



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/115153/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Jorgensen, A., Dobson, S. and Heatherington, C. (2017) Parkwood Springs – A fringe in time: Temporality and heritage in an urban fringe landscape. *Environment and Planning A*, 49 (8). pp. 1867-1886. ISSN: 0308-518X

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17704202>

Jorgensen, A., Dobson, S., & Heatherington, C. (2017). Parkwood Springs – A fringe in time: Temporality and heritage in an urban fringe landscape. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 49(8), 1867–1886. Copyright © 2017 The Author(s). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17704202>. Article available under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 **Parkwood Springs- a fringe in time: temporality and heritage in**
2 **an urban fringe landscape**

3

4 **Abstract**

5 This paper aims to advance the theory and practice of landscape heritage
6 planning, design and management, focusing especially on the question: what are
7 the relationships between landscape narratives—the ways in which we tell the
8 story of a landscape—and landscape heritage outcomes (landscape practice-
9 planning, design, management- based on particular readings of the past)? The
10 paper explores this question through a critical examination of three different
11 narrative accounts of Parkwood Springs, an urban waste site in the city of
12 Sheffield, UK: a conventional history, a personal experiential account, and an
13 analysis based on the Sheffield Historic Landscape Characterisation. The critique
14 is informed by a cross-disciplinary theoretical discussion of the ways time is
15 conceptualized and presented in narrative, and how these conceptualizations
16 influence future landscapes.

17

18 **Keywords**

19 Derelict landscapes, landscape narrative, memory, performativity, ruins

20

21

22

23

24 **Introduction**

25 Whilst there has been much recent interest in urban and post-industrial ruins
26 and urban derelict and waste landscapes (see e.g. Berger, 2007; DeSilvey and
27 Edensor, 2013; Gandy, 2013; Jorgensen and Tylecote, 2007), this has rarely
28 focused on their cultural significance as sites of urban landscape heritage, nor on
29 an in-depth discussion of the implications for the future of these sites. This paper
30 aims to advance the theory and practice of landscape heritage planning, design
31 and management, focusing especially on the question: What is the relationship
32 between landscape narrative—the ways in which we tell the story of a
33 landscape—and landscape heritage outcomes? The paper examines this question
34 in the context of one urban waste site, Parkwood Springs, in the city of Sheffield,
35 UK.

36

37 “Landscape heritage” is commonly thought to refer to that which is considered to
38 be of lasting value in landscape (Whitehand and Gu, 2010), encompassing
39 individual landscape elements e.g. woodlands or coastal defences, composite
40 landscapes e.g. historic parks and gardens, as well as large scale landscapes e.g.
41 the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape, a UNESCO World Heritage
42 cultural landscape in south west England. One of the 12 core principles of
43 England’s National Planning Policy Framework (2012:6) is that planning should
44 “conserve heritage assets [including landscapes] in a manner appropriate to
45 their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality
46 of life of this and future generations.” The attribution of value typically leads to
47 landscape heritage “outcomes” aimed at the interpretation and conservation of
48 these landscapes, ranging from a listing on registers such as Historic England’s
49 Register of Parks and Gardens, or the World Heritage list of cultural landscapes,

50 to smaller scale interventions of more local significance e.g. the creation of
51 heritage trails. These processes of valuation are underpinned by narratives that
52 seek to justify the status, meaning and significance of the landscapes in question.

53

54 A number of writers have recently called for a rethinking of landscape heritage
55 theory and practice (e.g. Smith, 2006; Harrison 2015). Laurajane Smith
56 (2006:19ff), for example, critiques “authorized heritage discourse”, and its
57 tenets; this type of heritage is seen as a precious “inheritance”, with “innate
58 value”, meaning that it must be stewarded into the future by experts. It is also
59 both physically and temporally demarcated: “Heritage has traditionally been
60 conceived...as a discrete ‘site’, ‘object’, building or other structure with
61 identifiable boundaries that can be mapped, surveyed, recorded, and placed on
62 national or international site registers” (Smith, 2006: 31). Further, it is a
63 representation of an (often exclusive) social identity that is designed to be
64 passively consumed by visitors.

65

66 Scholarly attention is therefore moving away from deterministic and definitive
67 histories and the establishment heritage they support towards discursive,
68 multiple and sometimes conflicting accounts reflecting different social and
69 cultural perspectives and identities (Wu and Hou, 2015). The interdisciplinary
70 academic field of Heritage Studies has seen a reframing of heritage “as discourse
71 concerned with the negotiation and regulation of social meaning and practice
72 associated with the creation and recreation of identity” (Smith, 2006: 5). This
73 increasingly democratized understanding of heritage has also permeated
74 landscape policy and practice. The role of landscape heritage in the formation of

75 identity, and its importance for communities, is recognized both by the European
76 Landscape Convention (ELC) (2000),¹ to, which the UK is a signatory, and by
77 heritage initiatives such as the Landscape Partnerships funding programme of
78 the Heritage Lottery Fund, which promotes a more inclusive approach to
79 heritage practice, and emphasizes the multiple benefits to people and
80 communities.

81

82 This paper builds on existing critiques of establishment heritage (Winter, 2013),
83 and developing forms of heritage practice (e.g. projects funded by the
84 Community Heritage Funding stream of the Heritage Lottery Fund, 2017). It
85 responds to calls for further innovation and interdisciplinarity (DeSilvey, 2012;
86 Harrison 2015), by showing how different forms of narrative support diverse
87 interpretations of the past, as well as a wider range of landscape heritage
88 outcomes. We proliferate this narrative diversity further in the context of an
89 urban wasteland, a landscape form that is rarely associated with landscape
90 heritage. On the contrary, urban wastelands are “ambivalent landscapes”
91 (Jorgensen and Tylecote, 2007), with contradictory meanings ranging from a
92 repulsive dump to a useful natural space (Brun et al., 2017). This narrative
93 diversity deserves further exploration, as these sites are a recurring phase in
94 cycles of urban development, and they share common characteristics with a wide
95 range of other degraded urban landscapes. Parkwood Springs is both an example
96 of this landscape form, and exemplary of wastelands throughout the UK and
97 Europe. Whilst every site is unique, wastelands have common characteristics e.g.

¹ e.g. The preamble states: “landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures and ... is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human well-being and consolidation of the European identity;”

98 modified land form, contamination, spontaneous vegetation and derelict
99 buildings and structures. They are also typically surrounded by communities
100 with high levels of deprivation. With at least 8,860 sites of “previously
101 developed land” recorded in England alone in 2012, covering a total area of
102 24,000ha (roughly the size of Birmingham) (Harrison, 2006), their future
103 treatment has implications for the cultural heritage and well-being of many
104 marginalized local communities.


105

106 In this paper we adopt DeSilvey’s (2012: 33) definition of narrative as “the
107 ordering of events, actions and elements of experience in a communicative
108 structure”. According to Potteiger and Purinton (1998: 3) narrative is therefore
109 both a story, and the way in which it is told. Drawing on Ricoeur, they (1998:7)
110 also claim that narratives have both a temporal and a spatial component.

111

112 The paper begins with a short introduction to Parkwood Springs. This is
113 followed by Part 1, an outline of the main theoretical strands running through
114 the paper, showing how different conceptualizations of time are mobilized in
115 narrative, and how this affects interpretations of the past. Part 2 consists of three
116 different forms of narrative about Parkwood Springs: a conventional history, a
117 personal experiential account and an analysis based on the Sheffield Historic
118 Landscape Characterisation (HLC) (South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS),
119 undated), each preceded by a brief introduction. We consider that it is
120 appropriate to examine the HLC as a narrative resource in this paper given the
121 importance of landscape characterisation in both the ELC, and in heritage
122 initiatives such as the landscape partnerships funded by the Heritage Lottery

123 Fund.² Part 3 is a critical comparative review of the narratives and their
124 implications for the planning, design and management of Parkwood Springs as
125 landscape heritage, and is followed by some final concluding remarks.
126



127
128 **Figure 1** Location map of Parkwood Springs (prepared by Stephen Dobson)

129
130 **Parkwood Springs, Sheffield, UK**

131 On a foray into Parkwood Springs in October 2010 a walking companion
132 declared: “But this is an urban fringe landscape- surrounded by the city!”
133 Though no longer located at the edge of the city, its complex hotchpotch of land-
134 uses does closely resemble the land-use combinations typically found in an
135 urban fringe landscape, combining landfill, green space and derelict sites and

² e.g. The Heritage Lottery Fund’s (2013) Landscape Conservation Action Plan (LCAP) Guidance emphasizes the need to review existing Landscape Character Assessments and to prepare new ones if existing assessments need revision.

