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Moss Valley - Collaboration on and in the edgeland

Introduction to the edgeland

The fuzzy designation of edgeland for those spaces that are neither urban nor rural, that seem to be unplanned or unmanaged, and that exist in a patchy between, perhaps but not necessarily on the ignored edge of town was popularized by John Farley and Michael Symmons Robert’s 2011 book Edgelands: Journey’s into England’s True Wilderness. This book is itself a notable collaboration. Roberts (2016) explains that the writers used a collective “We” and wrote the book together in a “fused joint narrative voice” which involved each writer starting half the chapters each and then sending each chapter to the other for editing and re-writing, “simple, but high risk, in that it risked our friendship” (Roberts, 2016). Roberts explains that the reason for this collaborative writing style was to “guard against a too easy nostalgia”. A personal nostalgia is a danger when writing about edgelands because the definition is well known but fuzzy; as Farley and Roberts put it, “we all know [an edgeland] when we see it” (2011, 8).

I ended up writing in an edgeland inadvertently, this led me into an investigation of the term’s history that unearthed the tensions which this often undefined blanketing term covers over; Farley and Roberts sometimes use the term as a concept, sometimes to point to specific places, very often to describe a vague affect. This paper begins by tracing the term edgeland back to its first coining by campaigner Marion Shoard and looks at how her writing interacts with geographer Alice Coleman’s writing on land use planning. I show how edgeland space encompasses a variety of ideas about how urban/rural, past/future, ruin/remediation and centre/margin should or should not interact. As the writers attempt to classify this paradoxical space of dynamic process many words are used like “interface”, “fringe” and “frontier”. This proliferation of terms frames a description of the collaboratively produced artist’s book Historically Lawful that I worked on with visual artist Abi Goodman which explores why collaborative practice is a particularly appropriate way for artists to respond to the paradoxical edgeland space.

For the last three years I have been making regular visits to The Moss Valley to conduct field work and write on site as part of a practice based PhD which considers whether hybrid writing and open form poetry can help instigate and enable an ecologically aware encounter with others. I had a particular aim to write on site, in the presence of others and some of the poems which resulted from this work are located in the interstices of this article. I was going to type “I initially chose The Moss Valley because” but am tentatively considering writing “The Moss Valley chose me”. My first introduction happened before I knew it as a place. Oliver Blensdorf, field recorder for The Moss Valley invited me to go with him and look for badgers at dusk. It was pouring with rain and dark and I was in the following mode, which meant that I didn’t register where we were as we crashed through woodland, brambles, across paths. My partner saw the flash of a badger but by the time I turned around it was too late. Oliver told me a bit about the area and how much of it had been designated as SSSI during the 1980s due to the work of his Natural History group who were fighting to protect the area from housing development. I had lived less than three miles from what I came to know as Moss Valley for over ten years and never considered it. I knew there was something I needed to write about, something about my frustrations when trying to talk about the environment, something about how this linked to the awkwardness and confusion relating to anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism in eco-critical writing (Clark, 2011) and something which drew upon the burgeoning work taking place in animal studies (Parry, 2017). I knew that I wanted to write about a variety of species in fresh ways and to write about species I would encounter regularly. Moss Valley seemed to be the perfect location, both close and unknown. As I was passed from person to person, collaborating with the inhabitants of Moss Valley in different ways - as conservationist, protester, observer, tamperer, cutter, nuisance, trespasser or obstacle - I altered back and forth from being guest to host, from being stranger to friend. Always an incomer, circling the
tracks, I found myself lost, in literal woodland, in open field and in a forest of never quite satisfactory terms.

**Into The Moss Valley – Marion Shoard and the Interface**

I tend to go into The Moss Valley as a pedestrian from the south side. This involves having to cross a dual carriageway, one of Sheffield’s confusing ring roads that don’t completely ring the City. I wait for a break in the traffic and then briskly walk across the four lanes. Then I walk up the side of the road, listing the roadkill: badger, hedgehog, fox, crow. I am facing the traffic that whizzes towards me and walk in a limping manner, half stuck in the gutter. The road gives off heat at all times of year. The odd chipping flies towards me. If I’m with someone we shout to communicate over the continuous sea-like shushs of traffic. The fenced off electric sub-station buzzes invitingly but there is no easy way to climb the fence. In my recollection the weather defaults to massing cloudy, muting the colour but this can’t be the only weather I walk through. I know I’m nearly there when I see the “Welcome to the South Yorkshire Forest” road sign on the other side.

