means any activity that causes disturbance of or alteration to a place or its fabric. *Intervention* includes archaeological excavation, invasive investigation of built structures, and any intervention for conservation purposes.

**Iwi** means a tribe of the *tangata whenua*.

**Kaitiakitanga** means the duty of customary trusteeship, stewardship, guardianship, and protection of land, resources, or taonga.

**Maintenance** means regular and on-going protective care of a place to prevent deterioration and to retain its cultural heritage value.

**Matauranga** means traditional or cultural knowledge of the *tangata whenua*.

**Non-intervention** means to choose not to undertake any activity that causes disturbance of or alteration to a place or its fabric.

**Place** means any land having cultural heritage value in New Zealand, including areas: cultural landscapes; buildings, structures, and monuments; groups of buildings, structures, or monuments; gardens and plantings; archaeological sites and features; traditional sites sacred places; townscapes and streetscapes; and settlements. Place may also include land covered by water, and any body of water. Place includes the *setting* of any such place.

**Preservation** means to maintain a place with as little change as possible.

**Reassembly** means to put existing but disarticulated parts of a structure back together.

**Reconstruction** means to build again as closely as possible to a documented earlier form, using new materials.

**Recording** means the process of capturing information and creating an archival record of the fabric and setting of a place, including its configuration, condition, use, and change over time.

**Reinstatement** means to put material components of a place, including the products of reassembly, back in position.

**Repair** means to make good decayed or damaged fabric using identical, closely similar, or otherwise appropriate materials.

**Restoration** means to return a place to a known earlier form, by reassembly and reinstatement, and/or by removal of elements that detract from its cultural heritage value.

**Setting** means the area around and/or adjacent to a place of cultural heritage value that is integral to its function, meaning, and relationships. Setting includes the structures, outbuildings, features, gardens, curtilage, airspace, and accessways forming the spatial context of the place or used.
in association with the place. Setting also includes cultural landscapes, townscape, and streetscapes: perspectives, views, and viewsheds both to and from a place, and relationships with other places which contribute to the cultural heritage value of the place. Setting may extend beyond the area defined by legal title, and may include a buffer zone necessary for the long-term protection of the cultural heritage value of the place.

Stabilisation means the arrest or slowing of the processes of decay.

Structure means any building, standing remains, equipment, device, or other facility made by people and which is fixed to the land.

Tangata whenua means generally the original indigenous inhabitants of the land; and specifically the people exercising kaitiakitanga over particular land, resources, or taonga.

Tangible value means the physically observable cultural heritage value of a place, including archaeological, architectural, landscape, monumental, scientific, or technological values.

Tongan means anything highly prized for its cultural, economic, historical, spiritual, or traditional value, including land and natural and cultural resources.

Tino rangatiratanga means the exercise of full chieflyship, authority, and responsibility.

Use means the functions of a place, and the activities and practices that may occur at the place. The functions, activities, and practices may in themselves be of cultural heritage value.

Whanaung means an extended family which is part of a hapu or iwi.
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Appendix C

NEW ZEALAND POLICY FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT’S
MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC HERITAGE 2004

Introduction

Purpose

New Zealand's historic heritage is rich, varied and unique. It is a legacy of all generations, from the earliest places of Māori use and occupation to inner-city buildings. Places of historic heritage value are integral to our sense of nationhood and are an important visual and historical presence in the landscape. Iwi and hapū identity and cultural well-being are inseparable from whakapapa connections with places of historic heritage significance to Māori.

Government departments are the stewards of a large and significant portfolio of historic heritage, which they manage on behalf of the people of New Zealand. These properties illustrate aspects of past and continuing government activities, and New Zealand's social and economic development, culture and identity.

The government is committed to the promotion and protection of New Zealand's historic heritage and has established legislation and agencies for this purpose. It has ratified the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972). This policy is a further demonstration of the government's leadership role in historic heritage management.

The government regards the management of the historic heritage within its care as an important part of its responsibilities and will ensure that historic heritage values are taken into account when decisions are made. It has therefore decided to adopt a best practice approach in order to:

- respect and acknowledge the importance of the historic heritage in its care;
- foster an appreciation of and pride in the nation's heritage;
- ensure that its historic heritage is cared for and, where appropriate, used for the benefit of all New Zealanders;
- ensure consistency of practice between government departments;
- set an example to other owners of historic heritage, including local government, public institutions and the private sector;
- contribute to the conservation of a full range of places of historic heritage value;
- ensure that places of significance to Māori in its care are appropriately managed and conserved in a manner that respects mātauranga Māori and is consistent with the tikanga and kawa of the tangata whenua; and
- contribute to cultural tourism and economic development.

Following adoption of this document, departments holding properties of historic heritage value will work with Ministry for Culture and Heritage on the development of guidelines based on these policies.

**The potential constraints on the management of government historic heritage**

It is recognised that there may be constraints on effective management of government heritage. Examples include:

- The special operational needs of particular departments, for example, the requirements of the New Zealand Defence Force, security of departmental buildings, facilities for research institutions.
- Societal or cultural practices that may require physical changes to places, for example, changes to institutional practices in prisons and courts, the provision of facilities for immigrant and religious groups, and demographic changes.
- Compliance with legislation, such as the *Building Act* 1991, which may require balancing public health and safety with conservation objectives.
- The competing needs for limited resources.
- Other government policies on the disposal of surplus property.

**Heritage Principles**

The following are the key principles designed to inform a best practice approach to heritage management in New Zealand by government departments, and reflect national legislation and international and national charters and guidelines.
Intrinsic values

Historic heritage has lasting value in its own right and provides evidence of the origins and development of New Zealand's distinct peoples and society.

Diversity

The diverse cultures of New Zealand and its diverse social and physical environments are important considerations in historic heritage identification and management.

Sustainability

Places of historic heritage value are finite and comprise non-renewable resources that need to be safeguarded for present and future generations.

Māori heritage

The government has a significant role in the management, with Māori, of places of significance to iwi and hapū throughout New Zealand.

Research and documentation

The conservation of historic heritage requires that the resource be fully identified, researched and documented.

Respect for physical material

Historic heritage practice involves the least possible alteration or loss of material of historic heritage value.

Understanding significance

The values of historic heritage places are clearly understood before decisions are taken that may result in change. Decision making, where change is being contemplated, takes into account all relevant values, cultural knowledge, and disciplines.
Setting and curtilage

The setting and curtilage of historic heritage places often have heritage value in their own right and are regarded as integral to a place.

Policies

The policies provide a framework for the management of government departments’ historic heritage. As acknowledged in the constraints above, operational requirements of particular departments may need to be taken into account when implementing guidelines to fulfil these policies.

Identification and documentation

Policy 1 – Identification (a)

Government departments will identify places of historic heritage value on the land they manage, based on the following values: aesthetic, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, technological, or traditional significance or value.

Policy 2 – Identification (b)

Government departments will work with iwi and hapū to identify places of historic heritage value to Māori on the land departments manage.

Policy 3 – Recognition

Government departments should support initiatives to recognise publicly the heritage values of historic heritage they manage, for example, registration under the Historic Places Act 1993 and listing on district plans.

Policy 4 – Documentation

Government departments will research, assess, document, and record changes to their historic heritage. Access to such records may need to be restricted in line with iwi or hapū requirements or for functional reasons.
Planning and work

Policy 5 – Planning (a)

Government departments will provide for the long-term conservation (including disaster mitigation) of historic heritage, through the preparation of plans, including management plans for historic reserves, maintenance or conservation plans, and specifications. Hapu and iwi will be consulted where their historic heritage is involved.

Policy 6 – Planning (b)

When planning and carrying out work adjacent to places of historic heritage value, government departments will ensure that heritage values are not adversely affected.

Policy 7 – Monitoring, maintenance and repair

Government departments will care for their places of historic heritage value by monitoring their condition, maintaining them, and, where required, repairing them.

Policy 8 – Alteration

Where alterations are needed for a new or continuing use of a place with historic heritage value, or to secure its long life, government departments will ensure that heritage values are protected.

Policy 9 – Standards

For all planning and work on historic heritage, government departments will ensure that accepted national conservation standards are met. The ICOMOS New Zealand Charter 1993 provides useful guidance.