136 structures, alongside a host of miscellaneous other official and unofficial uses. It
137 is a considerable area, around 80 hectares in size, sprawling for nearly two
138 kilometres along the eastern slope of the River Don valley, which runs due north
139 from Sheffield's urban core (Figure 1). This vast open landscape is itself only two
140 kilometres from the city centre, and is completely surrounded by built
141 development. Parkwood Springs is also imposing topographically: its steep
142 slopes rise to a height of 174 metres, approximately 100 metres above the valley
143 floor.

144

145 A former landfill site lies at the heart of the site, surrounded by a fringe of
146 extensively managed green space. Many buildings and structures are in an
147 advanced state of dereliction and decay, and none of the material remains have
148 undergone any significant preservation or restoration. Much of the site, including
149 the ruined buildings and structures, is densely vegetated, due to a combination
150 of ancient woodland, natural succession and various tree planting initiatives
151 (Figure 2a).

152

153 The *Sheffield Local Plan* (Sheffield City Council, 2009) designates Parkwood
154 Springs as Open Space and a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, with a
155 Waste Management Area. The *City Sites- Preferred Options* document (Sheffield
156 City Council, undated a) specifies that: "This site is proposed as major Open
157 Space Improvement... This open space can be created and laid out on [sic] a
158 phased approach as the tipping phases cease". Tipping has now ceased. Sheffield
159 City Council manages the site together with the Friends of Parkwood Springs,

160



161

162 **Figure 2** (clockwise from top left): Figure 2a Fishing on the River Don, surrounded by Parkwood
 163 Springs’s woodland landscape. Figure 2b The ruins of the Old Park Silver Mill. Figure 2c
 164 Gravestone in Wardsend Cemetery, amidst regenerated Silver Birch. Figure 2d Allotment site on
 165 Parkwood Springs. (All photographs take by Anna Jorgensen)

166

167 formed in 2010, whose aim is to “work towards improving the green space as a
 168 resource for local residents and the City”, envisioning Parkwood Springs as “our
 169 country park in the city” (Friends of Parkwood Springs). Pursuant to that aim an
 170 area of green space to the south of the site has undergone a number of recent
 171 changes, including the creation of a forest garden and a mountain biking trail.

172

173 **Part 1- Time and narrative**

174 Part 1 lays the foundation for our three narratives in Part 2 by exploring how
 175 diverse narrative forms have been used to know the past, focusing especially on

176 the role of different conceptualisations of temporality in narrative. It goes on to
177 demonstrate the relevance of these forms to a landscape context, and
178 particularly waste sites such as Parkwood Springs. A central argument of this
179 paper is that whilst such narratives seem to be retellings of the past, they are in
180 fact projective and constitutive of the future: they are part of a process of
181 becoming, shaping personal identities, environments and landscapes (Ingold,
182 2012). Thus, landscape histories and their forms determine what is significant
183 and valued in a landscape, and how that significance and value is projected into
184 the future as landscape heritage.

185

186 Ingold (2012: 7) makes this process explicit: “Perception is imaginative, then,
187 insofar as it is generative of a world that is continually coming into being with
188 and around the perceiver, in and through his or her own practices of movement,
189 gesture and inscription”. Whilst Ingold is talking about imagining, rather than
190 narrating landscape, narrative is essentially a means of articulating a particular
191 way of imagining the world. He (2012: 8) identifies (“at least”) three modes of
192 imagining the past in landscape: materialising, gestural and quotidian. The
193 materialising mode “turns the past into an object of memory to be displayed and
194 consumed as heritage”, the gestural model remembers the past “in the very
195 process of redrawing the lines and pathways of ancestral activity” and the
196 quotidian mode uses “what remains of the past” as “a basis for carrying on”.
197 These three modes of imagining the past provide the broad framework for this
198 paper, corresponding with our narratives- a conventional history, a personal
199 experiential account and an analysis based on the Sheffield Historic Landscape

200 Characterisation- combined with the landscape implications we draw from them
201 in Part 3.

202

203 The ways in which time is conceptualized and represented in a narrative are
204 fundamental to its intended meaning and purpose. There is perhaps still a
205 general perception in western thought that all human beings have the same
206 conception of time as a way of measuring duration, and ordering the sequence in
207 which things happen. However, Farago (2005: 426) writes of “the culturally and
208 historically specific nature of chronology as a western, European construct”. It
209 follows that “the past” and “the present”, inherent in the writing of history, are
210 also culturally and historically specific:

211 “history is not a fact of the world that is more or less accurately
212 represented... it is only one way for a society to constitute the past and
213 establish a relation with it. To live in history and *to wish to* write it, is not
214 a universal anthropological postulate, but it is a certain way to conceive of
215 and be in the world, and it is a certain practice of subjectivity.” (Farago,
216 2005: 426).

217 We might add that history is “a practice of subjectivity” even within and between
218 cultures that subscribe to the idea of chronology (Crouch and Parker, 2003):
219 there is no such thing as a definitive historical account.

220

221 The chronological view of time underpins the “grand narratives” associated with
222 modernity (Lyotard, 1984), which assume that progress takes a linear course,
223 each step being an extropic movement on the path towards an ever more
224 evolved and rationalised future. This notion of progression, as associated with

225 “progress”, sets historic events as the inevitable increments toward our current
226 state, thus attributing a false agency of time in the chronological narrative. As
227 Farago (2005: 427) puts it: “Chronology is a powerful and seductive rhetorical
228 apparatus, a fictive construct that masks ideology under the guise of ‘natural
229 time’”. The chronological idea of time, and the heroic narratives and explanatory
230 accounts of the world it supports, have been challenged across numerous
231 disciplines in the late 20th century.

232

233 The canonical challenge must come from Walter Benjamin’s dialectical image,
234 the vehicle he used to critique modernity in *The Arcades Project*. Set in the Paris
235 Arcades, an ideal locale from which to critique the superfluity of capitalism,
236 Benjamin used a montage of quotation and allusion to bring about revelatory
237 insights into the relationships between things and their meanings. Benjamin’s
238 sources are the “fragments of modernity” (Frisby, 1986), not its grandiose
239 expositions, but “the rags, the refuse” (Benjamin, 1999: 460), cited in Friedlander
240 (2008), the inconsequential statements, the asides. The dialectical image has its
241 own temporality outside of chronological time:

242 “This time internal to meaning should be distinguished both from the
243 objectively measurable time and from the subjective structure of the
244 experience of time. Any meaningful phenomenon has an inner life whose
245 realization is brought about by a work of expression in that present which
246 recognizes it.” (Friedlander, 2008: 21)

247

248 Within the field of art history chronological time is contrasted with anachronism.
249 Here the discussion focuses, *inter alia*, on the question of whether it is possible

250 for a later audience to understand the effect that works of art had on their
251 viewers at the time they were produced. Didi-Huberman (2005: 38) is
252 contemptuous of the idea that we can decipher the meaning of past objects:
253 “Everything past is definitively *anachronistic*:...it exists only in the
254 operations of a ‘reminiscing present,’ a present endowed with the
255 admirable or dangerous power, precisely, of *presenting* it, and in the wake
256 of this presentation, of elaborating it and representing it.”

257

258 Yet despite this definitive statement, Didi-Huberman (2005: 17) acknowledges
259 that the sheer materiality of objects does have an inherent power to move us
260 profoundly. Whilst he claims that we have lost the ability to understand Christian
261 art, the force and passion with which he writes about the visceral impact of Fra
262 Angelico’s *Annunciation* contradicts this. He implies that some objects have a
263 timeless capacity to affect us in the same way, confirmed by his assertion that the
264 experience of archaic places...is nothing other than “the physical sensation of
265 time” (Didi-Huberman, 1996: 58).