This sign is part of the legacy of the Community Forest Programme which came to an end in 2016 due to reductions in EU funding. The programme was based on UK and European Union government grants given to establish nature reserves and remediate landscapes; a policy derided by the creator of the term edgeland, Marion Shoard (2000):

> Afforestation has emerged as the fashionable mechanism for transforming as much as possible of the interface into something more acceptable to polite society and hiding as much as possible of the rest of it from view. (86)

The interface is Shoard’s term for those areas that are neither urban nor rural, neither town nor countryside, that exist “betwixt the urban and the rural” (74). This term quickly morphs into edgeland and I was initially confused by Shoard’s characterisation of “these jungles of marshalling yards and gasometers, gravel pits, waterworks and car scrapyards” (75) as interfacial. This type of landscape doesn’t necessarily appear on the city fringe in Sheffield: I had always thought of it as post-industrial, the result of a planning de-regulation desperate for investment in suddenly economically redundant land.

Shoard admits this:

> It is equally true that land with the distinguishing features I have identified as typically interfacial is not found exclusively on the present-day border between town and country. Although yesterday’s interfacial zones are often swallowed up by subsequent building, sometimes they survive as edgeland within built-up areas (79).

As edgeland moves away from its “typically interfacial” character it becomes a term defined by a space’s affect, as Bristow (2015) notes this is an affect which is the attraction of edgeland for Farley and Roberts and is much like my initial experience of The Moss Valley, paradoxically close but unknown: “the present rural/urban interface is the expanding landscape of our own age. Disregard of the interface means that data about it is largely absent” (79). Yet no matter how much the
explorer feels and acts as if alone when in the edgeland (Macfarlane, 2011) this aestheticised, submerged, affect laden landscape is - as I would discover – abundantly inhabited.

I think of Moss Valley as clearly interfacial as it exists between urban and rural. This is made apparent if you enter the valley from the village of Eckington. The walk into the valley starts at the Norman Parish church through the graveyard and plunges down into what is clearly a valley. Sheep graze in the fields. The woodland is either coppiced or the regimented lines of still working forestry commission land. Interpretative signs give details of past human activity and ruins have been preserved. Wooden bridges are solid, well built and angularly maintained. Well thought out stiles mean that crossing between woodland and field is easy. Moving up and down the valley allows for fine views of the changing leaf-scape but having the Moss Brook on one side makes navigation easy. Entering the Moss Valley at his end allows an appreciation of the elements that Shoard says have been identified as typically English:

Lowenthal and Prince identified ten underlying attitudes to landscape on the part of the English. These were: love of the bucolic; of the picturesque; of the deciduous; of the tidy; facadism; antiquarianism; rejection of the present; rejection of the sensuous; rejection of the functional; and genius loci, such as literary (76).

This is used to link English identity to, “the countryside beloved by the great majority …. tamed and inhabited, warm, comfortable, humanised” (Loewenthal in Shoard, 76).
"Et in Acadia ego. There are the sound of buzz saws and the occasional echo of gunshot which puncture the façade and mark the functional technical violence of human labour. There are sticks which measure flood levels. On my first visit to Eckington I stopped at the Parish Church coffee morning and mentioned where I was going. The talk was all about dumping and where to avoid walking so that my sensitive poetic nature would not be confronted by abandoned sofas. This is perhaps the biggest mark of the landscape’s interfacial character: “Lowenthal and Prince tell us that the English applaud the absence of litter in a landscape: the interface sucks in the detritus of modern life… litter and household waste [are] casually dumped there because it is closer at hand than hedgerow and less effectively policed than high street” (76). This mixture of urban and rural makes
Moss Valley a paradoxically pure example of the impure interface: a place where the urban and rural conspire to strangeness.
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**Moss Valley and Greenbelt – Alice Coleman versus the fringe**

