

PLANARCH 2

ACTION 3A

MINISTRY OF THE WALLOON REGION (BELGIUM)

Impact Studies and Consideration of Cultural Heritage

**MARIE-JEANNE GHENNE
MARTINE SOUMOY**

2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. *Territory concerned by the study*
2. *Conduct of the study*
3. *Walloon legislation and European directives*

II. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS CRITERIA

1. *Limits of the study*
2. *Consultation of files*
3. *Selection of cases*

III. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

1. *Quality of the analysis of the study and impact on the heritage*

- A. Archaeology**
- B. Monuments**
- C. Landscapes**

2. *Quality of recommendations on the heritage in the summary table*

IV. CONCLUSION

1. *Study and analysis*

- A. Archaeology**
- B. Monuments**
- C. Landscapes**

2. *State of the question*

V. RECOMMENDATIONS AT REGIONAL LEVEL

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES I

- Map of Belgium (Wallonia, Flanders, Brussels)
- Map of Wallonia with the five provinces
- Walloon Regional Council Decree of 11 September 1985
- Decree of 11 March 1999 relative to the environmental permit
- Decree of 4 July 2002 (known as the "EIA decree"), amended on 22 January 2004
- List of decrees or ordinances in force in Wallonia since European Directive 85/337/EEC of 1985.

APPENDICES II

- Collection of technical data sheets

MINISTRY OF THE WALLOON REGION (BELGIUM)

PLANARCH 2 – INTERREG IIIB –

**Action 3 A
Impact Studies and Consideration of the Natural Heritage**

MARIE-JEANNE GHENNE

MARTINE SOUMOY

I. INTRODUCTION

1. *Territory concerned by the study*

The territory taken into consideration is Wallonia (i.e. 16 844 km²) comprising five provinces: Walloon Brabant, Hainaut, Liège, Luxembourg and Namur, so as to obtain a significant sample of the entire region.

4. *Conduct of the study*

The file examination and analysis work by two archaeologists from the Ministry of the Walloon Region, DGATLP, Direction de Hainaut I, under the Planarch 2-Interreg III B project, in addition to their ordinary professional occupation.

5. *Walloon legislation and European directives: general approach*

European Directive 1985/337/EC concerning the impact of certain public and private projects on the environment led very rapidly to the enactment of a Walloon Regional Council Decree although the actual regionalisation had not been definitively completed yet.

This is the decree of 11 September 1985, "organisant l'évaluation des incidences sur l'environnement en Région wallonne". Referring to Article 2 (Title I) of said decree, it becomes apparent why the legislator integrated fully the stakes concerned by the European directive, as it stipulates:

- *to protect and improve the quality of life and living conditions of the population, so as to provide a healthy, safe and pleasant environment;*
- *to manage the living environment and natural resources in such a way as to conserve their qualities and make a rational and judicious use of their potential;*
- *to establish a balance between human needs and the living environment so as to provide sustainable enjoyment of suitable living conditions and environment for the entire population.*

To this are added the provisions of Article 8 (Title II):

...the impact assessment, whether the environmental impact statement or the impact study, identifies, describes and evaluates in an appropriate manner, according to each particular case, the direct and indirect effects in the short, medium or long term of the establishment and update of the project on:

1° man, flora and fauna;

2° the soil, water, air, climate and landscape;

3° property and the cultural heritage;

4° the interaction between the factors mentioned under 1°, 2° and 3° of this paragraph.

The Walloon authorities therefore included very rapidly not only the natural factors but also the human and cultural heritage factors by underscoring the ties that bind them.

It is worth pointing out that these provisions antedate by about six years the decree of 18 July 1991, "relatif aux sites et découvertes archéologiques et intégré dans le Code wallon de l'Aménagement du Territoire, du Logement et du Patrimoine".

In 1988, three years after the first European Directive on impact studies and by virtue of the first Walloon decree on impact studies, an advisory committee was formed: the CWE (Conseil wallon de l'environnement), later to become the CWEDD (Conseil wallon de l'environnement pour le développement durable) with competencies in particular on¹:

- impact and approval studies;
- "plan d'environnement pour le développement durable" (PEDD), revised every five years, which has defined the guidelines for decisions by the public authorities since 1994
- plans ("plans de secteur et plans communaux d'aménagement"). Since 1998.