266

267 Time, narrative and history are also the main preoccupations of Marc Singer’s
268 (2003) exegesis of Ralph Ellison’s *The Invisible Man*, a novel about African-
269 American history. In the novel the protagonist wrestles with the deterministic
270 narrative chronologies of his oppressors: chronologies of progress, capitalism
271 and Marxism. These narratives are deterministic, because if we subscribe to
272 them, they define us, there is no place in them for alternative modes of thought
273 and action. The Invisible Man must learn how “different concepts of time can

274 inhibit or empower human agency and how the past exerts a continuing
275 influence on the present.” (Singer, 2003: 392–393)
276
277 Ellison (1952 quoted in Singer, 2003: 389–390) puts forward an alternative idea
278 of time: “the palimpsest: a synchronous conflation or superimposition of
279 multiple historical periods upon the present”. The Invisible Man also learns how
280 his outsider status enables him to step outside the flow of time: how to “slip into
281 the breaks and look around” (Ellison, 1952 quoted in Singer, 2003: 391) From
282 this new perspective, he learns to critique the narratives of modernity, find his
283 own sense of time, and recover his identity.
284
285 Singer (2003: 410) claims that “identity is an amalgamation of experiences over
286 time and a constant negotiation with the past”. Writing within the discipline of
287 management Hamilton (2013: 64) touches on similar themes: “narrative
288 mediates to configure (and reconfigure) our human experience of time and life
289 into narrative identities”. In exploring the narrative strategies used by different
290 entrepreneurs to describe the development of their businesses she uses three
291 time frames, derived from Czarniawska (2004): chronological, cyclical and
292 kairotic. Kairotic time is said to be “a narrative time punctuated by important
293 events, which might even run chronologically backwards.” The Kairotic time
294 frame was most frequently adopted by the entrepreneurs in telling their stories,
295 often using physical metaphors such as jumping, skipping or leaping about in
296 time (Hamilton, 2013: 70). Hamilton’s work chimes with Singer in the sense that
297 they are both concerned with the power of unconventional narratives that

298 provide “emancipatory possibilities from the compulsory nature of social and
299 cultural norms” (Hamilton, 2013: 76).

300

301 If using different time frames in narrative can be used to define personal
302 identities that support or subvert social norms, they can also be used to suggest
303 diverse landscape “becomings” (Ingold, 2012). DeSilvey (2012: 34) challenges
304 the conventional historical chronological narrative as a particular spatial and
305 temporal framing that justifies the preservation of a landscape as it appears at a
306 particular time. She asks the question of whether it is possible to “experiment
307 with other ways of storying landscape, framing histories around movement
308 rather than stasis, and drawing comparisons between past dynamism and future
309 process?”. DeSilvey adopts what she calls an “anticipatory history” (anticipatory
310 of an uncertain future), arranging a selection of present-tense narrative excerpts
311 from the past together with “auto-ethnographic anecdotes” (2012: 36) in reverse
312 chronological order to retell the story of Mullion Cove in Cornwall. Her aim is to
313 disrupt the false agency of the chronological narrative and its deterministic
314 implications for the future. Instead we see an assemblage of “past presents which
315 remain open to addition and subtraction, the process of making sense and
316 assembling story exposed” (2012: 48).

317

318 DeSilvey and others have explored narrative and its relationship with heritage
319 practice in the context of ruins and derelict landscapes. DeSilvey and Edensor
320 (2013: 15) claim that “ruins rarely lend themselves to representation in
321 seamless narratives” and call instead for approaches involving “multi-sensory”
322 engagement with these sites, physical interventions and “multivocal” narratives

323 reflecting their diverse uncertain nature. DeSilvey (2006: 335) has also claimed
324 that “the potential for ‘entropic heritage’ practice remains, for the most part,
325 untapped”. Both have also written extensively about why (unrestored) ruins and
326 dereliction invite such alternative readings and heritage practice. The decay and
327 disintegration into matter of ruins and the artifacts they contain is a central
328 theme, with DeSilvey (2006) showing how, whilst seemingly antithetical to a
329 heritage practice that is about preserving the past, decay constitutes the very
330 tangible and visceral evidence of the passage of time that is often absent from
331 museum displays and other conventional heritage forms. Ruins are also well-
332 known examples of *vanitas* (Woodward, 2002), with recent ruins especially
333 confounding the grand narratives of development, progress and civilization,
334 thereby legitimizing alternative readings of human endeavour and meaning
335 (DeSilvey and Edensor, 2013). Derelict sites are frequently layered
336 “pluritemporal” landscapes, containing evidence of many previous pasts
337 (DeSilvey and Edensor, 2013: 7). This temporal fluidity, combined with the mix
338 of nature and culture, decay and disorder often found in derelict sites, makes
339 their meanings ambivalent and difficult to distill (Jorgensen and Tylecote, 2007).
340 Hill (2013: 381) writes of the spectral or uncanny quality of postindustrial
341 landscapes, such as the sensation of smelling coal dust in a valley where mining
342 has ceased, claiming that the idea has value “because it suggests that our
343 experience of the world is haunted by a space-time in which past and future co-
344 exist, and interact, in uncertain and unpredictable ways”. All of these
345 characteristics make ruins and derelict sites “exemplary alternative sites of
346 memory”, in contrast to contemporary practices involving the commodification
347 of memory, both in and out of place (Edensor, 2005: 830). Edensor (2005) also

348 uses ghostly metaphors to characterize processes of remembering in these sites,
349 including sudden manifestations of involuntary memories evoked by their
350 sensory richness; embodied haunting in which the body is compelled by its
351 surroundings to respond to and even re-enact the habitual movements of former
352 inhabitants of the spaces; poltergeistic confrontations with the kinetic power of
353 the forces of disintegration within the ruin; together with close encounters with
354 evidence of the daily lives of the myriads of people who formerly used these sites
355 and meetings with “unidentifiable ghosts” representing uncanny “happenstance
356 montages” (2005: 844) of objects and matter.

357

358 Following this line of argument Parkwood Springs is therefore an ideal setting
359 for an examination of landscape heritage theory and practice, focusing on these
360 themes of time and narrative. Here we find the palimpsestic superimposition of
361 different historical periods and Benjamin’s (1999: 460) “rags” and “refuse”, the
362 source material for the dialectical images from which more profound insights
363 may be gained. Parkwood Springs represents one of Ralph Ellison’s “breaks”,
364 spatial as well as temporal. Parts of the landscape (especially the landfill) are
365 currently represented as blank space on maps, and parts of the site are in a sense
366 suspended between their previous uses and their future repurposing as an urban
367 park. Parkwood Springs therefore allows us to “slip into the breaks and look
368 around” (Ellison, 1952 cited in Singer, 2003: 391). From this vantage point we
369 can question the chronological narratives of authorized heritage discourse and
370 examine the alternatives.

371

372 In Part 2 of this paper we aim to illustrate and highlight the differences between
373 three narrative approaches in relation to Parkwood Springs. Presenting the three
374 accounts one after the other gives the reader a chance to experience these
375 differences, and to determine how the narratives inform, complement, duplicate,
376 subvert or detract from one other.

377

378 **Part 2 The Narratives**

379 *Narrative 1- Tracing the documentary history of Parkwood Springs*

380

381 One of the intriguing questions about Parkwood Springs is how it evolved into
382 this sprawling and disorderly enclosed “urban fringe” landscape so close to
383 Sheffield city centre. Why are the landfill site and its associated land uses located
384 here? This narrative is a conventional chronological historical account describing
385 how Parkwood Springs was transformed from a feudal landscape to an enclosed
386 post-industrial urban fringe site.