Policy 10 – Skills and expertise

Government departments will ensure that appropriately qualified conservation professionals, conservators and trades people are involved in all aspects of the management of historic heritage. Planning and implementation should involve all
relevant disciplines and all work should be supervised. Specialist conservation expertise will be sought where required for special fabric integral to a place, such as stained glass, carving and furnishings.

Policy 11 – New Zealand Historic Places Trust

Government departments will seek the advice of the Historic Places Trust on the management of items entered in the Trust's Register of Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wāhi Tapu and Wāhi Tapu Areas/Rārahi Taonga, on archaeological sites, and on places subject to a heritage order or a requirement for a heritage order notified by the Trust.

Use

Policy 12 – Use

Government departments will ensure that their places of historic heritage value in active use are managed in such a way that:

1. they retain, where appropriate, an ongoing function in the life of the community compatible with their heritage values;
2. the continuation of original or long-term uses is strongly encouraged; and
3. they are not disposed of without fully exploring options for their reuse or alternative compatible uses.

Policy 13 – Disposal

Government departments will ensure that in disposing of a place with historic heritage value:

1. heritage values are protected, for example, through a heritage covenant;
2. the public good is taken into account and financial return is not the sole criterion;
3. heritage values are maintained and the fabric of the place is not allowed to deteriorate while decisions about future use and disposal are made; and
4. the government's 'Sites of Significance' process is followed, where applicable.
Policy 14 – Acquisition and lease

Government departments will not acquire or lease a place with historic heritage value if changes are envisaged or required to enable its functional use that will result in a significant loss of heritage values.

Government responsibilities

Policy 15 – Community participation

Government departments will invite public participation, where appropriate, in the management of historic heritage of special significance through various initiatives, such as:

1. seeking public comment on conservation plans or disposal of historic heritage;
2. establishing partnerships with communities of interest; and
3. voluntary notification of resource consent applications.

Policy 16 – Education

Where practical and appropriate, government departments will promote the heritage values of the historic heritage they manage and facilitate public access to properties. Government employees will be made aware of the heritage values of government properties.

Policy 17 – Māori heritage

The relationship of Māori communities with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga will be recognised and provided for by government departments in the management of their historic heritage. Participation by iwi and hapū in the management of places identified as having historic heritage value to Māori will be facilitated.

Policy 18 – Monitoring

The performance of government departments will be reviewed to ensure that heritage management policy is being implemented effectively.
Policy 19 – Compliance

Government departments will ensure that they comply with relevant statutory and regulatory requirements, including the Resource Management Act 1991 and Historic Places Act 1993.

Key Source Documents

ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value, ICOMOS New Zealand, 1993

International Policies and Guidelines


National Policy for the Disposal of Public Property, Australian Council of National Trusts, 2002


Treasury Board Heritage Buildings Policy, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 1998

Legislation

Historic Places Act 1993

Resource Management Act 1991
Building Act 1991

Reserves Act 1977

Conservation Act 1987

Glossary

Archaeological site means any place in New Zealand that –

(a) Either -

1. Was associated with human activity that occurred before 1900; or
2. Is the site of the wreck of any vessel where that wreck occurred before 1900; and

(b) Is or may be able through investigation by archaeological methods to provide evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. (Historic Places Act 1993)

Best practice means a method that has been judged to be superior to other methods, or a procedure or activity that has produced outstanding results in one situation and could be adapted to improve effectiveness, efficiency and/or innovation in another situation.

Curtilage means the geographical area that provides the immediate physical context for a heritage place. Note that land title boundaries and heritage curtilages do not necessarily coincide.

Government departments includes, for the purposes of this policy, New Zealand Defence Force, New Zealand Police, and Parliamentary Service. (It is recognised that Parliamentary Service is not an instrument of the executive government and retains the separate rights and responsibilities of the House of Representatives and the Speaker.)

Historic heritage means those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities: archaeological, architectural, cultural, historic, scientific, technological; and includes: historic sites, structures, places, and areas; archaeological sites; sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources. (Resource Management Act 1991)
Historic heritage of significance to Māori means all places of Māori origin as well as later places of significance to Māori, as determined by iwi and hapū.

Place encompasses, for the purposes of this policy, all historic heritage as defined above, including areas.
Appendix D

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF
HISTORIC PLACES IN CANADA
Parks Canada - Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

2 Standards for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

The Standards

Definitions of the terms in italics can be found in the Introduction. The Standards are not presented in a sequential or hierarchical order, and as such, equal consideration should be given to each. All standards for any given type of treatment must therefore be applied simultaneously to a project.

General Standards (all projects)

1. Conserve the heritage value of a historic place. Do not remove, replace, or substantially alter its intact or repairable character-defining elements. Do not move a part of a historic place if its current location is a character-defining element.

2. Conserve changes to a historic place which, over time, have become character-defining elements in their own right.

3. Conserve heritage value by adopting an approach calling for minimal intervention.

4. Recognize each historic place as a physical record of its time, place and use. Do not create a false sense of historical development by adding elements from other historic places or other properties or by combining features of the same property that never coexisted.

5. Find a use for a historic place that requires minimal or no change to its character-defining elements.

6. Protect and, if necessary, stabilize a historic place until any subsequent intervention is under-taken. Protect and preserve archaeological
resources in place. Where there is potential for disturbance of archaeo-
logical resources, take mitigation measures to limit damage and loss of information.

7. Evaluate the existing condition of character-defining elements to
determine the appropriate intervention needed. Use the gentlest means possible for any intervention. Respect heritage value when undertaking an intervention.

8. Maintain character-defining elements on an ongoing basis. Repair character-defining elements by reinforcing their materials using recognized conservation methods. Replace in kind any extensively deteriorated or missing parts of character-defining elements, where there are surviving prototypes.

9. Make any intervention needed to preserve character-defining elements physically and visually compatible with the historic place, and identifiable upon close inspection. Document any intervention for future reference.

Additional Standards Relating to Rehabilitation

10. Repair rather than replace character-defining elements. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements. Where there is insufficient physical evidence, make the form, material and detailing of the new elements compatible with the character of the historic place.

11. Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to a historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.

12. Create any new additions or related new construction so that the essential form and integrity of a historic place will not be impaired if the new work is removed in the future.
13. Repair rather than replace *character-defining elements* from the restoration period. Where *character-defining elements* are too severely deteriorated to repair and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements.

14. Replace missing features from the restoration period with new features whose forms, materials and detailing are based on sufficient physical, documentary and/or oral evidence.
INTERNATIONAL CHARTER FOR THE CONSERVATION
AND RESTORATION OF MONUMENTS AND SITES
(THE VENICE CHARTER 1964)

IIInd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic

Adopted by ICOMOS in 1965.

Imbued with a message from the past, the historic monuments of generations of people
remain to the present day as living witnesses of their age-old traditions. People are becoming
more and more conscious of the unity of human values and regard ancient monuments as a
common heritage. The common responsibility to safeguard them for future generations is
recognized. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity.

It is essential that the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings
should be agreed and be laid down on an international basis, with each country being
responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions.

By defining these basic principles for the first time, the Athens Charter of 1931 contributed
towards the development of an extensive international movement which has assumed
concrete form in national documents, in the work of ICOM and UNESCO and in the
establishment by the latter of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and
the Restoration of Cultural Property. Increasing awareness and critical study have been
brought to bear on problems which have continually become more complex and varied; now
the time has come to examine the Charter afresh in order to make a thorough study of the
principles involved and to enlarge its scope in a new document.

Accordingly, the IIInd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic
Monuments, which met in Venice from May 25th to 31st 1964, approved the following text:

DEFINITIONS

Article 1.

The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also
the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a
significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but
also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the
passing of time.

Article 2.

The conservation and restoration of monuments must have recourse to all the sciences and
techniques which can contribute to the study and safeguarding of the architectural heritage.
Article 3.
The intention in conserving and restoring monuments is to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence.

CONSERVATION

Article 4.
It is essential to the conservation of monuments that they be maintained on a permanent basis.

Article 5.
The conservation of monuments is always facilitated by making use of them for some socially useful purpose. Such use is therefore desirable but it must not change the lay-out or decoration of the building. It is within these limits only that modifications demanded by a change of function should be envisaged and may be permitted.