Shoard (2001) states that:

Our contempt for the interface is enshrined in what is perhaps the best understood of all planning concepts: green belt. Paradoxically, this provides a few selected interfacial areas with what has perhaps been the most thoroughgoing protection against new building which Britain’s planning system offers. (81)

Moss Valley’s recent history is strongly linked to Sheffield’s Green Belt policy, which Sheffield Campaign to Protect Rural England describes as a way to keep the city’s “Golden Frame” intact (CPRE 2009). Much of the land is green belt and other land is ‘protected’ by Site of Special Scientific Interest designation. As Shoard notes, “the purpose of green belt, uniquely, is not to protect the land it enshrines. It is to protect the integrity of the built-up areas on one side of it and the countryside on the other.” (88) Green Belt as the sovereign expression of the desire to keep City
and Country separate. Shoard goes so far as to call this a “theology of hostility” (87) towards any space that seems to mix the two amongst land use planners; ironically the policy ends up preserving the paradoxical interfacial space and arguments for the freeing up of green belt land for housing development tend to point out that the term “green” masks a wide variety of land use (Morton, 2013).

I traced this attitude back to when what Shoard renamed “edgelands” were first noticed by planners in the 1960s. Alice Coleman, a geographer based at Kings’ College London, taking part in a land utilisation survey, uncovered the existence of a large amount of fringe land which did not fall neatly into the land-use pattern of “townscape, nor that of farmscape” (Coleman 1976; 1977). She called this land-type ‘the rurban fringe’, maintaining that new development had sprawled into the countryside in a way which dangerously obscured the distinction between town and country (87). The use of the term “farmscape” accurately reflects Coleman’s view of the countryside. Countryside is farmland, for Coleman the green belt is not just an aesthetic choice: it is supposed to encourage the preservation of land for food production and stop urban sprawl. Despite a consideration of townscape it is clear that the real concern is that ‘Rurban fringe’ isn’t good for the productivity of farmscape:

Such an environment is far from ideal for urban residents, while they in turn often make farming impossible, by trespass, damage, theft, fire setting and so on. Even the house sparrows that come with a new rurban-fringe building estate can devour up to half the grain in an adjacent field of wheat (422).

Indeed, the fringe is “open invitation to increased conflict” as unruly urban estates spill into the countryside, “[f]or example, in the green wedge at New Addington, the boys from the estate climbed over into the adjacent field and cut the tails off the cows”. (422) Moss Valley contains similar tensions as quad bike riders from estates that border the valley gain access and damage footpaths. There have also been incidents of badger baiting but is this a disruptive urban or traditional rural activity?
It was when I read this part of the article that I realised why Alice Coleman’s name had seemed resonant. I recalled working in a housing association amongst a group of sighing architects charged with designing new housing which met “Secured by Design” standard. This is a police sanctioned design standard which aims to “to reduce the opportunity for crime and the fear of crime, creating safer, more secure and sustainable environments.” (HMHO 2017) This standard originates from 1980s government funded studies and programmes designed to create “Defensible Space”. Alice Coleman was the academic who transferred this planning concept from North America to the UK (Jacobs 2003) and her 1977 article about urban fringe promotes it:

I will briefly mention the concept of ‘defensible space’. This concerns the most detailed subdivision of the townscape environment: the individual dwellings. It was well appreciated
that America’s excessive crime rates were particularly associated with publicly financed housing estates, and Oscar Newman (Newman, 1974) describes an investigation into all the crimes committed in the 169 public housing estates in New York City. It was discovered that the heaviest crime rates were causally related to certain specific types of planned design and layout, and by making appropriate modifications, some of them quite minor and inexpensive, local crime rates have actually been reduced. Here is a case where very specific types of environment can be associated with very specific types of planning treatment, and the result can be measured by an objective quantitative score (429).