387

388 The settlement of Sheffield was founded in the 12th century by a Norman,
389 William de Lovetot, whose retainer created a sub-manor at Shirecliffe, located to
390 the south east of the current site (Walton, 1943a; Hey, 2010). By 1392 the manor
391 had passed to Sir John Mounteney (Walton, 1943b), who obtained a royal charter
392 to hunt throughout his lands, and to empark over 400 acres of land, including
393 woodland and meadow, roughly contiguous with the current site. This became
394 known as “The Old Park” and remained in existence until at least 1795, when it,
395 and Shirecliffe Hall (on the site of the original manor) are both shown in William
396 Fairbank’s *Map of the Parish of Sheffield*. Whilst The Old Park and Hall remained

397 seemingly unchanged, the industrialisation of Sheffield had begun, with several
398 mills and forges having been constructed along the course of the Don bordering
399 Parkwood Springs.

400

401 In the 1850s Parkwood Springs saw its first radical modern transformation with
402 the construction of the railway, which ran through the site, from north to south,
403 parallel with the river. However, The Old Park woodland and Hall persisted right
404 up to the early 1900s, but were then surrounded to the north by Wardsend
405 Cemetery, and to the south and east by a fringe of housing and industry along the
406 valley floor, with newly constructed terraced houses (known as Parkwood
407 Springs) climbing up the southern slopes of the site (Jones and Jones, undated).

408

409 From the 1900s onwards Parkwood Springs underwent its most profound and
410 rapid changes. In 1750 the population of Sheffield was approximately 10,000; by
411 1901 it had risen to over 450,000 (Sheffield City Council, undated b). With the
412 exception of some small patches of woodland to the far north of the site the trees
413 were felled and most of the site given over initially to extractive industry
414 (quarrying and mining), and latterly to landfill. A coal-fired electricity generating
415 power station with three enormous cooling towers was built at Wardsend in
416 1902, only to be decommissioned a mere 70 years later, and subsequently
417 demolished. A further gas generating power station was built at Neepsend, with
418 no fewer than five gas holders, four of which were later demolished. By 1940
419 extensive garden city housing estates had been built to the north and east.
420 Shirecliffe Hall was damaged by bombing during the 1939-45 war and later
421 demolished. The Parkwood Springs terraced houses were also eventually

422 knocked down in the 1970s. Around this time, the southern part of the site was
423 “landscaped”, and trees were planted. No longer used for passenger transport,
424 the railway is still deployed infrequently for goods transportation.

425

426 From this brief historical overview it seems that what initially protected
427 Parkwood Springs from wholesale development and exploitation in the 1800s
428 was its post-deer park homogenous woodland character (at a time when timber
429 was in demand, due to industrial expansion, and its importance as a source of
430 fuel for steel-working and smelting). However, as timber declined in importance
431 the extractive value of Parkwood Springs as a source of building materials and
432 fireclay led to the felling of the woodland and its exploitation for the extraction of
433 these natural resources, and as a site for gas and electricity power generation
434 close to the sites of the old water powered mills. The Victorian bye-law terraced
435 housing and industrial development filled the gap between Parkwood Springs
436 and the city centre in *circa* 1900, turning Parkwood Springs into an urban fringe,
437 but the steep terrain made housing unviable during the garden city housing
438 boom of the early 1920s and 1930s, so that this development bypassed
439 Parkwood Springs and continued Sheffield’s urban expansion to the north east,
440 turning it into an enclosed urban fringe. In this respect Sheffield’s urban
441 development, and the existence of Parkwood Springs, are explained by
442 Whitehand’s (2010) “innovation/building cycle model”, according to which
443 urban expansion occurs in waves in response to building cycles, fluctuating land
444 values and transport innovations. With each cycle the expanding urban
445 development leapfrogs the existing fringe, leading to concentric rings of urban
446 fringe inside the city.

447

448 *Narrative 2- a personal account*

449 The next narrative in the sequence is a personal account written by the first
450 named author. It was written as a spontaneous subjective description of
451 Parkwood Spings with the intention that it would form part of this paper, but
452 before the premise of the three contrasting narratives was fully developed. No
453 particular literary style was intended, but the piece has similarities to
454 psychogeography: a form of semi-autobiographical narrative writing about
455 urban ruins, derelict sites and urban fringe and other dystopian landscapes.
456 Exponents of the form include Patrick Kieller, Ian Sinclair, W.G. Sebald, and more
457 recently Jason Orton and Ken Worpole (2013) in *The New English Landscape*, and
458 Paul Farley and Michael Symmons Roberts (2011) in their book about urban
459 fringe landscapes *Edgelands*. The form has also been used previously in academic
460 writing about landscape, for example by Caitlin DeSilvey (2012), Lisa Hill (2013)
461 and Bradley Garrett (2011).

462

463 Figure 2 about here

464

465 *I find Parkwood Springs both appalling and fascinating, as well as being deeply*
466 *evocative. In February 2012, I approach it via my usual route from the south,*
467 *passing the euphemistically-named sauna, the demolition waste reprocessing yard*
468 *with its noise and dust, the vast heaps of reprocessed rubble, earth slopes and*
469 *unbelievable quantities of rubbish discarded by fly-tippers and passers-by. I feel as*
470 *though I am leaving the regulated and ordered part of Sheffield behind and*
471 *entering a kind of Wild West where anything goes. Along Club Mill Lane the ruins of*

472 *the Old Park Silver Mill are intriguing, evoking curiosity about their past, and*
473 *inviting exploration (Figure 2b). Catherine Heatherington and I stood beside this*
474 *ruin a couple of years ago, by the confluence of the rivers Don and Loxley, and*
475 *watched a flock of long-tailed tits flitting through the tree tops on the far side of*
476 *the river. I notice that the caravan installed beside the ruin has gone, though the*
477 *neat fence that was put up to demarcate the territory associated with this*
478 *temporary home remains. Just beyond the Old Park Silver Mill, further along Club*
479 *Mill Lane, and surrounded by dereliction, is a small industrial estate, packed with*
480 *small and seemingly prosperous factories and industrial units. At its far end it is*
481 *possible to see right into a metal working factory and catch glimpses of the*
482 *incandescent interiors of furnaces, and men wearing protective clothing and visors.*
483 *Somehow this sight is evocative of a pre “Full Monty”³ Sheffield, when the steel*
484 *industry was still in its heyday, and for a moment it feels as though time has*
485 *somehow left this place untouched. At the core of the site the waste is modelled into*
486 *enormous terraces and embankments, and capped with more rubble, and on the*
487 *older slopes pioneer tree species have already aggressively taken hold, forming*
488 *dense impenetrable thickets. Along the top of a whale-backed mound close to the*
489 *river someone has made an orderly row of gigantic tree stumps. I start to feel as*
490 *though I have entered a primeval territory, where the raw materials of the earth*
491 *are being crudely re-assembled into new landscapes. Just beyond the edge of the tip*
492 *is Wardsend Cemetery (Figure 2c). It has the poignancy of all disused and*
493 *overgrown cemeteries, but here that is re-enforced by its location beside the tip,*
494 *which seems to be encroaching onto the graves and memorials and obliterating*

³ A comedy-drama film from 1997 directed by Peter Cattaneo, about unemployed steel workers from Sheffield in the 1970s who decide to form a male striptease act.

