

Almut Jirku

## **Landscape as Urbanism**

Lecture at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Department of Architecture, Urbanism and Planning, 20.11.2007

In the Anglo-Saxon professional debate, Landscape Urbanism is a much-discussed topic. There are lots of journals and readers about the subject. But when I started to prepare for this lecture I soon asked myself: how is Landscape Urbanism discussed in Germany? Quickly I came to the conclusion: there is no such discussion. I then started to ask landscape architects whom I met on conferences and professional meetings: Do you know the term and if yes, what do you think about it? Many landscape architects, even those who are internationally successful had never heard about it. Others, mostly people with some connection to the USA, had heard about it but were not really interested. Only a handful of people really had read texts about it, mostly academicians. But at least half of them were sceptical about the concept. Only two thought it a worthwhile approach.

But everybody had heard about James Corner and Field Operation. Also in our last big open competition, the one for the Gleisdreieck Area - to which I will come back later -, diagrams which bore a lot of superficial similarity to the ones from the Fresh Kills project, although the substance behind it was mostly lacking.

Why is that? One problem is language. Not even the theoretical key texts have been translated into German. I found only one German article in the most widely read German Landscape magazine, Garten und Landschaft, about Landscape Urbanism. The whole issue was dedicated to Landscape Architecture in Northern America, and the article in question didn't really discuss the concept but only reported about it, more or less as one of those quaint American ideas which we in Europe can do without.

Another reason is the abundance of different definitions with a lot of complicated words whose meanings are rather obscure which make some people think it is all much ado about nothing or very little.

A third reason, and this one touches on the base of our professional self-definition as landscape architects, lies in the fact that many architects and urbanists embrace the concept. Several landscape architects are afraid that the other planning professions will infringe on the centre of our domain, landscape. Especially in the era of shrinking cities where built up quarters are turned into landscape and cities become full of holes, planners and architects look for new things to do.

The few landscape architects, who think it is a worthwhile approach that constitutes a valuable addition to the set of methods and tools of the profession, are of the opinion that the way of thinking is too complex for most people, which is of course a rather arrogant position to take but perhaps there is some truth in it.

And last but not least there are the people who think Landscape Urbanism is just a new word for what landscape architects have always done, at least some of them. To quote Bart Brands in Kerb15:3: "If I listen to everybody very carefully it is what we have been doing for a long time. It is building a city; building a neighbourhood or building a society, whatever skill you are working on. Looking at what's there and what's happening. Not only what's physically there but also what kind of processes are happening; what the transformations are in the landscape." This view is shared for instance by Pierre Donadieu (in JoLa, autumn 2006) who cites examples of what is called in French 'paysagisme d'aménagement', e.g. the work of Jaques Sgard. Kelly Shannon writes about similar attitudes in " From Theory to Resistance: Landscape Urbanism in Europe" in the L.U. Reader.

Mainly I agree with this. A certain section of landscape architects have been working in this way at least in the last two decades. Landscape architecture on an urbanistic level goes back in history at least to the time when public parks started to be conceived, first in Britain, and then also on the continent. Regent's Park for instance is an urbanistic concept. Abbé Laugier already wrote in 1735 in his essay about architecture: " Everybody who knows how to design a park will have no problems to conceive the design for a city". When the competition department of landscape architects and urbanists in our administration was joined with the one of the architects, the head of our unit, an architect, was at first very confused when we made briefs for park competitions. In architecture there is always a program for the rooms needed, in a school for instance so many classrooms of this size and so many of that size, so many washrooms, so many staff rooms etc. Use, number and size usually fix everything, the architect only has to arrange it on a good floor plan. Briefs for parks are much more general: basically it is: make a nice, beautiful park where everybody can do something he or she likes to do. It is much more difficult to circumscribe the task more narrowly, and a lot of leeway is left to designers.

Nevertheless, for quite some time the profession was mainly defined as garden architects who decorated the spaces defined by others or, when cooperating with architects were only allowed to put names to trees which architects had already put into the plans. Nowadays, there are not many landscape architects who are content with this role, and most architects are ready to cooperate fully. But the attitude is not extinct as Bart Brands (Kerb 15:7) noticed when talking to an unknown architect in a conference: "I said I'm a landscape architect and he said he was an architect. I mentioned I had worked on Federation Square (a central square in Melbourne which is mainly hard landscape) and he said,' Oh there's not so much

landscape, there's just a couple of trees there'. He completely misunderstood what a landscape architect does." Bart Brands was justified in being angry with this.