Article 6.
The conservation of a monument implies preserving a setting which is not out of scale. Wherever the traditional setting exists, it must be kept. No new construction, demolition or modification which would alter the relations of mass and colour must be allowed.

Article 7.
A monument is inseparable from the history to which it bears witness and from the setting in which it occurs. The moving of all or part of a monument cannot be allowed except where the safeguarding of that monument demands it or where it is justified by national or international interest of paramount importance.

Article 8.
Items of sculpture, painting or decoration which form an integral part of a monument may only be removed from it if this is the sole means of ensuring their preservation.

RESTORATION

Article 9.
The process of restoration is a highly specialized operation. Its aim is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument and is based on respect for original material and authentic documents. It must stop at the point where conjecture begins, and in this case moreover any extra work which is indispensable must be distinct from the architectural composition and must bear a contemporary stamp. The restoration in any case must be preceded and followed by an archaeological and historical study of the monument.

Article 10.
Where traditional techniques prove inadequate, the consolidation of a monument can be achieved by the use of any modern technique for conservation and construction, the efficacy of which has been shown by scientific data and proved by experience.
Article 11.

The valid contributions of all periods to the building of a monument must be respected, since unity of style is not the aim of a restoration. When a building includes the superimposed work of different periods, the revealing of the underlying state can only be justified in exceptional circumstances and when what is removed is of little interest and the material which is brought to light is of great historical, archaeological or aesthetic value, and its state of preservation good enough to justify the action. Evaluation of the importance of the elements involved and the decision as to what may be destroyed cannot rest solely on the individual in charge of the work.

Article 12.

Replacements of missing parts must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic evidence.

Article 13.

Additions cannot be allowed except in so far as they do not detract from the interesting parts of the building, its traditional setting, the balance of its composition and its relation with its surroundings.

HISTORIC SITES

Article 14.

The sites of monuments must be the object of special care in order to safeguard their integrity and ensure that they are cleared and presented in a seemly manner. The work of conservation and restoration carried out in such places should be inspired by the principles set forth in the foregoing articles.

EXCAVATIONS

Article 15.

Excavations should be carried out in accordance with scientific standards and the recommendation defining international principles to be applied in the case of archaeological excavation adopted by UNESCO in 1956.

Ruins must be maintained and measures necessary for the permanent conservation and protection of architectural features and of objects discovered must be taken. Furthermore, every means must be taken to facilitate the understanding of the monument and to reveal it without ever distorting its meaning.

All reconstruction work should however be ruled out "a priori". Only anastylosis, that is to say, the reassembling of existing but dismembered parts can be permitted. The material used for integration should always be recognizable and its use should be the least that will ensure the conservation of a monument and the reinstatement of its form.
PUBLICATION

Article 16.

In all works of preservation, restoration or excavation, there should always be precise documentation in the form of analytical and critical reports, illustrated with drawings and photographs. Every stage of the work of clearing, consolidation, rearrangement and integration, as well as technical and formal features identified during the course of the work, should be included. This record should be placed in the archives of a public institution and made available to research workers. It is recommended that the report should be published.

The following persons took part in the work of the Committee for drafting the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments:

Piero Gazzola (Italy), Chairman
Raymond Lemaire (Belgium), Reporter
José Bassegoda-Nonell (Spain) Luis
Benavente (Portugal) Djurđe Boskovic
(Yugoslavia) Hiroshi Daifuku (UNESCO)

F.L. de Vrieze (Netherlands)
Harald Langberg (Denmark)
Mario Matteucci (Italy) Jean
Merlet (France) Carlos Flores
Marini (Mexico) Roberto Pane
(Italy)
S.C.J. Pavel (Czechoslovakia) Paul
Philippot (ICCOM) Victor Pimentel
(Peru) Harold Penderleith (ICCOM)
Deodato Redig de Campos (vatican)
Jean Sonnier (France) François Sorlin
(France) Eustathios Stikas (Greece)
Gertrud Tripp (Austria) Jan
Zachwatowicz (Poland) Mustafa S.
Zbiss (Tunisia)
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FLORENCE CHARTER 1981
HISTORIC GARDENS (THE FLORENCE CHARTER 1981)

Adopted by ICOMOS in December 1982.

PREAMBLE

The ICOMOS-IFLA International Committee for Historic Gardens, meeting in Florence on 21 May 1981, decided to draw up a charter on the preservation of historic gardens which would bear the name of that town. The present Florence Charter was drafted by the Committee and registered by ICOMOS on 15 December 1982 as an addendum to the Venice Charter covering the specific field concerned.

DEFINITIONS AND OBJECTIVES

Article 1.

"A historic garden is an architectural and horticultural composition of interest to the public from the historical or artistic point of view". As such, it is to be considered as a monument.

Article 2.

"The historic garden is an architectural composition whose constituents are primarily vegetal and therefore living, which means that they are perishable and renewable." Thus its appearance reflects the perpetual balance between the cycle of the seasons, the growth and decay of nature and the desire of the artist and craftsman to keep it permanently unchanged.

Article 3.

As a monument, the historic garden must be preserved in accordance with the spirit of the Venice Charter. However, since it is a living monument, its preservation must be governed by specific rules which are the subject of the Present charter.

Article 4.

The architectural composition of the historic garden includes:

- Its plan and its topography.
- Its vegetation, including its species, proportions, colour schemes, spacing and respective heights.
- Its structural and decorative features.
- Its water, running or still, reflecting the sky.
As the expression of the direct affinity between civilisation and nature, and as a place of enjoyment suited to meditation or repose, the garden thus acquires the cosmic significance of an idealistic image of the world, a "paradise" in the etymological sense of the term, and yet a testimony to a culture, a style, an age, and often to the originality of a creative artist.

**Article 6.**

The term "historic garden" is equally applicable to small gardens and to large parks, whether formal or "landscape".

**Article 7.**

Whether or not it is associated with a building in which case it is an inseparable complement, the historic garden cannot be isolated from its own particular environment, whether urban or rural, artificial or natural.

**Article 8.**

A historic site is a specific landscape associated with a memorable act, as, for example, a major historic event; a well-known myth; an epic combat; or the subject of a famous picture.

**Article 9.**

The preservation of historic gardens depends on their identification and listing. They require several kinds of action, namely maintenance, conservation and restoration. In certain cases, reconstruction may be recommended. The authenticity of a historic garden depends as much on the design and scale of its various parts as on its decorative features and on the choice of plant or inorganic materials adopted for each of its parts.

**MAINTENANCE, CONSERVATION, RESTORATION, RECONSTRUCTION**

**Article 10.**

In any work of maintenance, conservation, restoration or reconstruction of a historic garden, or of any part of it, all its constituent features must be dealt with simultaneously. To isolate the various operations would damage the unity of the whole.

**MAINTENANCE AND CONSERVATION**

**Article 11.**

Continuous maintenance of historic gardens is of paramount importance. Since the principal material is vegetal, the preservation of the garden in an unchanged condition requires both prompt replacements when required and a long-term programme of periodic renewal (clear felling and replanting with mature specimens).

**Article 12.**

Those species of trees, shrubs, plants and flowers to be replaced periodically must be selected with regard for established and recognised practice in each botanical and horticultural region, and with the aim to determine the species initially grown and to preserve them.
The permanent or movable architectural, sculptural or decorative features which form an integral part of the historic garden must be removed or displaced only insofar as this is essential for their conservation or restoration. The replacement or restoration of any such jeopardised features must be effected in accordance with the principles of the Venice Charter, and the date of any complete replacement must be indicated.

**Article 14.**

The historic garden must be preserved in appropriate surroundings. Any alteration to the physical environment which will endanger the ecological equilibrium must be prohibited. These applications are applicable to all aspects of the infrastructure, whether internal or external (drainage works, irrigation systems, roads, car parks, fences, caretaking facilities, visitors’ amenities, etc.).

**RESTORATION AND RECONSTRUCTION**

**Article 15.**

No restoration work and, above all, no reconstruction work on a historic garden shall be undertaken without thorough prior research to ensure that such work is scientifically executed and which will involve everything from excavation to the assembling of records relating to the garden in question and to similar gardens. Before any practical work starts, a project must be prepared on the basis of said research and must be submitted to a group of experts for joint examination and approval.