495 *them. Perched above the cemetery at the northern end of the escarpment is a small,*
496 *embattled allotment site, each garden defensively re-enforced with stout but*
497 *ramshackle barriers against thieves and intruders. Through these fences, and*
498 *surrounded by the sporadic barking from the dogs protecting their owner's small*
499 *territories, I glimpse winter vegetables growing in dark earth, and pigeon lofts*
500 *(Figure 2d).*

501

502 *In March 2012 I took two colleagues (Richard Keenan and Ed Cartledge) to see*
503 *Parkwood Springs for the first time. It was pouring with rain, the hillside was*
504 *shrouded in mist, and Club Mill Lane was ankle deep in mud. Rubbish lay*
505 *everywhere. Richard noted that it was a graveyard for abandoned sofas, and*
506 *Rawson Spring (from which Parkwood Springs presumably gets the second half of*
507 *its name) was a river of refuse and discarded car tyres. During our tour we saw*
508 *only two people, a young couple in waterproofs taking a swift short cut across the*
509 *site. I tried to be enthusiastic, but thought I sensed a credibility gap opening up*
510 *between us. Although they had both lived and worked in Sheffield for many years,*
511 *neither of my colleagues had ever been to Parkwood Springs, or given it much*
512 *thought. Ed said that it was like Sheffield's collective unconscious, necessary, but*
513 *not somewhere you wanted to go.*

514

515 *On a later visit with Stephen Dobson in May 2013 the sun was shining, and there*
516 *were signs of change. Club Mill Lane had been closed beyond the industrial estate,*
517 *and shiny new barriers erected to prevent vehicular access along the future*
518 *recreational route running north beside the river. Significant tree planting had*

519 *taken place on the older slopes of the landfill site and bluebells were flowering in*
520 *the ancient woodland next to the allotments.*

521

522 *Narrative 3- Historic Landscape Character analysis*

523 Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) has its origins in the ‘post-modern
524 revision’ of archaeology theory in the 1980s (Turner 2006), which replaced
525 traditional approaches focusing primarily on the site as an evidential repository
526 that could be used to provide authoritative explanations concerning processes of
527 human adaption, subsistence and settlement at particular locations and times in
528 the past (Turner, 2006; Fairclough 2012). This shift was characterised by the
529 acceptance of a plurality of interpretations concerning the social and cultural
530 dimensions of a reciprocal and dynamic relationship between people and place,
531 and a greater emphasis on landscape perception (Fairclough 2012; Turner 2006;
532 Tilley 1994; Bender 1993).

533

534 Although rooted in an landscape archaeology narration of the past, through its
535 retrogressive approach to the identification of evidence in our present
536 surroundings, HLC is not solely a heritage management tool but moreover aims
537 to introduce a depth of temporality within the “Landscape Character turn” in
538 mainstream planning (Cheng, 2012). It represents a shift in emphasis from the
539 protection of valued landscapes through designation, to an approach for
540 managing and indeed mediating change. HLC was developed by English Heritage
541 from the mid-1990s and is a process of defining current landscape character and
542 the depth of time which may be attributed to it evidenced through map and
543 aerial photographic interpretation. Areas of consistent landscape pattern or

544 morphology are mapped and classified into types based on land use and land
545 cover. Geographic information systems are used to store, manage and present
546 the data, and whilst initially the focus was on rural landscape, more recent HLC
547 surveys, including that produced for Sheffield by South Yorkshire Archaeology
548 Service, contains full urban coverage.

549


550 HLC offers a “retrogressive narrative” (Rippon 2004) in that the starting point
551 for analysis are the morphological units in the present day landscape. In this
552 sense, the past is reconstructed through a mosaic of modern character area
553 boundaries. Each layer of landscape interpretation is established backwards
554 through time with all associated description and historical sources attributed to
555 the modern character area boundaries. In recognition of HLC’s retrogressive
556 method, and inspired by the reverse chronology of DeSilvey’s (2012)
557 anticipatory history, our analysis also works backwards from the present day.
558 Figure 3 depicts the character types currently prevailing in Parkwood Springs,
559 and in 1900, 1750 and 1400 respectively. Figure 4 explores ‘flux’: the extent to
560 which each character area has changed.

561

562 Parkwood Springs Today

563 The Parkwood Springs area is predominantly characterised through HLC as an
564 industrial space, although visually it is overwhelmingly “green” in nature due to
565 the natural succession and tree planting that has followed previous phases of
566 landfill and extraction, and the presence of some remnant ancient woodland
567 (Figure 3) that provides evidence of substantial time depth. A small light
568 industrial complex is located along the River Don at the western edge of the site

569 dating from the late 1920s/early 1930s, close to the overgrown sites of the Old
 570 Park Silver Mill and Old Park Forge. This is surrounded by landfill, which
 571 incorporates pockets of woodland and unenclosed land. On all sides, Parkwood



572
 573 **Figure 3** (clockwise from top left) The Historic Landscape Character types prevailing at the
 574 present day, and in 1900, 1750 and 1400 respectively. (All HLC plots prepared by Stephen
 575 Dobson on the basis of the Sheffield HLC dataset (SYAS, undated))

576
 577 Springs is surrounded by the extensive urban fabric of Sheffield. Neighbouring
 578 residential areas include byelaw terraced housing and inter-war garden city
 579 suburbs. There is also a long stretch of industrial metal-trades along the river
 580 Don. The HLC broad character types outline a mixture of uses from multiple
 581 time-periods; however, the general character type of the whole zone is
 582 'industrial' (SYAS). The generalised character type for this site is therefore
 583 greatly influenced by function rather than its visual appearance.

584
 585 Parkwood Springs 1900

586 The 1900s time slice (Figure 3) identifies the fringe nature of Parkwood Springs
587 at this time, as it occupies the space between Victorian urban Sheffield and the
588 neighbouring countryside. Prior to the extractive industries that characterises
589 the present day space, Parkwood Springs's green centre is predominantly
590 wooded. Some quarrying is visible at Standish Gardens, Shirecliffe, and clay
591 pits/brick works are located in the south of the study area. Terraced housing is
592 also evident in the south. Piecemeal enclosures are visible close to Shirecliffe
593 Hall. The 1900 time-slice visually captures the study area in a predominantly
594 agricultural/rural setting with many of the current land use divisions remaining
595 legible from earlier enclosed land and woodland uses.

596


597 Parkwood Springs 1750

598 The "seeds" of Sheffield's industrial presence along the Don are evident by 1750,
599 when a number of water power sites are recorded in the HLC, identifying a few
600 distinct industrial character areas. Shirecliffe Hall is present in the 1750 time
601 slice, but essentially the study area is characterised by woodland with piecemeal
602 farming enclosures immediately surrounding the hall. Small hamlets are
603 dispersed amongst a surrounding landscape of mainly surveyed Parliamentary
604 enclosures with a few unenclosed commons. The ancient spring wood to the
605 south west of the study area (next to a 17th-century farm complex) and
606 landscape of enclosed farmland indicates the nature of the landscape character
607 prior to the urban expansion visible from the 1900s.

608

609 Parkwood Springs 1400

610 The earliest time slice clearly shows that the study area is largely characterised
611 by its use as a hunting park belonging to, and surrounding, the sub manor of
612 Shirecliffe Hall. Other individual dispersed residential areas are present in the
613 form of small farm complexes and settlements. Beyond the study boundary
614 piecemeal enclosures and unenclosed commons form this predominantly
615 agricultural landscape. Water power sites are established in the Don Valley at
616 this time, reinforcing the ancient legacy of industrial activity, which characterises
617 so much of the river's course in this part of Sheffield. Ancient woodland follows
618 the watercourse along with enclosed valley floor meadows.



619
620 **Figure 4** Landscape in flux - Historic Landscape Character plot of character areas exhibiting
621 more than one change in broad character-type. (All HLC plots prepared by Stephen Dobson on
622 the basis of the Sheffield HLC dataset (SYAS, undated))

623

624 A landscape in flux

625 The amount of change evident in this area is visually captured by the HLC
626 phasing of four key time periods in Figure 3. However, as a means of
627 summarising this level of flux Figure 4 highlights the areas that have seen more
628 than one significant landscape change through time. Importantly, it is this plot
629 that illustrates the fringe nature of Parkwood Springs, situated where the most
630 changeable areas of the landscape in blue start to give way to the least
631 changeable in white. This zone closely matches the urban/rural divide upon
632 which Parkwood Springs was a fringe site in 1900. Whilst much of the area
633 defined as white in this plot is now residential, this is only a relatively recent
634 phenomenon, since for many hundreds of years prior this had always been
635 agricultural land. This position on the edge of flux may explain why, for the
636 walking companion, Parkwood Springs “felt” so much like an urban fringe.

637

638 **Part 3- Critical review of the narratives and their implications for the**
639 **planning, design and management of Parkwood Springs as landscape**
640 **heritage**

641 With its linear, (forward) chronological organisation, and the benefit of
642 hindsight, the historical narrative imparts a sense of narrative coherence,
643 authority, and the relentless march of progress in transforming Parkwood
644 Springs from a Norman Deer Park to a landscape of extraction, infrastructure,
645 industry and latterly, waste. Whilst it seems comprehensive, the narrative
646 actually roves around, picking out key events and sites for commentary at
647 different times. Different localities in Parkwood Springs are briefly illuminated
648 as they take centre stage, and then pass into obscurity again as the story moves
649 on.