On the other hand side, in Germany especially there are many landscape planners. They make land use plans under an ecological premise or environmental impact assessments of planned projects and similar work. They frequently think only in a two-dimensional way. Also they often have a very static or backward oriented understanding of ecology and nature conservation where any change is considered to be to the worse. Many people in Germany, also professionals, have a very ideological understanding of ecology and not a scientific one. This attitude is the more pronounced the less they know about the way ecosystems work.

But there is also a third group. For lack of a better term they insist on being called landscape architects (and not garden architects). There is problem in the German language, which does not exist in English. The end-syllable –schaft as in Landschaft usually means a group of people not a site. Originally even Landschaft meant: the population in a given regional unit, like a county. The meaning only changed when landscape painting became a topic in itself, "Landschaft" was first used in the arts, and afterwards generally for a given section of geography that constitutes itself by the regard that is directed at it.

All other words with the ending –schaft mean groups of people, like Mannschaft (team) or Belegschaft (the workers of a mill or firm), Bürgerschaft (the citizens of a city, and in some cities it is also the name of the local parliament (Bremen, Hamburg)).

So we can't form words like townscape, seascape or drosscape. If we said Stadtschaft, which would be the literal translation of townscape, people would think this means something like citizenship. Some offices gave themselves names like "scape(s)" or "topotect", to show that they deal with topography or spaces on a larger and three-dimensional level.

Those who looked for a word to describe that the work they do happens also on an urbanistic scale and level, deals not only with nature but also with human beings, thinks in spaces and not only in surfaces and uses, had a problem. That is the reason why I was at first very enthusiastic about the concept of Landscape Urbanism because I thought this is finally the term we have been looking for a long time. In my opinion, a lot of people have been working in Landscape Urbanism "avant la lettre", before the term was coined.

But after reading a lot more texts about it I got doubts again. Is landscape architecture as urbanism really the same as Landscape Urbanism? As Christopher Gray writes in Kerb 15:94: "The theoretical genetic code that makes up the DNA of Landscape Urbanism is sliced from diverse and eclectic range of disciplines. (This) .... has resulted in discrete interpretations of landscape urbanism that are often contradictory and representative of specific rhetorical threads." In the end of his essay he writes: "... perhaps now is the time to

let the theoretical field lie fallow for a time and allow the germination of the many seeds of projects that lie below the surface. "

Therefore I want to show you several projects that in my opinion are examples of Landscape Urbanism. I want to check them with regard to the five principles by James Corner in his essay "Landscape Urbanism" in the book with the same name published by the AA (58 –63):

- Horizontality or better fields /networks, (horizontality is a bit two-dimensional), that allow for a vast range of varied and flexible arrangements.
- Infrastructure: to liberate future sets of possibilities
- Forms of process: very important in my view: to put materials to "work", creatively, to allow for future developments
- Techniques: apart from the obvious definition: Interdisciplinary collaboration, citizen participation, therefore mediation, and moderation
- Ecology, not in a static sense but dynamic, not trying to fix a state but to start a process; interconnectedness, flexible, responsive to change (also metaphorically)

Later on, in terra fluxus (2006:32) he added: the imaginary, the poetical and symbolical dimension of public space, transcending the merely functional and rational, which in my opinion is very important. Although landscape urbanism is certainly more a way of thinking and working than a style, it requires also an aesthetic that is different from the traditionally picturesque, as we will see in the following examples.

Let's first have a short look back in History.

The most prominent historic landscape gardener in Berlin is Peter Joseph Lenné (1789 – 1866). He created the famous Potsdamer Glienicke cultural landscape, now part of the UNESCO world heritage, a system of parks and vistas across and around the Havel River.