From 1985 to 2005, an impressive series of decrees and ordinances have been enacted chiefly for internal organisation reasons between the departments of regional planning and of natural resources, or according to amendments of the European directive in 1997 and in 2003.

Overall, the decree of 11 September 1985 was amended by that of 11 March 1999 relative to the environmental permit of 1 October 2002 and was implemented by the decrees of 2 and 15 May 2003. The Walloon Government decree of 4 July 2002 "organisant l'évaluation des incidences sur l'environnement dans la Région wallonne" was amended by the decree of 22 January 2004 "arrêtant la liste des projets soumis à études d'incidences".

Class	Former procedure (1988-2002)	Current procedure (since 1 October 2002, in force since 15 May 2003)
-------	---------------------------------	--

1	Regional planning, large transport infrastructures and facilities and dams	Regional planning, town planning, business activities and free-time activities
2	Regional planning, average scope of projects in particular infrastructure and facilities and regional planning and free-time activities	Infrastructure projects, including transport and communication
3	Regional planning, town planning	Mines and quarries
4	Mines and quarries	Industrial processes relative to energy
5	Industrial processes relative to energy	Industrial processes for the transformation of materials
6	Industrial processes for the transformation of materials	Waste management
7	Waste treatment and storage	Water management (training, purification, distribution and treatment)
8	Farming permits	Farming permits

¹ CWEDD, Report on Activities, 2003, p. 10.

Nevertheless, the decree of 11 September 1985 and the ordinance of 4 July 2002, amended in January 2004 (hereinafter referred to as the EIA decree) are the basic legislative texts².

Article 7 of the EIA decree defines the form and minimum content of impact studies by referring to Annex II of the decree.

II. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS CRITERIA

1. *Limits of the study*

Overall, the methodology applied is compliant with the note sent in March 2004 by J. Williams (Kent County Council), Leader. It was necessarily adapted and revised according to the human resources placed at the disposal of the study in Wallonia, as the survey was conducted by external experts in England, the Netherlands and Germany (the Universities of Manchester, Amsterdam and Coblenz respectively).

An analysis grid was designed on the File Maker Pro 5 database for the systematic data entry and the requests concerned by the study.

The survey is geared to the overall cultural heritage comprising archaeology, monuments and landscapes. Particular importance was given to the archaeological heritage in the conclusions and recommendations owing to the aim of the Planarch 2 project, but also because of the intangible and more vulnerable nature of the matter.

The part devoted to the real follow-up and application of the recommendations could not be broached because of time limitations and the reduced human resources. That would have required another type of survey, inventorying the town planning permits issued and analysing the consideration and scope of the recommendations.

There is no summary document on this topic, in fact, as it is not a stipulated requirement of the process (L. LANGSTAFF et A. BOND, 2002).

2. *Consultation of files*

The files were consulted at the Ministry of the Walloon Region:

- la Direction générale des Ressources naturelles (DGRNE), Division de la Prévention et des Autorisations (DPA) des directions de Mons et de Charleroi ;
- à la Direction générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire, du Logement et du Patrimoine (DGATLP).
 - o Division de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Urbanisme, Direction de l'Aménagement local et des Directions de Hainaut I et II ;

They were consulted at Liège, the CWEDD in the premises of Conseil économique et social de la Région wallonne (CESRW).

The dispersion of the dossiers is not only due to the different provinces but also to the different departments or qualified authorities that deal with the files according to their degree of competence.

² CWEDD, Approval of authors of impact studies in the Walloon Region, 2003, p. 2.

3. Selection of cases

According to the CWEDD Report on Activities 2004, 819 opinions have been given by the Council since 1988, of which 279 from 1999 to 2003. There was an increase in 2004 (128 dossiers).

A choice was made in the survey according to the chronological bracket imposed on all partners by the common study, i.e. from 1999 to 2003.

For practical reasons for consultation or by strategic choice, previous or subsequent files were examined. These are exceptional cases however that do not risk affecting the study, as the predefined chronological bracket constitutes the best sample represented (84 files out of 100, i.e. 35% of the files examined between 1999 and 2003 by the CWEDD).

This flexible approach has also been applied in England, apparently for different reasons.

Furthermore, it seemed interesting to consult some more recent files covering the year 2004 (11) so as to take stock of any progress in the consideration of heritage.

Eighteen (18) different consulting firms were inventoried for the one hundred cases examined.