The concept of “defensible space” has been heavily criticised for its environmental determinism (“causally related”) but was taken up as government policy on the official fiat of Margaret Thatcher as it was scientifically sanctioned and chimed with the idea of promoting increased individual responsibility (“individual dwellings”) to be the solution to the problems of urban unemployment (Jacobs, 2003). Coleman’s article is itself a product of the waning of post war social democracy, “we must seriously address ourselves to the question: ‘Can we afford the vast expense of a planning establishment when free enterprise will do the same job free?’” (411) and as such it is a transitional text. It is marked by the post war obsession with increased agricultural productivity at the expense of creating monocultures: land needs to have a clear designation. It is also a product of Limits to Growth arguments regarding resource depletion:

Meanwhile, we should make an immediate beginning upon the production of our own food equivalent. If we begin now, we may still have time to achieve a state of sufficiency before North Sea oil runs out, or before that possibly earlier date when food prices overshadow oil price rises. (414)

It is easy to see how defensible space fits with Coleman’s emergent bio-political worldview: defensible space is achieved by re-designing “the external spaces around dwellings … such that residents more directly control or feel responsible for them” (Jacobs 2003). Space is planned for visibility so that it can be brought back into responsible management, based upon the results of quantitative field work. Quantitative mapping shows that productive farmland is threatened by rurban fringe, creating a clean break between townscape and farmscape is the policy response to create “defensible space” for farmland. Shoard picks up on the way that Coleman’s need for clarity and visibility makes the rururban fringe threatening when she notes that it feels like “a vaguely menacing frontier-land hinting that here the normal rules governing human behaviour cannot be altogether relied upon.” (85)
Struggle and Change

Despite her belief in free enterprise Coleman does notice that market forces are the cause of the dwindling of farmland and even a cause of conflict. Rururban fringe creates fuzzy land use:

It is these patterns of co-dominance that generate the most severe land-use conflicts. In the marginal fringe, the conflict is between vegetation and improved farmland. If farm prices are depressed, the farmer cannot afford to protect his fields against infestation, but it better times he can upgrade some of the rough pastures to improved status. This is a zone of struggle and change; it can also expand and contract (427).
To think of the “rurban fringe” as a marginal place of struggle and change chimes with Shoard’s characterisation of the interface “frontier-land”. If it is marginal Shoard also notes its paradoxical centrality: the frontier-land “where normal rules of human behaviour cannot be relied upon” is also what tells us most about our society, “the ultimate physical expression of the character of our age, unmediated by the passing tastes of élite groups.” (Shoard, 88).

Moss Valley’s status as a dynamic frontier and zone of struggle and change is most apparent when considering hydraulic fracturing (fracking). Jason Moore (2015) argues that capitalism needs “Four Cheaps” to function effectively: cheap labour, energy, food and raw materials (56). These “cheaps” need to be found and then accumulated on a “capitalist frontier” as the best way of getting something “on the cheap” is by commodifying a bundle of energy that was developed outside of the capitalist system, this can be seen as “unpaid work” (57). Moss Valley is one of the areas that has been designated as suitable for fracking and a number of licenses for exploratory work have been given, potentially the Moss Valley has become a frontier zone. However, Moore’s explanation for the uptake of fracking makes this designation more complicated. Fracking can be seen as a re-industrialisation of the Moss Valley: one of the concerns of local residents is that previously worked coal seams that exist under their houses will be disturbed by the fracking process. Moore points out that the reason fracking is viable is due to depletion of energy sources: the fact that cheap energy is becoming harder to find (76) has resulted in a doubling of operating costs for oil production since 2000 (87), this increases the price of energy and makes so called “unconventional” forms of extraction viable. Fracking is actually the sign of the cheap energy frontier closing; the fracking well is a modernist ruin before it has even been built.
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towards an artistic response

How should the artist respond to this paradoxical edgeland space, one which is perceived as both perceived as marginal but also on the front line of conflict over response to environmental
damage and resource extraction, a space which allows different types of response to and use of space to interface and to exist in conflict or tension? Shoard remarks that “[i]t would be even more interesting to see artistic expression of the dynamism which the interface enshrines, rather than simply the decay and redundancy with which artists usually identify it.” (91) and sees artistic response as a way of raising awareness and thus promoting better protection, on the model of the change of attitude towards moorland and lakeland. This points to the dilemma that edgelands represent: for Shoard dynamism is a result of being outwith the planning system, can you “conserve” dynamism, can you enshrine it, even? Is awareness raising what art should be doing? I’ve had a number of conversations with people in Moss Valley concerned with wildlife who ask me to make sure that I don’t reveal the locations of particular species as this would put them under risk.