[http://www.google.de/imgres?imgurl=http%3A%2F%2Fupload.wikimedia.org%2Fwikipedia%2Fcommons%2F1%2F1d%2FUmgebung\\_Potsdam\\_1833.jpg&imgrefurl=http%3A%2F%2Fde.wikipedia.org%2Fwiki%2FPeter\\_Joseph\\_Lenn%C3%25A9&h=619&w=1019&tbnid=i87bD255A0089M%3A&zoom=1&docid=DN-6jn4eJvTvuM&ei=ihhqVa21CIGoUITHg-AF&tbnm=isch&iact=rc&uact=3&dur=270&page=1&start=0&ndsp=18&ved=0CCcQrQMwAg](http://www.google.de/imgres?imgurl=http%3A%2F%2Fupload.wikimedia.org%2Fwikipedia%2Fcommons%2F1%2F1d%2FUmgebung_Potsdam_1833.jpg&imgrefurl=http%3A%2F%2Fde.wikipedia.org%2Fwiki%2FPeter_Joseph_Lenn%C3%25A9&h=619&w=1019&tbnid=i87bD255A0089M%3A&zoom=1&docid=DN-6jn4eJvTvuM&ei=ihhqVa21CIGoUITHg-AF&tbnm=isch&iact=rc&uact=3&dur=270&page=1&start=0&ndsp=18&ved=0CCcQrQMwAg)

Less well known is his plan for the Schmuck- und Grenzzüge around the then city of Berlin. It was only realised in the north, in the south the city grew too quickly. These corridors had several functions: one was to mark the city limits as they were planned at the time and to provide an agreeable promenade for city dwellers. The second was the creation of an infrastructure system of canals and walks. For developing the southern Luisenstadt canals

were a necessity. All the building material came by boat. The third purpose was dehydrating the area south of the Tiergarten that was very swampy at the time. Although ecologists would not approve today in his day this was considered as creating a better and healthier environment. He certainly thought in a field system and created a network of paths. He developed new techniques for his canals together with civil engineers. And the linear promenades were a new aesthetic element in the landscape garden style open spaces. Also the system had and has lots of potential for further development, was and is open for change.

[http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/umwelt/stadtgruen/geschichte/de/stadtgruen/bis\\_1870/index.shtml](http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/umwelt/stadtgruen/geschichte/de/stadtgruen/bis_1870/index.shtml)

So, most criteria of landscape urbanism apply to this work. It is still useful for leisure and transport in the present day so it is also a very sustainable concept. Boats riding on it or mooring in harbours have to pay fees so the system contributes also to its own maintenance. This should also be an important aspect of landscape urbanism.

[http://www.google.de/imgres?imgurl=http://www.greeningthegrays.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/emerald-necklace.jpg&imgrefurl=http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/kbenfield/bostons\\_emerald\\_necklace\\_sets.html&h=613&w=1422&tbnid=mS95sEuDFYu IM:&zoom=1&tbnh=90&tbnw=209&usq=Btuup5L-C386edPFpSxXYAhtWxU=&docid=VKJmBljJamMBDM](http://www.google.de/imgres?imgurl=http://www.greeningthegrays.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/emerald-necklace.jpg&imgrefurl=http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/kbenfield/bostons_emerald_necklace_sets.html&h=613&w=1422&tbnid=mS95sEuDFYu IM:&zoom=1&tbnh=90&tbnw=209&usq=Btuup5L-C386edPFpSxXYAhtWxU=&docid=VKJmBljJamMBDM)  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emerald\\_Necklace](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emerald_Necklace)

The emerald necklace by Olmstead is now very well known not least because it fascinates Michel Desvigne so much. It is often cited as an early example of landscape urbanism. But it was never mentioned when I studied in the seventies, I first read about it in an architectural journal much later. That are the ups and downs of projects, there seems also to be a fashion to it.

Later on, urbanistic schemes became more two-dimensional, like the scheme for open spaces in Berlin by Martin Wagner, a building politician in the 1920ies. Nevertheless he was also very network-orientated and fought hard for creating a path system alongside rivers and lakes.

[http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/umwelt/stadtgruen/geschichte/de/stadtgruen/1920\\_1948/1920\\_bis\\_1935/](http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/umwelt/stadtgruen/geschichte/de/stadtgruen/1920_1948/1920_bis_1935/)

Our actual open space system for Berlin is even more schematic. The concept for the regional parks is a bit more illustrative because it was drawn with an eye to attract tourists. But both these schemes need to become more-dimensional in the next steps.

### **Berliner Barnim**

That happened when we started the series of competitions for the Berliner part of the Barnim, a small part of the regional park, which is mainly in the federal state of Brandenburg.

The foundations for landscape architecture in the Barnim area in the northeast of Berlin were laid as early as the end of the nineteenth century. To safeguard the options for nearby recreation and sewage disposal, the administration of Berlin bought woods and estates outside the city limits.