**Article 16.**

Restoration work must respect the successive stages of evolution of the garden concerned. In principle, no one period should be given precedence over any other, except in exceptional cases where the degree of damage or destruction affecting certain parts of a garden may be such that it is decided to reconstruct it on the basis of the traces that survive or of unimpeachable documentary evidence. Such reconstruction work might be undertaken more particularly on the parts of the garden nearest to the building it contains in order to bring out their significance in the design.

**Article 17.**

Where a garden has completely disappeared or there exists no more than conjectural evidence of its successive stages a reconstruction could not be considered a historic garden.

**USE**

**Article 18.**

While any historic garden is designed to be seen and walked about in, access to it must be restricted to the extent demanded by its size and vulnerability, so that its physical fabric and cultural message may be preserved.

**Article 19.**

By reason of its nature and purpose, a historic garden is a peaceful place conducive to human contacts, silence and awareness of nature. This conception of its everyday use must contrast with its role on those rare occasions when it accommodates a festivity. Thus, the conditions of such occasional use of a historic garden should be clearly defined, in order that any such festivity may itself serve to enhance the visual effect of the garden instead of
Article 20.

While historic gardens may be suitable for quiet games as a daily occurrence, separate areas appropriate for active and lively games and sports should also be laid out adjacent to the historic garden, so that the needs of the public may be satisfied in this respect without prejudice to the conservation of the gardens and landscapes.

Article 21.

The work of maintenance and conservation, the timing of which is determined by season and brief operations which serve to restore the garden’s authenticity, must always take precedence over the requirements of public use. All arrangements for visits to historic gardens must be subjected to regulations that ensure the spirit of the place is preserved.

Article 22.

If a garden is walled, its walls may not be removed without prior examination of all the possible consequences liable to lead to changes in its atmosphere and to affect its preservation.

LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROTECTION

Article 23.

It is the task of the responsible authorities to adopt, on the advice of qualified experts, the appropriate legal and administrative measures for the identification, listing and protection of historic gardens. The preservation of such gardens must be provided for within the framework of land-use plans and such provision must be duly mentioned in documents relating to regional and local planning. It is also the task of the responsible authorities to adopt, with the advice of qualified experts, the financial measures which will facilitate the maintenance, conservation and restoration, and, where necessary, the reconstruction of historic gardens.

Article 24.

The historic garden is one of the features of the patrimony whose survival, by reason of its nature, requires intensive, continuous care by trained experts. Suitable provision should therefore be made for the training of such persons, whether historians, architects, landscape architects, gardeners or botanists. Care should also be taken to ensure that there is regular propagation of the plant varieties necessary for maintenance or restoration.

Article 25.

Interest in historic gardens should be stimulated by every kind of activity capable of emphasising their true value as part of the patrimony and making for improved knowledge and appreciation of them: promotion of scientific research; international exchange and circulation of information; publications, including works designed for the general public; the encouragement of public access under suitable control and use of the media to develop awareness of the need for due respect for nature and the historic heritage. The most outstanding of the historic gardens shall be proposed for inclusion in the World Heritage List.
The above recommendations are applicable to all the historic gardens in the world.

Additional clauses applicable to specific types of gardens may be subsequently appended to the present Charter with brief descriptions of the said types.
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Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes

Charles A. Birnbaum, ASLA

U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Cultural Resources
Preservation Assistance

Cultural landscapes are areas of more than a thousand acres of rural tracts of land that are small homogeneous areas, like historic buildings and districts, that have a significant aspect of our country's origin. They also reveal much about our evolving relationship with the natural world.

A cultural landscape is defined as a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals thereon, associated with a historic event, activity or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes: historic agricultural landscapes; historic recreational landscapes; and scenic scenic landscapes. These are defined in the Table on page 2.

Historic landscapes include residential gardens and community parks, scenic highways, rural communities, institutional grounds, cemeteries, battlefields, and zoological gardens. They are composed of a number of characters that individually or collectively contribute to the landscape's historical appearance as they have evolved over time. In addition to vegetation and topography, cultural landscapes may include water features such as ponds, streams, and fountains, cultural features such as roads, paths, signs, and walls, buildings, and furnishings including homes, bridges, lights, and sculptural objects.

Figure 1: The New York Fire Monument atop Lookout Mountain in the Valley Chatsworth and Chestatee National Military Park, Chattanooga, Tennessee, commemorates the battle of the Civil War between the North and South. The strategic high point provides panoramic views to the City of Chattanooga and the Mississippi River. Today, it is recognized for its cultural and natural resources. (The image was added in 1989 to part of this landscape's historic trail. Kentucky State, Land and Natural Geographic.)
DEFINITIONS

Historic Designed Landscape - a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, archaeologist, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amenity gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. The landscape may be associated with a significant person or event or be of importance to a group of people, or be part of a larger historic landscape such as a historic park, garden, or countryside. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes. Examples include public parks, campuses, and estates.

Informative Vernacular Landscape - a landscape that evolved through the actions of the people who occupied it. The landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural characteristics of the area. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. They can be a single property such as a farm or a collection of properties such as a district of historic farms along a river valley. Examples include farm villages, industrial complexes, and agricultural landscapes.

Historic Site - a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person. Examples include battlefields and presidential house properties.

Archaeological Landscape - a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that are important to the study of heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, religiously significant sites, and other sites of cultural importance. Small plant communities, animals, and cultural resources are often components.

Most historic properties have a cultural landscape component that is integral to the significance of the resource. A landscape is a residential area without sidewalks, lawns, and tons or a plantation with buildings, but no adjacent land. A historic property consists of all its cultural resources - landscapes, buildings, archaeological sites, and collections. In some cultural landscapes, there may be a total absence of buildings.

The Preservation Brief provides a framework for understanding the significance of a historic property and for identifying the cultural resources that are associated with it. The Brief identifies the cultural resources that are associated with it. The Brief identifies the cultural resources that are associated with it. The Brief provides a framework for understanding the significance of a historic property and for identifying the cultural resources that are associated with it. The Brief identifies the cultural resources that are associated with it. The Brief provides a framework for understanding the significance of a historic property and for identifying the cultural resources that are associated with it.

Developing a Strategy for Seeking Assistance

Nearly all designed and vernacular landscapes evolve from, or are dependent on, cultural resources. It is these interconnected systems of land, air and water, vegetation and wildlife which have dynamic qualities that differentiate cultural landscapes from other natural resources, such as historic structures. Thus, their documentation, treatment, and ongoing management require a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach.

Today, those involved in preservation planning and management for cultural landscapes represent a broad array of academic backgrounds, training, and related experience.
CULTURAL LANDSCAPE REPORTS

A cultural landscape report (CLR) is the primary report that documents the history, significance, and condition of a cultural landscape. A CLR evaluates the historic integrity and significance of the landscape, including any changes to its geographical features, materials, and use. CLR's are often prepared when a change (e.g., a new building or parking area) to a landscape is proposed. In such instances, a CLR can be a useful tool to present the landscape's character-defining features and their current state, attention, or loss. CLR can include maps, drawings, and other materials to help management decisions.

A CLR will often yield new information about a landscape's historic significance and integrity, even for those already listed on the National Register. Where appropriate, National Register files should be amended to reflect the new findings.

These steps can result in several products including a Cultural Landscape Report (also known as a Historic Landscape Report), statements of management, interpretive guides, maintenance guides, and maintenance records.

Historical Research

Research is essential before undertaking any treatment. Findings will help identify a landscape's historic period(s) of ownership, occupancy and development, and bring greater understanding of the associations and characteristics that make the landscape or history significant. Research findings provide a foundation to make earlier decisions for work, and can also facilitate ongoing maintenance and management operations, interpretation, and eventual compliance requirements.

A variety of primary and secondary sources may be consulted. Primary archival sources include historic plans, surveys, plats, and maps, atlases, U.S. Geological survey maps, soil surveys, aerial photographs, photographs, stereo views, glass-plate slides, postcards, engravings, paintings, newspapers, journals, construction drawings, specifications, plant lists, nursery catalogs, household records, account books, and personal correspondence. Secondary sources include books, periodicals, published histories, blogs, National Register forms, survey data, local preservation plans, state cultural heritage plans, and scholarly articles (see figures 1-7, page 6)...