The years examined ranged from 1997 to 2004:	1997: 2
	1998: 3
	1999: 10
	2000: 13
	2001: 21
	2002: 18
	2003: 22
	2004: 11

The files were also chosen according to the province, so that there is telling representation of each of them. The files from the provinces of Liège and Hainaut, more important in terms of area and number of projects, are in the majority. The province of Hainaut is more widely represented than the others for practical reasons to do with the consultation of files.

Provinces:	Brabant:	14
	Hainaut:	39
	Liège :	25
	Namur :	14
	Luxembourg:	8

The scope and nature of the project, as well as their potential impact on the heritage also played a role in the selection.

Of the one hundred cases examined, the areas concerned by a project range from 2 hectares (building plot) to 85 ha with a low peak of 0.04 ha (establishment of a waste zone) and a high peak of 850 ha for a revision of the master plan (EES).

The project concerned comprise :

- 31 building plots ;
- 11 Municipal Plans ;
- 8 quarries ;
- 7 farms ;
- 7 revisions of the master plan
- 6 Aeolian parks,

A perusal of the impact studies clearly shows that consulting firms are grudging when it comes to the archaeological heritage, and that the poor understanding of the matter is probably due to a lack of information.

We have thus made a certain number of observations that could have elicited an immediate response on the part of an archaeology expert:

- “exposure of lands with risk of erosion;”
- “a serious modification of the relief of the soil;”
- “serious pressure on the subsoil (wind pumps);”
- “a relatively sizeable volume of rubble and debris (rubblework, possible buried reservoirs) that have to be evacuated.

These notes extracted from the impact studies show that the notion of impact on excavated vestiges is poorly integrated and that the effects can be treacherous (erosion, ammonia percolation, etc.) At times, the damage is altogether foreseeable, when the relief of the soil is modified or when sizeable rubble is expected from the works.

Furthermore, the impact on the subsoil (expropriated ground, excavation and pressure) from the installation of wind pumps has not yet been fully integrated and the analyses are geared primarily to the impact on the landscape, whereas it should be borne in mind that the installation of a wind pump, aside from the expropriated ground, requires an excavation of at least 290 m³.

When we examine certain means and resources on the geological (cuts) or geotechnical (core boring) front, we can only deplore the lack of concerted action inasmuch that the archaeologists, having been previously involved, could benefit from these studies. Further to an in-depth geotechnical study, it was even noted that “it would be interesting to determine the thickness of less consistent superficial formations,” and archaeologists could once again be brought in to play their role.

These cited notes are not anecdotal, but point in particular to a lack of understanding for the archaeologist’s work and the specific nature of the task.

B. Monuments

Written sources on monuments were consulted in 79 out of 100 cases. Twenty-seven (27) out of the 100 cases were mapped.

Listed monuments belong to a category of real property⁴ with a legal status and consequently, the decisions to be taken are more transparent and must be included in a well defined procedure. This observation had already been made by L. LANGSTAFF and A. BOND (2002), in the SUIT project. This rationale applies also to listed cites (which may have landscape value). If they are concerned by the project, a specialist will certainly have his say in the final decision-making when the permit is implemented.

Protection is less guaranteed as regards properties on the Inventory of the Monumental Heritage of Belgium, insofar as they do not enjoy legal protection.

The monumental heritage is taken into account in 83 cases out of 100, and the recommendations are made on 10 out of the 83. This figure may seem quite low, perhaps because it was possible to discard any danger of impact on a visible heritage item.

It is also worth underscoring that confusion regularly arises between the environmental built area, the monumental heritage proper, and even the notion of landscape. It is

⁴ A. BOND et al., 2004, p.44

worth bearing in mind that we have taken into account only the monumental heritage, protected by a legal status, or by case law in force, such as the inventory of monuments.

C. Landscape

Written sources on landscapes were consulted in 81 cases out of 100. Fifty-six cases out of 100 were mapped.

The studies for landscapes are relatively complete but characterised by a traditional approach comprising geology, geography, agronomy, ecology and often of visual perception and quality criteria. The characterisation and historical identification of the landscape, as well as the links between man and nature, as evoked at the Florence Convention in 2000, are rarely raised. Nevertheless, 92 cases out of 100 were taken into account, accompanied by 85 landscape recommendations out of 92. This observation is significant for the attention paid to landscapes.