Open sewage disposal within the city was abolished. Sewage was now transported in canals to the outskirts where it was cleaned by seepage in so-called "Rieselfelder". So the area was an important part of the infrastructure of Berlin. At first, these sewage fields were also used for agricultural purposes; later on, this was no longer possible because of pollution, especially heavy metals, in the wastewater. The fields were divided up by dams into rectangular polders, into which the sewage was directed in order to allow the water to seep away (Fig. 1). The cleaned water was then returned to the water system by means of artificial ditches. These sewage farms were gradually replaced by sewage processing plants.

Once their use as sewage farms was discontinued, the expanses were used by the agricultural production co-operatives of the GDR (Landwirtschaftliche Produktionsgenossenschaften - LPG) as extensive fields and meadows. The landscape was largely empty and unstructured, due to industrialised farming methods. Also the poor soils of the Mark Brandenburg make large continuous acres necessary because the yield per acre is low and the distance to the farmstead is often long

### **Wartenberger Feldmark“ Competition**

The „Wartenberger Feldmark“ was the last competition in this area. As a result from the initial workshop for the entire area, the competition brief required that the space had to be marked by forest strips to the right and left. The competition area was open in a special way - the challenge was to structure the expanse without breaking it. Thus, the brief had the motto "Landscape with a view".

The winning entry by plancontext, Berlin, took up the geometrical structure of the landscape and filled it with new content. Structuring the "forest fractals" required an exact analysis to allow for many diverse views while passing the area. Highlights are placed at prominent points, and small places of sojourn are created. At the edge of the built-up area there is a

more intensive zone; the lake proposed as an option can remain a meadow until it may one day be built.

Although the formal language of this concept is completely different from that of the classical landscape park, there is a common element. While walking through the area, new views, each one differently framed and directed, can be appreciated.

But rather than being traditionally picturesque, however, this approach demonstrates a new aesthetic quality – it does not attempt to disguise the technical elements of the periphery but rather takes them into consideration. According to the location within the city equipment elements are robust.

Although this area is outside of the built up area it is still part of the city. Here it was necessary to create spaces and structuring only with the means of landscape architecture. This was achieved mainly with the forest fractals that of course still need time to grow, also with the planting of alleys. A network of paths in the whole area provides a recreational infrastructure; rows of trees and hedges offer windbreaks for the fields. By renaturalizing the brooks and the afforestation new ecological features are introduced. Through the income from the leases the landscape contributes to its maintenance.

[http://www.plancontext.de/referenzen/referenzen/?tx\\_ttnews%5Btt\\_news%5D=6&cHash=6a45f14a3869574c1cd3fc53b28ff6cc](http://www.plancontext.de/referenzen/referenzen/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=6&cHash=6a45f14a3869574c1cd3fc53b28ff6cc)

### **Schöneberger Südgelände / Hans- Baluschek-Park**

This area is framed by traffic infrastructure. Formerly it was part of it, but fell into disuse. Nature developed, the technical elements became more or less ruins. The site is in the middle of nowhere. To the west there are large areas of allotments, to the east a rather desolate industrial site. But by the city railway, a relict of the former goods station use, people can easily reach the area.

After long debates it was finally decided to zone this area as a green space, part of the north-south green corridor. Now landscape architecture had the task to make an urban landscape out of this leftover in-between field. This was achieved very successfully.

In the eastern part with its "wild" nature, which in reality is very much influenced by former human uses, the so-called nature of the fourth kind (Kowarik) was carefully preserved. This term is an addition to the already known three natures. It is a type of nature that develops spontaneously on sites very much changed by human intervention, in the soil, but also by importing species from other regions (e.g. by railway) and by the general change in climate in cities. It is neither primeval nature (first nature) nor cultivated nature (like the second and

third nature). A management scheme takes care that the natural succession does not happen everywhere so that some valuable open meadows are preserved.

But the most important intervention is the addition of the artistic elements. Metallic grids mounted over the old railway tracks and several observation towers introduce another unexpected layer to the site. The remaining railway building has become a venue for cultural and musical events.

The landscape planners originally wanted to build paths out of wood, like one does in nature conservation areas, which would have been boring. The added metal elements evoke the railway tradition but in a new way. The "wasteland" is no longer perceived as such, it is put into a new setting. Weeds are being reinterpreted and the way is cleared for new perceptions that revise older patterns. The staging does not alter the "work" but initiates new interpretations, just like in a theatre.