In 2010 the UK coalition government announced a “bonfire of quangos and red tape” at the time I attended a talk by Friend of the Earth’s head of local campaigns regarding the dismemberment of the planning system (Sheffield, 2010). The campaigner remarked at the end of his talk that he did a PhD in planning in the early 1980s where he used a Marxist approach to argue that the planning system was a tool used by capitalism to ensure rational investment and thus continued exploitation of labour and for that reason should be torn down. In 2010 he found himself in the position of having to defend the same system as the only thing stopping what he recognised as complete free market irrationality. This “cunning of history” might point toward a more radical approach than relying on the planning system as a way of responding to the interface.

Thus, despite Shoard’s resistance to “decay and redundancy” my writing aims to characterise Moss Valley as a place where ruins and dynamism co-exist on the lines described by Anna Tsing (2017). Tsing aims to create, “an open-ended assemblage, not a logical machine” (viii), writing stories that, “tangle with and interrupt each other – mimicking the patchiness of the world I am trying to describe” (viii). She describes “first nature” as “ecological relationships (including humans)”, “second nature” as “capitalist transformations of the environment” offering “third nature” as “that which manages to live despite capitalism” (viii). I’m particularly attracted to the idea of patchiness as it is borrowed from Oliver Rackham who used it to describe the ecology of ancient woodlands (238) in contradiction to the monoculture of forestry commission plantations. The ruruban fringe is patchy, refuses monoculture. Edgeland has been characterised as “England’s forgotten wilderness” but wilderness is problematic for what I’m trying to describe here: it is definitely not wilderness as pristine, protected, labour free space it is place of vulnerability, exposure and work, where things are all tangled up, where we can “sense precarity” (Tsing, 20).

Many of the humans I met in Moss Valley could be said to have what Tsing calls a “peri-capitalist” attitude, both within and outside capitalism. The Troway Honey Farm supplies honey to Waitrose, sells Christmas Trees, has a small restaurant but also gives free medicinal treatment to local people. Volunteer run organic gardening schemes dot up throughout the valley, cooperatively selling veg boxes to leafy Sheffield suburbs and fixing fence holes created by badgers. A person buys some woodland with inheritance money and establishes a Forest School for children outside of mainstream education. Volunteers work with destitute asylum seekers to clear “invasive” rhodadendrons and overly territorial holly. The Chatsworth Estate allows exploratory fracking wells on its land as it would rather take the money than be forced into allowing the wells through the planning system, the Sitwell Estate doesn’t allow exploratory drilling, Farmer Pomfrey sells a field
to INEOS. It is this patchwork of land ownership which works against monoculture, encouraging collaboration even cooperation and sometimes conflict.

**Responding to the edgeland through collaboration**

The collaborative work *Historically Lawful* undertaken with visual artist Abi Goodman aims to capture this sense of living in dynamic capitalist ruins. Abi is a critical designer whose work is particularly interested in elevating background infrastructure; she has considered wallpaper, book design and urban regeneration ([http://abigoodman.com/portfolio/](http://abigoodman.com/portfolio/)). She is also interested in collaborative artistic practice (Goodman and Smith 2012, Farrago, 2011), particularly forms of psychogeography (Goodman, 2013) and participatory art (Goodman, 2016). We went on a series of walks through Moss Valley, using both the rural and urban entrances, experiencing the Moss Valley landscape as a patchwork through which the walker crossed. The middle of our walk was notoriously dis-orientating as we passed from small woodland, to field, up and down hills, losing sight of the Moss Brook, almost being turned around. We both became slightly obsessed with the various gates and stiles which were both an obstacle and a place of pause which forced us to think about how we were accessing the space, about which creatures were allowed to cross the boundary and which were not. We took photographs of all the gates and stiles encountered, noting the variety of designs and the various signs and route markers: “Keep to Side of Field”, “Permissive Path”, “Welcome”, “Managed by”, “In Memory of”, “Rotary Walk”, “Bull in Field!”.