2. *Quality of recommendations on the heritage in the summary table*

There is no in-depth study nor detailed analysis in most cases, and information most often continue to be administrative, without scientific reasoning. Consequently, specific exhortations from the archaeological point of view are all too rare in final conclusions, i.e. in the summary table of recommendations or even in the non-technical summary geared to a wider public.

The archaeological heritage was taken into account in 42 cases out of 100, followed by 27 archaeological recommendations out of 42.

As regards intrusive and non-intrusive exploration, there is no upstream impact study because there is no consultation -- at the heritage level in any event -- on the choice of selected area.

A non-intrusive exploration is at times organised during the study but the files examined do now show that an evaluation was conducted during the study.

This does not mean either that this is never done in Wallonia (in particular near the Mons/Spiennes site, entered on the world heritage list). Nevertheless, the interventions are customarily carried out at another stage, often in connection with the town planning permit or through certain preferential contacts with consulting firms or public planners (such as the "Intercommunales"). Interventions at the town planning permit stage can be explained by the fact that the applicant is not ready -- as the legislation does not require it -- to finance the opening of the ground. The issue of the availability of the ground, rarely settled at the time of the impact study, also arises, in that rental would drive the cost of the operation considerably higher.

This procedure has arisen in particular in Hainaut province (at Mouscron and Estaimpuis during the creation of a shopping centre or in Enghien during the establishment of an industrial estate).

It may however occur, altogether exceptionally, that a planner, made aware by the municipality, itself attentive to the proximity of a prestigious archaeological site, finance the archaeological work (for example in Antoing in the province of Hainaut during the expansion of a quarry next to a Roman tumulus).

As we have already underscored, the overall quality of the information from documents made available is largely insufficient, from the heritage point of view, even for the non-initiated: the studies and analyses are poor, the recommendations virtually non-existent.

Legislation is theoretically applied, but the survey conducted is ineffective as it is neither analysed nor interpreted or taken over by a specialist in the heritage field. Consequently, documents submitted by the consulting firm on heritage are rarely contested by the competent authorities and department, because they meet formally the dictates of Annexes I and II of the Walloon Government Decree of 4 July 2002 ("Moniteur Belge" [Official Gazette] of 21 September 2002). Nevertheless, with regard to heritage, they do not achieve the aim of an impact study, i.e. the possibility to take a decision with knowledge of the facts.

IV. CONCLUSION

1. Study and analysis

Based on the list of recommended steps for an impact study by the European Directive 1997, made compulsory by the Walloon Government Decree of 4 July 2002, Article 7, Annex II, out of the 100 cases studied, most can be certified to have been scrupulously followed, all the more so as a verification is conducted by the CWEDD in particular. The points concerning the announcement of the decision, the advisability of lodging an appeal, and the monitoring after the decision, could not be broached as we have pointed out above.

Whereas every point of the procedure is followed, we must reiterate that the quality of the contents, its analysis, and even its conclusions are rarely satisfactory for the heritage, because of the 100 cases examined, 40 studies covered all three areas: archaeology, monuments and landscapes.

In none of the cases were specialists, at least on heritage, consulted on the choice of site selected upstream. Even the Department of Regional Planning of the Ministry of the Walloon Region was rarely consulted, aside from the case of public plans or the installation of wind pumps for which informal prior consultation did take place, as did a joint discussion with the planner, based on an exclusion map drawn up by the Standing Conference on Territorial Development (known by the French initials CPDT).

The question as to whether non specialists take decisions on cultural matters must be qualified depending on the subject broached.

A. Archaeology

As regards archaeology, only the Department of Archaeology of the Ministry of the Walloon Region of the province concerned by the project, or more rarely, local archaeological societies are asked, and we have noted that they are mutually exclusive: they are never consulted simultaneously.

Most of the answers given are therefore purely administrative: presence or absence of vestiges and legal recommendations. As a management and public service body, the Department has neither the tool (an exhaustive inventory) nor the human resources to deal with the matter in a more accomplished way.

B. Monuments

For the monuments, the studies refer directly to the existing indexes (listed monuments or inventory of the monumental heritage of Belgium). Nevertheless, it is advisable to specify that the list of listed properties, most often consulted on the Internet, is not updated, that the list of exceptional properties modified every three years is not correctly disseminated, and that moreover the Inventory of the monumental heritage of

Belgium (a tool for information, but with no legal value) is not systematically analysed. This means that the built heritage with a historical and/or archaeological value, in principle more tangible and better indexed, also suffers from incomplete studies.