Contemporary documentary sources should also be consulted. This may include recent studies, plans, surveys, aerial and infrared photographs, soil Conversation Service soil maps, inventories, investigations, and interviews. Oral histories of residents, managers, and maintenance personnel with a long tenure or historical association can be valuable sources of information about changes to a landscape over many years. (Figures 8-10, page 6) For properties listed in the National Register, nomination forms should be consulted.
Proposed Treatment Plans

Figure 29. Landscape architect's rendered concept illustrating the proposed design.

Site Conditions

The site is a former industrial area adjacent to a敏感区. The site is characterized by a dense urban fabric with limited green space. The site is currently underutilized and has the potential to become a vibrant public space. The proposed design aims to transform the site into a community-oriented park that enhances the neighborhood's sense of place and promotes social interaction.

Identification of existing obstacles and opportunities

The site presents several challenges, including limited daylight, poor drainage, and existing infrastructure that needs to be addressed. Opportunities include the potential for rainwater harvesting, the creation of green corridors, and the integration of community spaces.

Landscape Design

The design incorporates native plants and local materials to create a sense of place. The use of permeable surfaces and rain gardens will improve water quality and reduce stormwater runoff. Community spaces such as picnic areas and playgrounds will be included to support social activities.

Construction and Implementation

The project will be implemented in phases, with a focus on minimizing disruption to the existing community. A public engagement strategy will be employed to ensure the design aligns with the community's needs and preferences.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The project will be monitored to assess its impact on the neighborhood. Feedback from residents will be solicited to refine the design and ensure its continued success.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC LANDSCAPE FEATURES</th>
<th>SITE EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MANNING PLAN</th>
<th>HISTORIC PHOTOS</th>
<th>LETTERS 1934-1946</th>
<th>DRI-E Commander</th>
<th>SECONDARY SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL SYSTEMS/CONSTRUCTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment (Chasey Creek)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER FEATURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment—Creekside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland—Rocks &amp; Boulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material—Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment—Lateral Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material—Entrance Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Site (Chasey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of Cottage (Chasey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views of Cottage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGETATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Forest (Chasey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental WIndow in Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasses in Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous Plants in Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE FURNISHINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Gate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Well Covering Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensil House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent &amp; Ladder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33: This chart illustrates available documentation for characteristic features in the Frances Gardiner Site (Site (1906)) in North Carolina. Details include the types of evidence available, such as site plans, photos, letters, and historical records. An illustration of the site's layout is provided, based on the available information. (Drawing by Thompson Parkway Foundation, Inc.)

Figure 35: This plan shows the historical layout of the site, including the location of key features and pathways. The site's development is illustrated with arrows indicating the flow of movement and interaction. The site includes a variety of features, such as pathways, garden beds, and historical markers. (Illustration by Thompson Parkway Foundation, Inc.)
READING THE LANDSCAPE

The attempt to derive meaning from landscapes possesses overwhelming value. It seems on constantly aim to the world around us, demanding that we pay attention not just to some of the things around us but to all of them—the whole visible and invisible, the rich, glorious, messy, continuous, ugly, and beautiful complexity.

Landscapes can be read on many levels—landscape as urban, rural, natural, cultural, historical, social, political, economic, and political. When developing a strategy to document a cultural landscape, it is important to attempt to read the landscape in its context of place and time. See Figures 7-15, page 40.

Reading the landscape, like engaging in archival research, requires a knowledge of history and method as well as a willingness to be skeptical. As with archival research, it may involve a great deal of discovery.

Evidence gained from reading the landscape may exist in the landscape, or in your mind, or both. If the landscape has been studied, the observer may be able to draw conclusions about its history and its current condition. If the landscape has not been studied, the observer may be able to make observations about its potential significance.

Figure 22, page 37 for an example. The points may also correspond to historic views. To illustrate the change in the landscape to date, the observer may be able to use a series of photographs or drawings to show what the landscape looked like in the past and how it has changed over time.

All features that contribute to the landscape's historic character should be recorded. These include the physical features described in page 1 (e.g., topography, vegetation, and the visual and spatial relationships that some structures define). The identification of existing plants should be specific, including genus, species, common name, age (if known), and size. The observer should also note any significant historic associations.

Treating living plant material as a curatorial collection has always been undertaken at some cultural landscapes. This approach, either done manually or by computer, can track the condition and maintenance operations on individual plants.

For example, the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, in Boston, Massachusetts, has developed a field investigation and management system to track all woody plants. (See Lathbury, page 29.) This system allows the preservation and replacement of significant plant material in a number of properties, including those that are no longer commercially available. The system also provides a historical record of the properties, including a list of all dead trees, and a record of the plants that were not replaced.

Once the research and documentation are complete, a foundation is in place to analyze the landscapes continuously and change, determine its significance, assess its integrity, and place it within the historic context of similar landscapes.
Figures 9 and 10: Existing conditions along the study corridor.

Incorporation of the existing conditions into the planning process is important. The study area is characterized by a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and industrial. The existing conditions include a network of roads, waterways, and natural features.

Incorporation of the existing conditions into the planning process is important. The study area is characterized by a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and industrial. The existing conditions include a network of roads, waterways, and natural features.
HISTORIC PLANT INVENTORY

Within cultural landscapes, plants may have historical or botanical significance. A plant may have been associated with a historic figure or event or be part of a notable landscape design. A plant may be an uncommon cultivar, exceptional in size, age, rare and commercially unobtainable. If such plants are lost, there would be a loss of historic integrity and biological diversity of the cultural landscape. To ensure that significant plants are preserved, an inventory of historic plants is being conducted at the North Atlantic Region of the National Park Service.

Historical landscape architects work with botanists, arborists, and horticulturists to gather oral and documented history on the plant’s origin, cultural use, and potential significance. Each plant is then examined in the field by an expert horticulturist who records its name, condition, age, size, distribution, and, when possible, botanical characteristics.

Plants that are difficult to identify or are of potential historical significance are further examined in the laboratory by a plant taxonomist who compares leaf, fruit, and flower characteristics with herbarium specimens for named species, cultivars, and varieties. The plants species with many cultivars, such as apples, roses, and grapes, specimens may be sent to specialists for identification.

If a plant cannot be identified, it is listed as in decline and unavailable from commercial nurseries, it may be propagated. If propagation ensures that rare and significant plants can be replaced with genetically identical plants, cuttings are propagated and grown to replacement size in a North Atlantic Region Historic Plant Nursery.
Site Analysis: Evaluating Integrity and Significance

By analyzing the landscape, its change over time can be understood. This may be accomplished by overlaying the various periods plans with the existing conditions plan. Based on these findings, individual features may be attributed to the particular period when they were introduced, and the various periods when they were present.

It is during this step that the historic significance of the landscape component of a historic property and its integrity is determined. Historic significance is the recognized importance a property displays when it has been evaluated, including when it has been listed in the National Register of Historic Places. A landscape may have several areas of historical significance. An understanding of the landscape as a continuous through history is critical in assessing its cultural and historic value. In order for the landscape to have integrity, these character-defining features or qualities that constitute its significance must be present.

While National Register nominations document the significance and integrity of historic properties, in general, they may not acknowledge the significance of the landscape's design or historic land use, and may not contain an inventory of landscape features or characteristics. Additional research is often necessary to provide the detailed information about a landscape's evolution and significance useful in making decisions for the treatment and maintenance of a historic landscape. Existing National Register forms may be amended to recognize additional areas of significance and to include more complete description of historic properties that have significant land use and landscape features.

Integrity is a property's historic identity evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics from the property's historic or prehistoric period. The seven qualities of integrity are location, setting, association, design, craftsmanship and materials. When evaluating these qualities, one should be aware of the potential for change itself. For example, when a second-generation woodland creates an open pasture in a hilly landscape or a wooded ridge encloses a scenic valley. For situations such as these, the accessibility and compatibility of these features should be considered, both individually, and in the context of the overall landscape. Together, evaluations of integrity and significance, when combined with historic research, documentation of existing conditions, and analysis findings, influence future treatment and interpretation decisions (see Figures 18-21).