Abi was interested in how accessible a stile had to be. British Standard BS5709:2006 (BSI 2006 - since updated) gave the eight rules, covering these areas:

* Least restrictive option
* Reasonableness
* Manoeuvering space
* Location of structures
* Ongoing
* Ground
* Barbed Wire etc.
* Protrusions

In general, the rules are typically English in their following of precedent: the stile or gate should be as accessible as possible having taken into account what the guidance calls “historically lawful” considerations; a decaying, wonky stile only useable by the brave or foolhardy will meet the British Standard purely due to its longevity. Abi set me the challenge of writing eight pieces that would each be titled by one of the rules. I tried to write using fragmentary thoughts and phrases which had been in my consciousness as I walked through Moss Valley, with form and content led by each of the titles. The words chosen were generally from found text, placed into dynamic relationship. This was different to my usual practice: other Moss Valley pieces were deliberately led by encounter with specific places or species, with the works being titled at the end of the process. Perhaps because of the working method, which lifted me into a greater attention to language being moved from one context to another these poems seemed to end up marking my frustration with particular phrases and forms of expression, marked by intertextual excess and extreme fragmentation. They
ended up jaggy and uncomfortable, anxy and impersonal. There is attention drawn to the difficulties and pleasures of identification.

Abi took these pieces and then worked each one into a visual design based upon a drawing of gate or stile found in Moss Valley. She used a combination of inkjet and collagraph print to create eight A3 pages (Fig 1 and Fig 2). The prints deliberately weaved traditional and digital printing techniques together, incorporating texture to give a sense of a multi-sensory landscape and working with the random element introduced by the collograph process. The colours were taken from those experienced on our walks at different times of day, to give a sense of time passing. These were bound together into a large artist’s book which unfolded in a deliberately unwieldy way, forming a barrier within a gallery space.

The collaboration examined the tension between word and image when they were forced to share the same space. The pieces of writing already explored page based spatial layout and the gates and stiles chosen by Abi aimed to work with the shapes suggested by the poem’s layout. Each gate chosen spoke both spatially and thematically to the poem placed on the page. The words begin to exist in the gaps between the gate structure, or the structures exist to support the words. Some words are almost obscured by another part of the printing process. Generally, Abi worked to preserve the spatial structure of the poem she was given but this wasn’t necessarily possible. Sometimes words are almost pushed from on to the edge of the page. Both the poems and the visual pieces seem to be both of a place and out of place: as infrastructure the stiles could be any stiles but are actually particularly located (indeed, one viewer I’ve spoken to has recognised a stile and had particular memories associated with it). The poems could exist without the context of Moss Valley but are strongly marked by events which occurred during their composition and become anchored to a place by being located within and around the gates and stiles. The textured images make the gates and stiles look like ruins, reclaimed by the more than human material processes released by an open printing process. The awkwardness of the book encourages a bodily response from the reader as they navigate its pages within the gallery space to try and trace a sense of progression.

_Historically Lawful_ doesn’t seek to conserve, delineate or be systematic, it is a record of a playful joint process, deliberately containing the marks of tension between drawn and written response to place as two forms attempt to share the same space. This zone of often over-looked but intimately known tension and struggle is the edgeland as expressed in Moss Valley. As the changing conceptualisations of rurban fringe, interfacial zone or edgeland show these are spaces characterized by strange collaborations and sometimes conflict, shaped by attempts to enforce property rights but always expressive of dynamically shifting co-dominance. This is why collaborative art practices are a particularly appropriate way to respond to edgeland, we need risky engagement with multiple senses to acknowledge other actants; a paradoxical space where the rural and urban “conspire to strangeness” (Macdonald 2014, 8) is the place to learn how we can risk being strange with and alongside each other.
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