650

651 The historical narrative is consistent with the deterministic narratives
652 underpinning “authorized heritage discourse”, and with Ingold’s (2012)
653 “materialising mode”. According to this some sites within Parkwood Springs
654 could be seen as suitable for conservation or restoration as conventional
655 heritage sites, e.g. the ruins of the Old Park Silver Mill on Club Mill Lane, or parts
656 of Wardsend Cemetery. “Expert” decisions would have to be taken about how to
657 remove/manage the invading vegetation, which parts to preserve/restore, which
658 period in history to foreground, and how visitors would interact with the site
659 both in terms of physical access, and interpretation. The “materialising mode”
660 would preserve the material remains into the future, but remove them from the
661 entropic processes that accompany the passage of time (Woodward, 2001;
662 DeSilvey, 2006), cutting them adrift from their temporal context. For the ruins to
663 be saved Didi-Huberman’s “physical sensation of time” must be stripped away
664 (1996: 58). The “materialising mode” would make the ruins safer, and more
665 physically accessible to a wider range of people, but some users would be
666 displaced, and some of the sites’ existing qualities would be compromised,
667 including their entropic decay with its tangle of nature and culture, their sense of
668 mystery and incompleteness; as well as their potential for personal exploration,
669 discovery, and interpretation of meaning and identity: their “heuristic opening”
670 (Didi-Huberman, 1996: 54).

671

672 The personal account is a collection of impressions of Parkwood Springs that
673 respond to the materiality of the site, but are at the same time informed by a
674 cultural landscape that is both personal and idiosyncratic, social and shared.

675 Although the account is a summary of a journey, which does have a kind of linear
676 trajectory, the various localities are, in a sense, encountered randomly. It ranges
677 over multiple temporalities, creating the possibility of what Garrett (2011) calls
678 “pluritemporal encounters”, and multiple geographic scales: the Wild West
679 frontier lands of 19th-century America, the 20th-century steel industry in
680 Sheffield before the industrial collapse of the 1970s, a primeval landscape from
681 geological time, a cemetery from the 1900s (each grave with its own story of
682 time and place) and a vegetable patch with its implied promise for the future.

683

684 Compared with the historic narrative this account implies a completely different
685 view of time in the landscape. Rather than being contained in the historical site
686 multiple and shifting overlapping temporalities and geographies are ever
687 present, crystallising momentarily through experience in a locality (Edensor,
688 2005; Massey 1993; 2005), a process referred to by DeSilvey and Edensor (2013:
689 16) as “the contingent constitution of place”. In this way we can conceive of
690 chance interactions, unforeseen juxtapositions, multiple timeframes and
691 remembering: encounters with Singer’s (2003) palimpsestic temporality and
692 Hamilton’s kairotic time (2013).

693

694 Further, conventional heritage practice tends to communicate its message to a
695 passive recipient. Sites such as Parkwood Springs, without any special status or
696 protection, can potentially facilitate a much more active, embodied, way of
697 connecting with the past. Edensor (2005: 850) refers to the ways in which the
698 materials and forms of ruinous sites constrain the body to recreate habitual and
699 familiar gestures as “possession” or “embodied haunting”. As to whether we

700 really experience “double exposure in that we walk in the past and the present
701 simultaneously” (Löfgren 2002: 42), this inherent power of an object, or of a
702 place, to induce a habitual, and possibly archetypal, physical and psychological
703 response, has echoes in Didi-Huberman’s “physical sensation of time” (1996: 58),
704 and may also subsist in the wider landscape, for example in the act of walking
705 along an ancient pathway, or up a steep hill. On the other hand, it may be that the
706 temporal force of these landscape interactions derives from their power as
707 dialectical images, whose revelatory impact connects us with the temporalities of
708 personal and shared cultures and meanings.



709

710 **Figure 5** Forest Garden at Parkwood Springs. (All photographs taken by Anna Jorgensen)

711

712 If we were to adopt Ingold’s “gestural mode” of imagining the past we would

713 focus on all of Parkwood Springs’s current uses, formal or informal, authorized

714 or unofficial. In derelict and urban fringe sites such as Parkwood Springs, as a
715 result of a lack of surveillance, and a more relaxed official attitude to the
716 enforcement of planning requirements, examples of human interaction with
717 landscape include the resourceful, destructive, flamboyant, careless and
718 downright bizarre. Whilst these can be dismissed as aberrations, contaminated
719 by the “contemptuous” landscapes they occupy (Armstrong, 2006), they can also
720 be interpreted as helping to shape a “cultural landscape”, in which people
721 inscribe their narratives on the landscape when untrammelled by more usual
722 social norms and planning restrictions. The forest garden at Parkwood Springs
723 is a rather less challenging example of how a landscape may be re-imagined and
724 re-created through the gestures of its users (Grow Sheffield, 2013) (Figure 5).
725 Following the gestural mode these uses would be seen as a potential way of
726 connecting with the past *and* as a way of shaping Parkwood Springs for the
727 future. According to this interpretation these interactions are as much part of
728 Parkwood Springs’s cultural heritage as the material historical remains and the
729 official historical narratives that might attach to them. Dobson (2012) writes
730 that: “we might consider the urban environment both as the stage upon which
731 culture is ‘performed’ and also the product of the performance; a lived
732 palimpsest of actions, the accumulation of which is the basis of tradition.”

733

734 In foregrounding the gestural mode in the planning, design and management of
735 Parkwood Springs we would, in broad terms, look for ways of enabling current
736 uses of the site to continue, and of creating the settings for new uses. These uses
737 might range from the ephemeral, contingent and improvised to the more long-
738 term, officially sanctioned and organized. It would be a case of providing a mix of

739 indeterminate and programmed spaces, with a range of variants in between, and
740 would involve making judgments about the level of intervention appropriate to
741 each locality. Such judgments involve a delicate balance between laissez-faire
742 and regulation, and, crucially, deciding which uses and users are acceptable
743 within the reimagined landscape, and which need to be regulated out.

744 Nevertheless, conceptualizing human activity and interaction with the landscape
745 as culture, or as intangible heritage, does imply that the responsibility for re-
746 imagining and continually “regenerating” Parkwood Springs should be a shared
747 one. As Laurajane Smith (2006: 31) has pointed out: “The idea of a cultural
748 landscape as heritage makes both conceptual and physical space for a wider
749 range and layering of competing values than does the idea of ‘site’”. The “gestural
750 mode” implies that users are not passive consumers but are fundamental to
751 continually imagining and shaping the landscape.

752

753 The HLC analysis is about holistic land use change, flux and the legibility of the
754 past in the present, regardless of any supposed cultural heritage “value”. As such,
755 “the site” can be reframed within an increasingly wider context, illustrating how
756 spatio-temporal boundaries are simply descriptive mechanisms that are
757 immersed in a ubiquitous landscape time (Turner, 2006) Thus in the plot from
758 1400 (Figure 3), as well as Sir John Mounteney’s deer park, we can see water
759 power sites, ancient woodland, piecemeal enclosures and small farm complexes
760 and settlements. This undermines the idea that each plot summarises an epoch
761 characterised by a particular form of land use or land use change. The picture is a
762 far more complex one of multiple forms of land use, at different scales, occurring
763 simultaneously within different “trajectories of change” (Turner, 2006: 395).

764

765 The spatially comprehensive nature of HLC analysis provides a valuable
766 alternative to the boundedness of the historical site implicit in “authorized
767 heritage discourse” (Laurajane Smith 2006). Although character types are
768 inevitably only a schematic interpretation of some aspects of landscape typology
769 they help to suggest the existence of the complex temporal and spatial
770 interrelationships inherent in landscape and place (DeSilvey and Edensor, 2013;
771 Massey 1993, 2005). Fairclough (2003) refers to HLC as “a framework for
772 decision-making about change and management” and Dobson and Selman
773 (2012) claim that it can help overcome the binary between “conservation and
774 change” by seeing the whole landscape as a repository of time-depth, and by
775 valorizing non-expert opinions as to the meaning and significance of this time
776 depth.