Developing a Historic Preservation Approach and Treatment Plan

Treatments may be defined as work carried out to achieve a historic preservation goal—it cannot be considered in a vacuum. There are many practical and philosophical factors that may influence the selection of a treatment for a landscape. These include the relative historic value of the property, the level of historic documentation, existing physical conditions, historic and proposed use (e.g., educational, interpretative, passive, active public, institutional or private), long- and short-term objectives, operational and code requirements (e.g., accessibility, fire, security), and costs for anticipated capital improvements, site work, and maintenance. The value of any significant archaeological and natural resources.
Figure 3. Cultural landscapes often contain plant communities such as roadsides or meadows. While much care is taken to maintain a management structure, when evaluating landscapes it is important to recognize the present day importance of these structures. For example, the South Dakota Natural Area at Capitol Reef National Park in Utah, the landscape contains 5,000 fruit trees associated with welfare and agriculture on the Colville Indian Reservation.

Figure 2c. Integrity can result both continuity and change. This can be observed in several different areas of the landscape. Although the specific forests were not observed on the route, the route itself and the forest itself provide a sense of place and continuity. The forest itself provides a sense of place and continuity.

Figure 2b. Integrity can result from both continuity and change. This can be observed in several different areas of the landscape. Although the specific forests were not observed on the route, the route itself and the forest itself provide a sense of place and continuity. The forest itself provides a sense of place and continuity.

Figure 2a. Integrity can result from both continuity and change. This can be observed in several different areas of the landscape. Although the specific forests were not observed on the route, the route itself and the forest itself provide a sense of place and continuity. The forest itself provides a sense of place and continuity.
LANDSCAPE INTERPRETATION

Landscape interpretation is the process of providing the visitor with tools to experience the landscape as it existed during the period of significance or as it evolved to its present state. These tools may vary widely, from a focus on existing features to the addition of interpretive elements. These could include exhibits, self-guided brochures, or a new representation of a land feature. The authors of the cultural landscapes, especially those at a level of significance, innovation, and authenticity level of visitation anticipated may frame the interpretive approach. Landscape interpretation may be closely linked to the integrity and condition of the landscape, and therefore, its ability to convey historic character and defining features of the past. If a landscape has high integrity, the interpretive approach may be direct; visitors to surveying historic features without introducing obstructive interpretive devices such as these signs. For landscapes with a diminished integrity, where limited or outdated elements, the interpretive emphasis may be on using existing features and visual aids (e.g., markers, photographs, etc.) to help visitors visualize the resource as it existed in the past. The primary goal in these situations is to educate the visitor about the landscape's historic themes, associations, and characteristics, defining features or broad historic, social, and physical landscape contexts.

should also be considered in the decision-making process. Therefore, a cultural landscape's preservation plan and the treatments selected will consider a broad array of dynamic, and interrelated considerations. It will often take the form of a plan with detailed guidelines or specifications.

Adapting such a plan in concurrence with a preservation maintenance plan (pages 10-17), acknowledges a cultural landscape's ever-changing essence and the interrelationship of treatment and ongoing maintenance. Performance standards, scheduling and record-keeping of maintenance activities on a day-to-day or month-to-month basis, may then be planned for. Treatment management and maintenance proposals can be developed by a team of professionals and with expertise in such fields as landscape preservation, ecological studies, and landscape maintenance.

The selection of a primary treatment for the landscape, utilizing the criteria of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, establishes an overall historic preservation approach, as well as a philosophical framework from which to interpret. Selecting a treatment is based on many factors. They include management and interpretation objectives for the property as a whole, the period of significance, integrity, and condition of individual landscape features.

For all treatments, the landscape's existing conditions and its ability to convey historic significance should be carefully considered. For example, the fine work, design philosophy, and overall quality of an individual design or should be understood for a designed landscape such as an estate, prior to treatment selection. For a commercial landscape, such as a Battlefield containing a large tract of mid-nineteenth century family farm, the uniqueness of that aignment complex within its local, regional, state, and national context should be considered in selecting a treatment.

The overall historic preservation approach and treatment approach can ensure the proper retention, care, and repair of landscapes and their inherent features. In short, the Standards act as a preservation and management tool for cultural landscapes. The four potential treatments are described in the text opposite.

Landscape treatment can range from simple, inexpensive preservation actions, to complete major restoration or reconstruction projects. The prescriptive framework is inverse to proportion to the retention of historic features and materials. Generally, preservation involves the least change, and to be most respectful of historic materials. It maintains the form and material of the existing landscape.
TREATMENTS FOR CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

Prior to transplanting, each plant is considered a separate entity, and the number of plants present is documented. This ensures that the landscape is preserved. The treatment plan outlines the steps necessary to achieve the desired outcome.

Preservation also involves the act of moving a significant feature from one location to another. This process includes careful planning and execution to ensure the integrity and character of the feature are maintained.

In some cases, the treatment plan may include the creation of new features, such as a water feature or a garden path. These new features are designed to complement the existing landscape and enhance its overall appearance.

Restoration involves the act of repairing or reconstructing damaged or deteriorated features. This process may involve the use of historical or traditional methods to ensure the authenticity and integrity of the landscape.

Reconstruction is defined as the act of replacing or constructing new features. This process is typically undertaken when the existing features are no longer sustainable or when a new design is desired.

Rehabilitation involves the act of improving the condition of existing features. This process may involve the use of modern materials and techniques to ensure the long-term sustainability of the features.

Restoration and reconstruction often require a significant degree of intervention and are considered the highest level of documentation.

In all cases, treatments should be executed at the appropriate level to ensure the preservation of the landscape. Treatment plans should be developed to ensure the compatibility and durability of the features.

A landscape with a high level of integrity and authenticity may suggest preservation as the primary treatment. Such a treatment may emphasize preservation, stabilization, and repair of character-defining landscape features. Changes that are part of the landscape's continuous and significant in their own right may be significant in their own right.
retained, while changes that are not significant, yet do not encourage one of the character may also be undertaken. Preservation entails the essential operations to safeguard existing resources. (Figures 27-28)

Rehabilitation is often selected in response to a contemporary use or need—ideally such an approach is compatible with the landscape's historic character and historic use. Rehabilitation may preserve existing features along with introducing some compatible changes, new additions and alterations. Rehabilitation may be desirable in a private residence in a historic district where the homeowner's goal is to develop an appropriate landscape treatment for a front yard, or in a public park where a support area is needed for its maintenance or operations. (Figures 29-31)

When the most important goal is to portray a landscape and its character-defining features of an earlier period and restoration is selected as the primary treatment. Unlike preservation and rehabilitation, interpreting the landscape's condition or evolution is not the objective. Restoration may involve the removal of features from other periods and/or the construction of missing or lost features and material from the reconstruction period. In all cases, treatment should be substantiated by the historic research findings and existing conditions documentation. Restoration and reconstruction treatment works should avoid the creation of a landscape whose features did not exist historically. For example, if features from an earlier period did not co-exist with certain features from a later period that are being retained, their restoration would not be appropriate. (Figures 32-36)

In rare cases, when evidence is insufficient to avoid conjecture, and no other property exists that can adequately explain a certain period, reconstruction may be utilized to depict a vanished landscape. The accuracy of this work is critical. In cases where topography and the substance of soil have not been disturbed, research and existing conditions findings may be confirmed by thorough archaeological investigations. These two, or these factors that are not, should be recorded as necessary, realizing the original historic features to the greatest extent possible. The greatest care in reconstruction is creating a false picture of history.

False historicism in every treatment should be avoided. This applies to individual features as well as the entire landscape. Examples of inappropriate work include the introduction of historic-looking benches that are actually a new design. A beneficial gateway placed in what was once an open meadow, executing an unrecorded historic design, or designing a historic-looking landscape for a relocated historic structure within "restoration."