<http://www.gruen-berlin.de/parks-gardens/suedgelaende-nature-park/>

On the other side of the railway line Büro Kiefer established a long promenade. This is the backbone of the whole area. Attached are some robustly designed recreational spaces, stations where one can rest and play. In this linear park all the uses that are not allowed in the nature park are possible. The promenade is heavily used by inline skaters, joggers and cyclists. Although maintenance is low the aspect of the whole area is quite acceptable.

By means of the differentiated offer of atmospheres and possible uses, the site appeals to many different people. The rather homogeneous community of allotment owners, mostly rather parochial, lower middle class elderly families, is challenged by young inner-city dwellers that discover the attractions of an allotment garden. This way, urban mixture is furthered. The former mono-functional area has become a lively mixed-use urban landscape and the process is still going on while the site gets even better known.

<http://www.gruen-berlin.de/parks-gaerten/natur-park-suedgelaende/hans-baluschek-park/>

So, here are all elements of landscape urbanism united. Infrastructure, connecting fields, process, ecology and new construction methods for the metal paths: crowned by an imaginary use of landscape architecture and the arts.

### **Greenwich Peninsula**

Before I come to the next important site within the north-south green corridor, the Gleisdreieck, I want to speak about a project that was a very important inspiration for preparing the competition brief. I first saw the project in 2001. I hadn't heard about landscape urbanism then, and Desvigne/Dalnoky to my knowledge don't use the term either, but in my opinion it is one of the best examples of landscape urbanism I know.



Greenwich peninsular has been a site where lots of infrastructural elements were located, gas works, bus depots and similar things. When these came into disuse, the very polluted area was left alone for a long time. Although there were several schemes for reuse they all came to nothing because the costs for cleaning up the area were too high in relation to the expected income. This changed when the British government decided to make it a millennium site. Richard Rogers developed a master plan together with Desvigne/Dalnoky. The polluted soil was taken away, 2 m deep. Nothing was left except the old pub. Together with the construction of the Millennium dome, after the financial disaster it became the O<sup>2</sup>-dome, the jubilee tube line was extended to the east which connected not only Greenwich Peninsular but also many other former docklands, e.g. Greenland Dock and the Isle of Dogs, to the metropolitan underground system. All this happened with regard to the Thames Gateway development scheme, with which the government plans to build 120.000 habitations within the next twenty years, an incredible enterprise to work against the lack of affordable housing in the Greater London Area. The Olympic Games 2012 are also part of the strategy.

Now the task for the landscape architects was to develop a project for two different time levels: one was to produce an appealing image for the millennium event, the other was to make it flexible enough to be able to adapt to further developments. The park had to connect the Millennium Dome to the Millennium village at the other end of the site. Also the riversides had to be opened up for visitors. Apart from the dome and the village no three-dimensional structures were there. The future position and use of buildings to come was still very vague. There were no points of reference for a design scheme in the totally cleared up area.

Therefore Desvigne / Dalnoky developed a grid of trees, with forests of the fluvial plane as model. It was supposed to cover the whole site but the developers shied away from this. So it was only implemented in the future park area. Out of the forests clearings could be cut for future uses. The grid consists of quickly growing trees, planted narrowly together, and, with more distance between them, slower growing trees with a longer life span. These latter species have enough space between them so that paths can be introduced between them if the need should arise. The plantings should be pruned every five years to leave enough growing space for the remaining trees.

The backbone of the area is again a long promenade. A path network complements this for cycling and walking. The thickly packed plantations offer an immediate spatial effect; also they serve as wind breaks in this rather windy area. The riverbanks that are part of the tidal brackish water zone were cleared from their mountings and re-formed to terraces where appropriate plants were set. This was done to better the water quality, with measurably effect but it also makes the riverbanks more attractive, especially when the tide is low.

Desvigne / Dalnoky call the concept a "nature intermediaire", an In-between nature. They are looking for the aesthetics of transformation. They refer a lot to ecological processes but with the accent on process. They are far from the stationary and sentimental view of many nature conservationists. Ecological knowledge as well the forestry methods are considered as techniques, as tools to produce the desired effect. The artificial process creates a natural milieu, which can develop and grow and may later be transformed into something else as need be. Sobriety of means and a complex vision of nature combine into a strong idea, which is constructed with simple means.