777

778 However, whilst the Sheffield HLC is theoretically accessible to all via a public
779 web site (SYAS, undated), information is difficult to access without prior
780 knowledge and technical skill. Moreover, HLC has been critiqued on the grounds
781 that the processes involved in creating the spatial datasets and their
782 accompanying descriptions are reductive and flawed, and that it is suffused with
783 a top-down ideology of landscape change to smooth the way for development
784 (Williamson, 2007: 103): “It privileges top-down users and centralised
785 authorities and it consequently disempowers communities and their connections
786 to the landscape”. It can also be said that HLC replaces the chronological
787 pseudo-objectivity of the historical narrative with a Cartesian one, privileging
788 morphology over the fine grain of the landscape (Austin, 2007).

789

790 From our perspective as “landscape experts” we assert that whilst the HLC
791 analysis broadly concurs with the historical narrative in identifying Parkwood
792 Springs as a surviving surrounded urban fringe, it also underscores aspects of
793 Parkwood Springs as heritage that would not be revealed through a conventional
794 site-based heritage approach. Despite its characteristics of waste and dereliction,
795 as a surrounded urban fringe Parkwood Springs is an important part of
796 Sheffield’s urban heritage, being emblematic of Sheffield’s urban development
797 and expansion, “the historical grain of the city” Whitehand (2010: 38-39). What
798 is perhaps more remarkable is that, paradoxically, and despite all the change and
799 abuse it has seen, its essential character of wooded parkland (or medieval deer
800 park), has endured: in this case change has not been inimical to time-depth in
801 landscape, or to heritage.

802

803 In this instance the HLC helps to reveal the intangible quality of landscape
804 heritage at Parkwood Springs, demonstrating that it does not reside purely in
805 historical material remains or in small-scale spatial configurations of terrain and
806 vegetation. At Parkwood Springs there is a quality that seems to permeate the
807 entire landscape. Dobson and Selman (2012: 2) use the term “remanence” to
808 describe this, and assert that “By working with the remanence of broad temporal
809 processes, rather than isolated “snapshots” of remnants in time and space, it is
810 possible that a more comprehensive and inclusive location of the genius loci of a
811 place can be promoted”. On the other hand, HLC may also help to draw attention
812 to small-scale disregarded or undervalued “remnants”, and to emphasize

813 linkages and networks rather than individual sites (Dobson 2011; Dobson and
814 Selman, 2012).

815

816 Thus if we were to use the HLC in a quotidian mode of imagining the past at
817 Parkwood Springs (Ingold, 2012), we might choose to work with some of the
818 “broad temporal processes” (Dobson and Selman, 2012) that it identifies. As we
819 have seen Parkwood Springs has many histories including Deer Park, woodland,
820 and site of power generation for Sheffield. These histories “anticipate” a series of
821 possible alternative or complementary futures for Parkwood Springs (for
822 example: venue for extreme sports, productive woodland; or water, wind or
823 biomass power generation) (DeSilvey, 2012). We can therefore use the HLC to
824 explore where time-depth in the wider landscape resides (as remnant,
825 remanence or network) and how this might inform heritage practice.

826

827 **Conclusion**

828 Whilst a more benign future for Parkwood Springs seems assured, many
829 unanswered questions remain. Can Parkwood Springs’s qualities of mystery,
830 danger, laissez-faire and decay survive the transformation process? Should one
831 particular vision of Parkwood Springs prevail or is the site large and complex
832 enough to enable its multiplicity of histories and meanings to be retained?
833 Should the material traces of past land use be restored and interpreted, or
834 should the process of entropy take its course? Will Parkwood Springs become
835 frozen in park time, or will its history of adaption and change be allowed to
836 continue? The processes of landscape and heritage planning, design and
837 management involve making choices between numerous landscape narratives,

838 including the official, entrepreneurial, communal or personal. We accept that
839 there is an irony in a paper critiquing “expert” narratives of landscape, which
840 only contains narratives written by “experts”. Nevertheless, despite this
841 limitation, we believe that, through this critical examination of our three
842 narrative strands, we have opened up new conceptual ground that will enable
843 greater sensitivity and reflexivity towards site narratives on the part of those
844 individuals and agencies involved in imagining landscape futures, and provide a
845 greater range of possibilities in landscape and heritage planning, design and
846 management. Whist the paper has focused on an urban waste site we believe the
847 findings are relevant to landscape in general. Our paper also implies that further
848 experimentation with storying landscape in landscape scholarship and research
849 is needed. Our analysis reinforces the need for an awareness of the sheer
850 diversity of narratives entangled in landscape and the many forms they can take.
851 It highlights their underlying epistemologies and values, and their implications
852 in terms of what the narratives valorize in the landscape. It points towards
853 landscape and heritage strategies involving performativity and change, as
854 opposed to static representations of the past. It suggests possibilities for the co-
855 production of landscape by bodies and agencies that go far beyond “public
856 consultation”. Landscape is full of stories, and there are many different ways of
857 telling them. This paper highlights the need for approaches to landscape and
858 heritage that work with this complexity.

859

860 **References**

861 Armstrong H (2006) Time, dereliction and beauty: an argument for 'landscapes
862 of contempt'. In: *International Federation of Landscape Architecture Conference*
863 *papers 2006*. Available at: www.aila.org.au/lapapers/conferences/2006-01.htm
864 (accessed 2 March 2012)
865

866 Aldred O and Fairclough G (2003) *Historic Landscape Characterisation Taking*
867 *Stock of the Method The National HLC Review 2002*. Bristol, UK: Somerset County
868 Council, English Heritage.
869

870 Austin D (2007) Character or caricature. *Landscapes* 2: 92-105.
871

872 Bender B (ed) (1993) *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg.
873

874 Benjamin W (1999) *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University
875 Press.
876

877 Berger A (2007) *Drosscape: wasting land in urban America*. New York: Princeton
878 Architectural Press.
879

880 Brun M, Di Pietro F and Bonthoux S (In press) Residents' perceptions and
881 valuations of urban wastelands are influenced by vegetation structure. *Urban*
882 *Forestry & Urban Greening*.
883

884 Cheng H (2012) *The Landscape Character Turn: an examination of experience in*
885 *the UK and Taiwan*. PhD thesis, Department of Landscape Architecture,
886 University of Sheffield, UK.
887
888 Crouch D and Parker G (2003) Digging-up Utopia? Space, practice and land use
889 heritage. *Geoforum* 34: 395–408.
890
891 Council of Europe (2000) *European Landscape Convention*. Available at:
892 <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/heritage/landscape/> (accessed on 1
893 November 2016).
894
895 Czarniawska B (2004) *Narratives in Social Science Research*. London: Sage.
896
897 Department for Communities and Local Government. (2012) *National Planning*
898 *Policy Framework*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government.
899
900 DeSilvey C (2006) Observed decay: telling stories with mutable things. *Journal of*
901 *Material Culture* 11(3): 318–338.
902
903 DeSilvey C (2012) Making sense of transience: an anticipatory history. *Cultural*
904 *Geographies* 19: 31–54.
905
906 DeSilvey C and Edensor T (2013) Reckoning with ruins. *Progress in Human*
907 *Geography* 37(4): 465–485.
908

909 Didi-Huberman G (1996) The Supposition of the aura: the now, the then, and
910 modernity. In: Francis R (ed) *Negotiating Rapture the Power of Art to Transform*
911 *Lives*. Chicago: The Museum of Contemporary Art, pp.48–63.
912

913 Didi-Huberman G (2005) *Confronting Images Questioning the Ends of a Certain*
914 *History of Art*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
915

916 Dobson S (2011) Sustaining place through community walking initiatives.
917 *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1(2):
918 109–121.
919

920 Dobson S (2012) Managing urban change: the culturally sustainable city – ‘a
921 daunting task’. *The Historic Environment: Policy and Practice* 3(2): 179–184.
922