Figure 33-34: Forest Manor Park in St. Louis, Missouri, is a National Historic Landmark. The main features that mark the site as a historic landmark are the large stone gatehouse, the various brick buildings, and the garden. This area is under ecological processes, especially the water level which may affect the landscape. Based on the excellent renovation studies, nineteenth century aerial views, photographs, and archival materials, the area was recently restored. Illustrated above are a layout plan, with the progress and the completed renovation project. Elements Green, PHLA.
Developing a Preservation Maintenance Plan and Implementation Strategy

Throughout the preservation planning process, it is important to ensure that existing landscape features are retained. Preservation maintenance is the practice of monitoring and controlling change in the landscape to ensure that its historic integrity is not altered and features are not lost. This is particularly important during the research and long-term treatment planning process. To be effective, the maintenance program must have a guiding philosophy or approach and an understanding of preservation techniques and a system for documenting changes in the landscape.

The philosophical approach to maintenance should coincide with the landscape's current stage in the preservation planning process. A Cultural Landscape Report and Treatment Plan can take several years to complete, yet during this time, managers and property owners will likely need to address immediate issues related to the decline, wear, decay, or damage of landscape features. Therefore, initial maintenance operations may focus on the stabilization and protection of all landscape features to provide temporary, often emergency measures to prevent deterioration, failure, or loss, without altering the site's existing character.

After a Treatment Plan is implemented, the approach to preservation maintenance may be modified to reflect the objectives defined by this plan. The detailed specifications prepared in the Treatment Plan relating to the retention, repair, removal, or replacement of features in the landscape should guide and inform a comprehensive preservation maintenance program. This would include schedules for monitoring, and routine maintenance, appropriate preservation maintenance procedures, as well as ongoing records of the work performed. For vegetation, the preservation maintenance program would also include thresholds for growth or change in character, appropriate pruning methods, propagation, and replacement procedures.

To facilitate operations, a property may be divided into discrete management zones (Figure 11). These zones are sometimes defined during the Cultural Landscape Report and are typically based on historically defined areas. Alternatively, zones created for maintenance purposes and priorities could be used. Examples of maintenance zones would include woodlands, lawns, meadow, specimen trees, and hedges.

Training of maintenance staff in preservation maintenance skills is essential. Preservation maintenance practices differ from standard maintenance practices because of the focus on perpetuating the historic character or use of the landscape rather than beautification. For example, introducing new varieties of plant material or trees is likely to be inappropriate. Substantial cutting or moving of vegetation may be inappropriate, where there are potential archaeological resources. An old hedge or shelter should be reconstructed, or propagated, rather than removed and replaced. A mature specimen tree may require careful and careful monitoring to ensure that it is not a threat to visitor safety. Through training programs, and with the assistance of preservation maintenance specialists, each property could develop maintenance specifications for the care of landscape features.
Figure 10. A management decision made to place a once crowded a
special check in Redwood Park, Redwood, California. The area provides the
special check and storage — areas from structure that is considered to
be a major drainage control method.

Figure 11. The importance of landscape and natural systems is reflected in a
line plan for Denning Park, Hempstead, New York. The plan, not only
provides for future use, but also for recreation and
recreational uses. The plan, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.

Figure 12. The plan for the park, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.

Figure 13. The plan for the park, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.

Figure 14. The plan for the park, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.

Figure 15. The plan for the park, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.

Figure 16. The plan for the park, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.

Figure 17. The plan for the park, right, shows the planting of a
large number of trees in the park.
DEVELOPING A PRESERVATION MAINTENANCE GUIDE

In the past, there was rarely adequate record-keeping to fully understand the ways a landscape was maintained. This created gaps in our research findings. Today, we recognize that planning for ongoing maintenance and historic applications should be documented—both routinely and comprehensively. An annual work program or calendar records the frequency of maintenance work on built or natural landscape features. It can also monitor the age, health, and vigor of vegetation. For example, on-site assessments may document the presence of weeds, pests, dead leaves, pole color, seating, or compostation—all of which signal particular maintenance needs. For built elements, the deterioration of paving or drainage systems may be noted and the need for repair or replacement indicated before hazards develop. An overall maintenance program can assist in routine and cyclic maintenance of the landscape and can also guide long-term treatment projects.

To help structure a comprehensive maintenance operation that is responsive to staff, budget, and maintenance priorities, the National Park Service has developed two computer-driven programs for its own landscape resources. A Maintenance Management Program (MMP) is designed to assist maintenance managers in their efforts to plan, organize, and direct the park maintenance system. An Inventory and Condition Assessment Program (ICAAP) is designed to complement MMP by providing a system for inventorying, assessing conditions, and generating corrective work recommendations for all sites.

Another approach to documenting maintenance and recording changes over time is to develop an informal or computerized graphic information system. Such a system should have the capability to include plans and photographs that would record a site's living collection of plant materials. (Also see discussion of the use of graphic documentation in Preserving Historic Landscape Plans, page 50). This may be achieved using a computer-assisted drafting program along with an integrated database management system.

To guide immediate and ongoing maintenance, a systematic and flexible approach has been developed by the embroidered Center for Landscape Preservation. Working with National Park Service landscape managers and maintenance specialists, staff assemble information and make recommendations for the care of individual landscape features.

Each landscape feature is assessed in the field to document existing conditions and identify field work needed. Recommendations include maintenance procedures that are sensitive to the longevity of the landscape.

---

Figure A—Existing Conditions: A map of the existing plant at the Statue of Liberty National Monument is used as a living inventory for future maintenance work (Courtesy of Margaret Cortis, 1970).

Figure B—Field Inventory, Inspection, and Work Schedule: This schedule of all landscape maintenance activities is a graphic representation of the condition, potential problems, such as drought or insect infestation, and specific work needed. A comprehensive inventory is used to locate features that require attention.
Scenic landscapes change through the seasons, so specifications for ongoing preservation maintenance should be organized in a calendar format. During each season or week, the calendar can be referenced to determine when, where, and how preservation maintenance is needed. For example, for some trees, winter pruning is best done in the late winter while other times are best planned for the late summer. Specific dates are mentioned at specific times of the year. In certain stages of their life cycle. This detailed calendar will in turn identify staff needs and work priorities.

Depending on the level of sophistication desired, one approach is documentating maintenance data and recording change over time to a computerized or visual information system. This approach would include photos and graphical representations of the site's landscape features.

If a computer is not available, a manual or notebook can be developed, long-term, and store important information. This manual allows for any detail to be recorded, and regular updates to the landscape changes provide an ongoing record of the maintenance staff.

Recording Treatment Work and Future Research Recommendations

The last step in the preservation planning process records the treatment work as carried out. It may include a series of as-built drawings, supporting photographs, materials, specifications, and a summative assessment. New technologies that have been successfully used should be highlighted. Ideally, this information should be shared with interested national organizations for further dissemination and evaluation.

This need for further research or additional activities should also be documented. This may include site-specific or contextual historical research, archeological investigations, pollen analysis, stem analysis, and other unusual plant materials or material testing for future applications.

Finally, in consultation with a conservator, archivist, or historian—should the potential for data loss all primary documents should be organized and preserved as archival materials. This may include field notes, maps, drawings, photographs, material samples, oral histories, and other relevant information.

Summary

The planning, treatment, and maintenance of cultural landscapes requires a multi-disciplinary approach. In landscapes, such as parks and playgrounds, battlefields, cemeteries, village greens, and agricultural land preserves—more than any other type of historic resource—continues to preserve a sense of stewardship. It is often this greater sense of commitment that has been the catalyst for current research and planning initiatives. Individual residential properties often do not receive the same level of public outreach, yet a systematic planning process will assist in making educated treatment and maintenance decisions.

With stewardship comes the tradition and the spirit of a place by recognizing history as change over time. Often, this also involves our own personal changes through treatment. The potential benefits from the preservation of cultural landscapes are enormous. Landscapes provide...
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Appendix H

LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR ADVOCACY DIRECTORS

1. Name and title of position.

2. How long have you been with the current organization?

3. How long have you been in your current position?

4. What is your educational background (degrees, credentials, etc.)?

5. (If not available electronically) What is your mission and vision for your organization?

   When were they written and/or revised? (attach copy of mission and vision)

6. Do you feel those adequately direct your organization today? Why or why not?

7. What individual or body is responsible for the decision making process for your organization related to mission and project planning?