In this project the process is the goal. Ecology, infrastructure, technique, all this comes together to initiate a strong spatial structure, immediately usable, that has a lot of potential for further developments and helps them on the way. Also it shows that landscape architecture can create strong three-dimensional structures without the help of architecture. This quality is needed even more in the shrinking cities in East Germany than in fast growing London.

[http://archiv.patzerverlag.de/Portals/4/Archiv/SuG/SUG\\_2005\\_06.pdf](http://archiv.patzerverlag.de/Portals/4/Archiv/SuG/SUG_2005_06.pdf) page 28

### **Gleisdreieck Park competition**

Back from London to the city of Berlin, full of holes still to be developed. One of these is the Gleisdreieck, a site where several goods station and associated uses used to be. It is also part of the north-south-connection. To the west and to the east are densely populated quarters where many migrants live. There is very little open space for the inhabitants there. To the north is the new business district of Potsdamer Platz. The site is very central, but this has not really been realised by many citizens in the borough of Kreuzberg, who are renowned for their alternative lifestyle and rebellious attitude. This is the only borough in Germany where a direct mandate for a candidate of the green party went through.

Due to the complicated political and juridical status of Berlin-West, this area was left more and more undisturbed during the division of the city. The type of Nature that is called fourth nature by Ingo Kowarik developed here too.

The origins of the north-south green corridor lie in the fight against a motorway that was planned along this line. Many community action groups fought against this, in the end successfully. The demand for a park on the site of Gleisdreieck is at least 35 years old. So, when this competition was prepared it was clear from the beginning that citizen participation would be very important and should be even more pronounced than usual. On the other hand the danger with this was that the active part of the population, foremost the community action group, would dominate the procedure and other people's needs would be neglected. Therefore new techniques were needed. We started with a representational survey in the neighbourhood. People were asked what they expected from the new park, not only verbally but also visually.

Parallel to the on-site participation an Internet dialogue was started, where users could express their opinions and discuss them with others online. Furthermore a lot of information was offered, not only about the site but also about modern park design. In our opinion both sides in the dialogue have to learn something not only the architects and planners. The competition was in two stages. After the first stage, eleven proposals were chosen to go in the next one. In the interim they were presented to the public, which could comment on it and give recommendations for redesign in the next stage. This procedure was very successful because people behaved very constructively.

From the urbanistic point of view, one of the problems with making the park was the undefined edges. In long negotiations with the railway company building lots were defined, but uses and urban design are still totally open. The planning situation is rather similar to Greenwich Peninsular, the difference is that there are already a lot of people waiting impatiently for the park. The new park has to create its own borders and spaces but has also to be flexible enough to be able to react to future developments. It is also very important to establish connections with the city again, in all directions. These have been cut for centuries, first because of the railway, than because of the special status in law. Also the site is not one coherent area but more of a patchwork that has to be sewn together. Furthermore it was important to have flexible fields in the park that can adapt to changes in fashionable sports and similar tendencies. In the same time basic structures, like trees, should be established for the long term. In addition, parts of the park will be realised much later than the core zone.

The winning project by Atelier Loidl solved these problems by proposing a strong frame where fields of activities were integrated. A system of parkways connects the park with the city. The frame also unifies the separate patches. If need be paths or more fields can be cut into it. In the middle are two huge meadows, which open up large vistas. Although very pleasant in aspect and readily accepted by the public there was also some criticism in the direction that the frame could be put around any space and is not very specific to the site.

Also very interesting is the third prize by Gross Max. In my opinion it is the most site specific. It did not treat the two sides similarly but accentuated the differences. To the west are huge meadows. Noisy uses are put underneath the tube lines, which provide also a roof. The little forest in the middle is augmented and treated like a nature reservation with high-rise walks. The eastern part is treated as a garden in which citizens can work (one of their wishes). Also there are proposals to finance desirable features that were considered to be too expensive in maintenance, like lifts from the street level to the park level, by combining it with a café.

Both proposals are open for change. They provide an infrastructure network that opens up other sites in the neighbourhood and may accelerate processes there, on building sites as well as on green area sites. Both teams view the ecologically valuable sites as starting points

for renaturalizing the remainder of the surface but not as static fixtures. This is now a conflict with some citizens who want to arrest the succession taking place because they have a very static conception of the site, not only with regard to ecology but also to the image and atmosphere connected to it. Finding new ways for integrating people in a two-way-process is an important technique to develop.