923 Dobson S and Selman P (2012) Applying Historic Landscape Characterization in
924 spatial planning: from remnants to remanence. *Planning Practice and Research*
925 27(4): 459–474.
926

927 Edensor T (2005) The ghosts of industrial ruins: ordering and disordering
928 memory in excessive space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23:
929 829–849.
930

931 Fairbank W (1795) *A Map of the Parish of Sheffield in the County of York*.
932

933 Fairclough G J (2003) 'The long chain': archaeology, historical landscape
934 characterization and time depth in the landscape". In Palang, H and Fry G (eds)
935 *Landscape Interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscapes*. Dordrecht,
936 Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.295–317.
937
938 Fairclough G (2012) A prospect of time: interactions between landscape
939 architecture and archaeology. In Bell S, Sarlov-Herlin I and Stiles R (eds)
940 *Exploring the boundaries of Landscape Architecture*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.83–
941 114.
942
943 Farley P and Symmons Roberts M (2011) *Edgelands Journeys into England's True*
944 *Wilderness*. London: Jonathan Cape.
945
946 Farago C (2005) Response: Time out of Joint., *Art Bulletin* 87(3): 424–429.
947
948 Friedlander E (2008) The Measure of the Contingent: Walter Benjamin's
949 Dialectical Image. *boundary 2* 35: 3.
950
951 Frisby D (1986) *Fragments of Modernity: Theories of Modernity in the Work of*
952 *Simmel, Kracauer, and Benjamin*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
953
954 Friends of Parkwood Springs (Undated) Available at: <http://www.Parkwood>
955 [Springs-springs.btck.co.uk](http://www.ParkwoodSprings-springs.btck.co.uk) (accessed: 26 July 2013).
956

957 Gandy M (2013) Marginalia: Aesthetics, ecology, and urban wastelands. *Annals of*
958 *the Association of American Geographers*, 103(6): 1301–1316.

959

960 Garrett BL (2011) Assaying History: creating temporal junctions through urban
961 exploration. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29: 1048–1067.

962

963 Grow Sheffield (2013) Join *the Multi-faith forest garden at Parkwood Springs*.

964 Available at:

965 <http://growsheffield.com/join-the-multi-faith-forest-garden-at-Parkwood>
966 [Springs-springs/](http://growsheffield.com/join-the-multi-faith-forest-garden-at-Parkwood) (accessed: 29 July 2013).

967

968 Hamilton E (2013) *Entrepreneurship Across Generations*. Cheltenham: Edward
969 Elgar.

970

971 Harrison A (2006) *National Land Use Database: Land Use and Land Cover*
972 *Classification Version 4.4, (App. A)*. Norwich: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

973

974 Harrison R (2015) Beyond ‘natural’ and ‘cultural’ heritage: toward an ontological
975 politics of heritage in the age of anthropocene. *Heritage & Society* 8(1): 24–42.

976

977 Heritage Lottery Fund (2013) *Landscape Conservation Action Plan (LCAP)*
978 *Guidance*. Available at: [https://www.hlf.org.uk/landscape-conservation-action-](https://www.hlf.org.uk/landscape-conservation-action-plan)
979 [plan](https://www.hlf.org.uk/landscape-conservation-action-plan) (accessed 1 November 2016).

980

981 Heritage Lottery Fund (2017) *Community Heritage*. Available at:

982 <https://www.hlf.org.uk/looking-funding/what-we-fund/community-heritage>
983 (Accessed 3 March 2017)
984
985
986 Hey D (2010) *A History of Sheffield*. Lancaster: Carnegie.
987
988 Hill L (2013) Archaeologies and geographies of the post-industrial past:
989 landscape, memory and the spectral. *cultural geographies* 20(3): 379–396.
990
991 Ingold T (2012) Introduction. In *Imagining Landscapes Past, Present and Future*
992 Janowski M Ingold T (eds) Farnham, UK: Ashgate, pp.1-18.
993
994 Jones M and Jones J (Undated) *Parkwood Springs From Deer Park to Country*
995 *Park?* Available at: <http://www.Parkwood Springs-springs.btck.co.uk/NewsInfo>
996 (accessed 29 July 2013).
997
998 Jorgensen A and Tylecote M (2007) Ambivalent landscapes - wilderness in the
999 urban interstices. *Landscape Research* 32(4): 443-462.
1000
1001 Löfgren O (2002) Landscapes of the Mind. In: *Landscape Architecture in*
1002 *Scandinavia: Projects from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland and Iceland*. Topos,
1003 Munchen: Callwey Verlag, and Berlin: Birkhäuser..
1004
1005 Lyotard J (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: a Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis:
1006 University of Minnesota Press.

1007

1008 Massey D (1993) Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In: Bird J
1009 Putman BCT Robertson G and Tickner L (eds) *Mapping the Future: Local Cultures,*
1010 *Global Change.* London: Routledge, pp.60-70.

1011

1012 Massey D (2005) *For Space.* London: Sage Publications.

1013

1014 Orton J and Worpole K (2013) *The New English Landscape.* London: Field Station.

1015

1016 Potteiger M and Purinton J (1998) *Landscape Narratives: Design Practice for*
1017 *Telling Stories.* Hoboken: Wiley.

1018

1019 Rippon S (2004) *Historic Landscape Analysis: Deciphering the Countryside.*
1020 London: Council for British Archaeology.

1021

1022 Sheffield City Council (2009) *Sheffield Local Plan.* Available at:

1023 <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/planning-and-city-development/planning->

1024 <documents/local-plan.html>

1025 (accessed 26 July 2013).

1026

1027 Sheffield City Council (Undated a) *City Sites- Preferred Options.* Available at:

1028 http://sheffieldconsult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/sdfcsites/cspo/city_sites_-

1029 preferred_options?pointId=chapter_47 (accessed 26 July 2013).

1030

1031 Sheffield City Council (Undated b) *Population and Health.* Available at:

1032 [https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/sheffield-profile/population-](https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/sheffield-profile/population-and-health.html)
1033 [and-health.html](https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/your-city-council/sheffield-profile/population-and-health.html) (accessed 29 July 2013).
1034
1035 Singer M (2003) 'A slightly different sense of time': palimpsestic time in *Invisible*
1036 *Man. Twentieth Century Literature* 49(3): 388–419.
1037
1038 Smith Laurajane (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.
1039
1040 South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) (Undated) *South Yorkshire Historic*
1041 *Environment Characterisation*. Available at:
1042 <http://sytimescapes.org.uk/home#timeslice> (accessed 29 July 2013)
1043
1044 Tilley C Y (1994) *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments*.
1045 Oxford: Berg.
1046
1047 Turner S (2006) Historic Landscape Characterisation: a landscape archaeology
1048 for research, management and planning. *Landscape Research* 31:4 385–398.
1049
1050 Walton M (1943a) Shirecliffe Hall. *Transactions of the Hunter Archaeological*
1051 *Society* 15: 53–60.
1052
1053 Walton M (1943b) The Three Darnall Halls. *Transactions of the Hunter*
1054 *Archaeological Society* 15: 126–130.
1055

1056 Whitehand J (2010) Urban morphology and historic urban landscapes. In: van
1057 Oers R and Haraguchi S (eds) *Managing Historic Cities UNESCO World Heritage*
1058 *Papers 27*. Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre, pp. 35–43.
1059
1060 Whitehand JWR and Gu K (2010) Conserving urban landscape heritage: a
1061 geographical approach. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2(5): 6948–6953.
1062
1063 Williamson T (2007) Historic Landscape Characterisation: some queries.
1064 *Landscapes* 2: 64-71.
1065
1066 Winter T (2013) Clarifying the critical in critical heritage studies. *International*
1067 *Journal of Heritage Studies* 19(6): 532-545.
1068
1069 Woodward C (2001) *In Ruins*. London: Chatto & Windus.
1070
1071 Wu Z and Hou S (2015) Heritage and Discourse. In: Waterton E and Watson S
1072 (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. London:
1073 Palgrave Macmillan, pp.37-51.
1074