C. Landscapes

According to the number of cases examined, still with regard to heritage in general (archaeology-monuments-landscapes) only landscape specialists are consulted (geographers, geologists, agronomical engineers, ecologists, physicists, etc.).

2. *State of the question*

In view of the research carried out, and even if the targeted quality is far from achieved as far as taking heritage into account is concerned, it is nonetheless clear that the studies are getting more precise and more exhaustive, that the teams of specialists are increasing, and that important progress has been registered in recent years on heritage topics broached.

Considerable variants have also been registered among the different consulting firms, the still restricted number of which in Wallonia is to be deplored. Their number having remained stable for years, went up slightly in 2004 (there were 63 as at 5 January 2005).⁵ On the other hand, the authors have become more specialised, as there were 16% qualified authors for a single category.⁶

We have also noted that the Walloon region adapted rapidly to the European directives on the environment. The serie of governmental decrees attests as much, as does the introduction of a particular procedure for closer consultation between environmental issues and regional planning (single permit).

Although not quantified in this study and even if the situation is far from optimal because it occurs beyond the initial analyses and decisions, a general archaeological clause features among the requirements for a town planning permit.

As we have already underscored, this is explained in particular by the fact that the “planner pays” principle does not apply in the Walloon Region, and consequently, at the present time, any intrusive method in an impact study will not be well received by investors.

Nevertheless, although there is still a malaise concerning the heritage approach, we have noted that it comes both from the poor integration of archaeologists in the regional procedures on impact studies but also, perhaps, from the persisting vagueness of the very definition of heritage in European directives, as similar difficulties arise in the partner regions of the Planarch project which could be due not only to the different local perceptions of the regulation but also to the subsidiarity principle.⁷

Furthermore, as J. Teller and A. Bond (2002)⁸ rightly underscore, there is a significant gap between the legal obligations and methodological tools. This difficulty will probably have to be overcome at local, regional or national level. Archaeologists will have to put forward a credible analysis method, the first step of which is the reference to a well structured, fast, and efficient inventory, accompanied by efficient cartographic links (SIG) whether on archaeology, monuments or landscapes. It is necessary in fact to remove the confusion that is taking root between the architectural heritage and the environment, which falls under the purview of town planning, and between the characteristics that define a heritage landscape and those that define a landscape said to be natural.

⁵ CWEDD, Report on Activities, 2004, p. 23

⁶ Ibid

⁷ J. TELLER and A. BOND, 2002. p. 612, 619 ; A. BOND et al., 2004, p. 44

⁸ J. TELLER and A. BOND, 2002, p.611 ; A. BOND et al., 2004, p. 44

Nevertheless, as J. Teller and A. Bond⁹ add, it is necessary to bear in mind that in the event of often intangible heritage¹⁰ the inventories are often restrictive and cannot lead to an exhaustive analysis that would serve exclusively as a basis for decision-making purposes.

At the end of this survey, we feel obliged to make recommendations at regional and European level.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS AT REGIONAL LEVEL

■ **Raise the awareness of the competent civil servants at the Ministry of the Walloon Region, the Chairman of the CWEDD** (Conseil wallon de l'environnement pour le développement durable) and the **Chairman of the Commission of Regional Planning** (known by the French acronym CRAT), so that they can gauge, upstream, the scope, location and potential impact of the project on the environment (screening).

Suggest that an archaeologist may sit as a member of CWEDD both in the "Impact Studies" Section and in that of "Environmental Planning for Sustainable Development" since *the members are designated for their skills on the environment in the widest meaning of the term, and so that all scientific disciplines on environmental matters are represented in the Council*¹¹.

Suggest to the Chairman of the CWEDD that he include a discussion on heritage in the annual memorandum.

■ **Raise the awareness of the applicant about the need to involve archaeologists in the EIA** (Environmental Impact Assessment) so that they can assess the impact of a project on the environment and possible alternatives.

■ **Involve provincial archaeologists in the preliminary consultations**

This involvement would make it possible to gauge better what should be taken into account on heritage (scoping) so as to enhance the quality and exhaustive nature of the study.¹²

Drawing up and distributing a memorandum (archaeology, monuments and landscapes) specifying what has to be taken into consideration for heritage, how to assess it, and the requirements to be specified for the final recommendations, might be a useful tool in this sense, while remaining aware that the assessment must be left up to the archaeologists.