<http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/aktuell/wettbewerbe/ergebnisse/2006/gleisdreieck/index.shtml>

<https://vimeo.com/30987736>

<http://referenzbauten.de/bauprojekt/westpark-des-parks-am-gleisdreieck-in-berlin.html>

### **Shrinking City Leipzig**

Finally I want to show you two projects from the city of Leipzig. Like many cities in Eastern Germany, Leipzig has lost many inhabitants since the reunification, due to migration of young people and demographic change. Leipzig has a lot of residential quarters from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century around the city centre that were neglected and in bad repair but essentially very attractive. Some buildings were irreclaimable and had to be demolished at once, others later, because the owners either had no money or no interest to invest in them. Often this happens alongside main traffic lanes because lodgings are noisy there. With a lot of choice (at the moment there are 55.000 empty apartments) people do not want to live there.

The term of the "perforated city" was coined in Leipzig. The demolition in the inner city quarters is a grave problem for the appearance of the 19<sup>th</sup> century blocks with their closed facades presented to the streets, also for the quality in the interiors of the blocks, because noise and air pollution can come in. Also neglected sites in a neighbourhood pull down the value and image of the remaining properties.

Since there is no need for more buildings landscape architecture is asked to do something about this. The program established by the state together with the single federal states and local authorities is called Urban Renewal East, which is in many cases a euphemism for Urban Demolishment East. Of course, this is politically a very sensitive subject. So there is also a lot of citizen participation involved in these planning processes. It is necessary to help people to adapt to the system change and to stop them mourning for the old times. For them the loss of houses is a symbol of many other losses, mainly security in the work place and orientation in the way the society system functions.

In this field of work the way of thinking and working behind landscape urbanism is most required. Nobody knows what will happen, many things are possible. Often work is done by scenarios as this example from Schwedt, a former industrial city in the East, where most industries closed after unification and many people left the city. Leipzig is in a better position

because besides the losses there are also gains. The trade fair has been revived, some big industries, e.g. BMW, have settled there, also the university is quite popular. So, hopefully, many quarters that are now under-populated may fill up again. In 2000, people started to come back into the inner city from the periphery because the inner city had now enough quality and enough green spaces to offer. The shrinking process is also a chance to provide what people always wanted. As the writer Kurt Tucholsky put it: "Well, that's what you would like: in front of the house the Friedrichstraße, in the back the Baltic Sea, " urbanity and green spaces together.

### **Leipziger Osten**

The eastern part of European cities is often the least liked. This is also the case in Leipzig. It never had a lot of open space (that was not thought to be necessary for working people quarters in the 19<sup>th</sup> century) and the building substance was very neglected. It was the last to be renovated so losses in buildings were especially high. As the result of a competition in the year 2000 the urban concept of landscape architects bgmr was chosen. The quarter was divided in several fields. The consolidation fields were mainly okay, the patience fields in substance also. But they need some animation so that people re-recognize their qualities. Measures were e.g. improving the public space, but also to give empty flats to artist at no charge, as workspace and for galleries.

The transformation fields, on the other hand, were considered hopeless in the middle term view. Here buildings were taken away and substituted by green structures. The "dark forest" marks the city entrance and simulates the missing block perimeters. It offers a strong image that is at the same time rather strange. In it there are breaks that contain paths, which connect the dark forest to the surroundings. The concept can be implemented part-by-part, as the lots become available over time. In other areas free lots a given to neighbours for temporary gardening. In case an investor wants to build something they have to leave again. But meanwhile the site is nice looking and useful.

Near the main station a deer park is proposed as a strange attractor. Normally to be found on country estates the deer park constitutes an irritation in this location. In the same time it makes curious for the reason why and points to the changes that are happening, and the potentials, which open up thereby. This is of course, a long-term project.

This project has all the characteristics of landscape urbanism. In my opinion the project is especially strong in imagery. It offers very unusual ideas, opens up a lot of possible developments and potentials for creative thinking. Its ecological value is mainly in keeping or fetching back people into the inner city, which avoids traffic and sprawl. Of course the scheme provides a lot of biomass, and also biotopes for fauna and flora. But the strong point of the concept is the creation of load-bearing structures by simple means that are easy and

cheap to establish and open for change. This offers hope to citizens and furthers their initiative.