8. How do you provide assistance to your members for projects?

9. How do you prioritize projects you choose to support?

10. How do you view your role in historic preservation nationally?

11. How is your organization involved with cooperative efforts among national organizations in historic preservation? In what ways could this be expanded or improved?
Appendix I

TEXT OF QUALITATIVE SURVEY

The Role of Historic Significance in Decision-Making at APGA Public Horticulture Institutions

This survey investigates the role of historic significance in decision-making at public horticulture institutions with historic resources. The study is being conducted by Matthew Quirey, a second year Fellow in the Longwood Graduate Program, University of Delaware. Results of the survey will be included in a Master's thesis and will be available upon request. Approximately 450 APGA institutions are being invited to participate in this survey.

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your name and institution will remain anonymous.

Individual responses will be collected on a secure web server. This data will remain confidential and viewed only by the study team. To protect confidentiality, personally identifiable information in the downloaded data files will be stored separately and securely from the rest of the survey response data. The data will be destroyed after 2 years.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. To leave the study at any time, simply close the web browser. Please note, once you complete the questions in a given section and click the "Next" button on the final page, you cannot return to the previous section.

If you have any questions concerning the study, please contact the principal investigator Matthew Quirey, Longwood Graduate Program, University of Delaware at mquirey@udel.edu. For questions about your rights as a subject or about any issues concerning the use of human subjects in research, please contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, University of Delaware, (302) 831-2136.

Thank you for participating. Please press the "Next" button to continue.
Section I
What is the size of your institution?
Small - operating budget less than $1 million
Medium - operating budget between $1 and $2 million
Large - operating budget more than $2 million

What is the type of your institution?
Arboretum
Farm Garden
Botanical Garden
Historic Landscape & Site
College & University Garden
Nature Garden
Display
Special Collection
Entertainment Garden
Other (please specify)

What is the mission statement of your institution?

What is the highest degree you have attained?
High School
Associate's degree
Bachelor's degree
Master's degree
Doctoral degree

What was your field of study for this degree?

Years of experience in the public horticulture field in a management position:
Less than 1
1-2
3-5
6-9
10-14
15-19
20+
Years at current institution:
Less than 1
1-2
3-5
6-9
10-14
15-19
20+

What is your current job title?

Years in your current position:
Less than 1
1-2
3-5
6-9
10-14
15-19
20+

Do you report to a board of directors / advisors / trustees?
Yes
No (Please type your supervisor's job title below)

This survey is intended to better understand the decision-making and management of public horticulture institutions with historic resources.

Historic resources are defined as any garden element (e.g., fountain, statue), garden space (e.g. rose garden, allee), or institution with links to an historic event, designer, movement or period of history.

Does your institution have an historic resource(s) as defined above?
Yes
No (opt out question, if no, question logic skips to “Thank You” at end of survey)
Section II
All questions in the following section make use of ratings scales with 7 places; you are to select the box that best describes your opinion. For example, if you were asked to rate “The weather in Hawaii” on such a scale, the 7 places should be interpreted as follows:

The weather in Hawaii is warm most of the year:
- Definitely False
- quite
- slightly
- neither
- slightly
- quite
- Definitely True

If you think the statement is definitely false, then you would select the first box on the left.
- Definitely False
- quite
- slightly
- neither
- slightly
- quite
- Definitely True

If you think the statement is definitely true, then you would select the last box on the right.
- Definitely False
- quite
- slightly
- neither
- slightly
- quite
- Definitely True
If you think the statement is slightly false, then you would select the third box on the left.
- Definitely False
- quite
- slightly
- neither
- slightly
- quite
- Definitely True

In the following questions, the phrase "supporting historic significance in decision-making" is intended to encompass the variety of decisions that management makes to support a healthy institution. In this case, it specifically targets those decisions that affect the historic resources of an institution. Management decisions include: budgeting, marketing, programming, capital projects, etc.

Please indicate the strength of your feelings about each of the following statements. Some of the questions may appear to be similar, but they do address somewhat different issues. Please read each question carefully.

(Screenshot from actual survey. The following questions are randomized and viewed one per page in Qualtrics.)

Supporting historic significance in decision-making is necessary for me to help my institution satisfy its mission.

Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

People who are important to me professionally think supporting historic significance in decision-making is valuable.

Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Supporting historic significance in decision-making is worthwhile.

Definitely True – Definitely False
I have the financial resources necessary to support historic significance in decision-making.
   Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

My staff agrees with supporting historic significance in decision-making.
   Definitely True – Definitely False

Supporting historic significance in decision-making will bring additional visitors to my institution.
   Extremely Unlikely – Extremely Likely

I have the necessary expertise to support historic significance in decision-making.
   Definitely False – Definitely True

Supporting historic significance in decision-making is important to my professional colleagues.
   Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

Supporting historic significance in decision-making will enhance my reputation.
   Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree

My superior (governing board, boss, etc.) believes supporting historic significance in decision-making is an effective management strategy.
   Definitely False – Definitely True

I have adequate staff (number and/or expertise) to support historic significance in decision-making.
   Definitely True – Definitely False

My visitors think supporting historic significance in decision-making is integral to protecting my institution's historic resources.
   Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree

My superior (governing board, boss, etc.) agrees with my efforts to support historic significance in decision-making.
   Definitely False – Definitely True
Supporting historic significance in decision-making is a key component in my institution’s strategic plan.
   Definitely False – Definitely True

Whether or not I support historic significance in decision-making is within my control.
   Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree
I want to support historic significance in decision-making this year.
   Definitely False – Definitely True

I intend to support historic significance in decision-making this year.
   Extremely Unlikely – Extremely Likely

Section III
Is your Institution listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)?
   Yes
   No

Does your institution have local or state historic significance?
   Yes
   No (if no, question logic skips next page)

Please briefly describe your institution’s local or state historical significance.

Do you have documentation supporting your institution’s historic significance?
   Yes
   No

Do you understand the concept of historic significance as the National Parks Service (NPS) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) use it?
   Yes
   No
Please briefly describe the concept of historic significance as the National Parks Service (NPS) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) use it?

Thank you for your time and assistance! Your participation is very important to the success of this research.

If you have any questions, please contact Matthew Quirey at mquirey@udel.edu
Appendix J

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

February 23, 2009

Institution
Name, Title
Street
Additional Address
City, State
Email address

Dear Name,

I am a graduate Fellow in the Longwood Graduate Program at the University of Delaware. I am writing to APGA member institutions in regard to my current thesis research concerning the role of historic significance in decision-making at gardens and landscapes in the United States. As part of this research, you will be receiving an electronic survey in the next few days. Your participation is vitally important to this research, and to thank you in advance for taking the time to complete the survey, I have enclosed a token of my appreciation.

The survey should not take more than 20 minutes of your time to complete. Your name, title, along with the name of your institution will remain completely anonymous. The data not reported in the study will also be destroyed after two years. I hope this research will provide insight into how historic resources, whether they be a large or small part of your institution, influence decisions about programming, marketing, budgeting, and the many other facets of managing a public horticulture institution. If you would like the results of this research, please send me an email at the address listed below and I will be happy to provide an electronic version to you at the conclusion of the study.
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Thanks again for your contribution to this research.

Best regards,

Matthew Quirey
Longwood Graduate Program
University of Delaware
126 Townsend Hall
Newark, DE 19716
T: (302) 831.2517
C: (405) 269.1381
F: (302) 831.3651
www.udel.edu/longwoodgrad
Appendix K
LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR CASE STUDIES

1. What is significant about your historic site?

2. How would you describe the mission of your organization?

3. How does your organizational structure work? (Board of directors, etc.)

4. Who do you feel is responsible for the management of the historic resources?

5. In regard to the historic resources, how are budgetary decisions made? By whom?

6. What consideration do your historic resources hold in your budget planning process?

7. On a scale of one to five, how important are the historic resources in that process?

8. How do you define historic significance?

9. How has the significance of your historic resources been used in decision making by your organization?
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May 19, 2009

Mr. Matthew Quirey
Longwood Program

Dear Matthew:

Subject:  An Analysis of Historic Significance Criteria and Its Impact on public Horticulture Institutions (XMP 312)

Re:  Addition of follow-up questions to survey

The Board appreciates you letting us know of this type of proposed deviation from the original protocol. The changes are approved and do not change the Exempt status of your work.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Duggins Peloso
IRB Administrator