■ **Raise the awareness of consulting firms (the applicants) about the value of involving an archaeologist as an expert in heritage, be it in archaeology, monuments or landscapes.**

⁹ J. TELLER and BOND, p. 623

¹⁰ A. BOND et al., 2004, p. 44

¹¹ CWEDD, Report on Activities, 2004, p. 1.

¹² J. TELLER and A. BOND, 2002., p. 623: *Scoping should consider the environment, both past and present, of which the cultural heritage resource is an integral part. It should also include the association and relationship of cultural heritage to the network of tangible and intangible elements that contribute to significance.*

This would be a generalist “archaeologist” who knows how to deal with the literary and cartographic sources, but also has good experience in the field, and a keen sense of analysis (indirect damage of heritage), but also of the legislation in force.

■ **Require archaeologists to adopt a professional conduct suitable for this type of negotiations, by establishing, in particular, a credible method for identifying as upstream as possible while remaining attentive to the proportionality principle.**

■ **Require that heritage be clearly taken into account in the recommendations and insist on the reversibility and alternative potentiality principle.**

According to the analysis grid, heritage is taken into account very often, or in any event evoked without really being understood.

Thus, in the best of cases, when the impact on potential archaeological vestiges has been more or less properly defined and consultation has taken place with the Department, there are very rarely clear requirements in the summary table of recommendations.

The same remarks can be made about the built heritage whether listed (requiring an update of the list of listed properties on the Internet) or entered in the inventory.

Only the landscape heritage is selected, even though the term “landscape heritage” is not fully suited because it is mainly a geographic or geological analysis that takes no account of the historical development of the site concerned by the project (old maps, cadastral development, any land consolidation, etc.).

The notion of reversibility is very important for monumental or landscape heritage and must be clearly stressed. It is worth underscoring that the principle is null and void in archaeology from the moment an impact on the subsoil is recognised.

The notion of potential impact is necessarily applied to the archaeological heritage and may be treacherous (e.g. infiltrations of ammonia after a deposit of liquid manure or erosion of the subsoil due to a sizeable runoff, as a result of surface cutting).¹³ In such a case, an alternative could also be taken into consideration

■ **Involve the archaeologists in drawing up or alternating the plans and programmes and the PEED (SEA strategic Environmental Assessments), such as the master plan or the municipal plans.**

■ **Follow up and monitor the recommendations** by making sure, in particular, that the heritage recommendations are indicated in the requirements of the town planning permit, so that they can be applied when the worksite is commenced.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

■ **Redefine the “human aspect” for heritage – and not exclusively socio-economic – purposes.**

¹³ J. TELLER AND A. BOND, 2002. p.624: *Obsolescence occurs for physical reasons (deterioration), functional reasons (not suited to present uses) or locational reasons... This is especially true for what is usually termed “minor heritage” or accompanying structures” often composed of mundane urban constructions...*

- ***Require a correct definition of the concept of heritage and its specific features from the archaeological, monumental and landscape-related point of view.***
 - ***Require an exhaustive and more precise identification of heritage than that given in Annex IV of the Directive and that applied in other areas: geology, geography, climate, health....***
 - ***Encourage the systematic implementation of strategic environmental studies involving preliminary assessments, so as to save time and money in the medium and long term.***
 - ***Require that the recommendations are followed up and monitored.***
-

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

LANGSTAFF L. and BOND A., 2002. The consideration of cultural heritage within EIA practice throughout Europe, EIA Unit –University of Wales, Aberyswyth, p. 1-5.

TELLER J. and BOND A., 2002. Review of present European environmental policies and legislation involving cultural heritage, Environmental Impact Assessment review 22, p. 611-632.

BOND A. and TELLER J., 2002. Prise en compte du patrimoine culturel dans les politiques européennes actuelles en matière d'environnement dans Cahiers de l'Urbanisme, 38, p. 73-76.

BOND A., LANGSTAFF L., BAXTER R., WALLENTINUS H.-G., KOFOED J., LISISITZIN K. and LUNDSTRÖM S., 2004. Dealing with the cultural heritage aspect of environmental impact assessment in Europe, Impact Assessment and project Appraisal, p. 37-45.

CWEDD, Rapports d'activités, 2003 et 2004.