### **Grüner Bogen Leipzig**

The housing estate at Leipzig Heiterblick (that means serene view) lies in the northern periphery of Leipzig and was designed in the 1980's as an East German prefabricated concrete high-rise settlement. Although it was never completed, it is an autonomous and functioning part of the urban fabric of Leipzig.

The structural plan that was developed by Häfner/Jimenez landscape architects combines short-term, medium-term and long-term solutions into one package. Using a concept that draws mainly on the structure of the landscape, the suggested measures can also be implemented independently of each other.

The core of the landscape concept consists of a park ring, which embraces Heiterblick estate. This park ring intentionally recalls the ring road around the centre of Leipzig, created by the citizens in the 19th century, and strengthens thereby the connection to the city core. Since there is no demand for buildings at present or in the near future, the circular walk, precincts and water shape the estate. Thus the park ring becomes a programme, which can be implemented step-by-step in foreseeable units, applying only modest means. The periphery course makes order in the public space, gives orientation and creates unity by weaving together the different building structures.

Open spaces on the outskirts of the estate are already in frequent use. This visible demand for the expansion of space is met by the construction of an intensively designed border zone: viewpoints, meeting and resting points, playgrounds, sports grounds, sites for sledding and mountain biking and many other areas are placed side-by-side. The area of the Green Arch is divided into different sections. Different landscape design and maintenance measures (which take existing structures into account) will bring out the unique character of each of the five sections while simultaneously reducing costs.

The Bürgerpark Terrace and the former military exercise site, ca. 35 ha, of the Heiterblick barracks are the first part to have been constructed. On one hand, the area is to become a recreational area for the residents of the neighbouring high-rise development, but on the other hand side, the space is dedicated as a protected biotope for animals, which are threatened with extinction. The two demands were unified by means of landscape architecture and innovative natural protection planning to form a model solution.

The idea of "protection through use" is employed to maintain the important ecosystem. Robust cattle and Przewalski horses use the pastures all year round and keep them open. They are very popular with visitors.

The landscape architects see the project less as a Landscape Design Project than a Landscape Strategy used to unify the demand for recreation and environmental conservation in an extensive area using simple and limited resources.

The Project's Planning and Building Phases were conceived in agreement with the local citizens, with the completion of the first Building Phase being quite well received. The Project's crowning achievement could be that it contributes to the creation of bonds between the population and their housing location, in this way nurturing the area instead of tearing it down, as has been the practice in many other cities in former East Germany.

This project also has all the characteristics of Landscape urbanism. Especially, it demonstrates a forward-looking attitude with regard to ecology. Not conservation at any price is the maxim but creating a self-supporting system that even enhances the experience value of the area.

<http://www.landschaftsarchitektur-heute.de/projekte/details/1737>

### **Concluding remarks**

The examples have shown that there are quite some projects that work in the landscape urbanism way even if the authors don't refer to the term. I think the concept is especially useful for long-term projects in larger areas where development guidelines may change with changes in society. Landscape architecture has at all times been more process-orientated than architecture because landscape projects always change with the seasons and with time as the vegetation changes and matures. But nowadays there are new challenges, which transcend the old professional practice.

The urban sociologist Walter Siebel has introduced the concept of "potential space" or space of possibilities, into planning terminology. Originally it was developed by the psychologist D.W. Winnicott. The potential space after his definition is the virtual space between mother and child that allows for the child to discover his autonomy and to try its wings. The boundaries are set by the parent, often they are flexible. Therefore the potential space is not totally open, limits are set and rules are established in cases where the child puts itself or others in danger or, depending on the nerves of the parent, becomes too burdensome or an encumbrance to the family. The potential space has rules and settings, in which there are then many possibilities for identity building and creativity, and generally, for going on with one's life.

In my opinion one of the important tasks of landscape urbanism is to create such potential spaces or spaces of possibilities, together with physical spaces that also are as flexible as possible. Obviously there are limits. Trees need time to grow and can't be transplanted at will.

The potential space or space of possibilities is different from the spaces of the first modern movement. As Corner says: (L.U.Reader:28) "The modernist notion that new physical structures would yield new patterns of socialization has exhausted its run, failing by virtue of trying to contain the dynamic multiplicity of urban processes within a fixed, rigid, spatial frame that neither derived from nor redirected any of the processes moving through it." The second modern movement, in which we are living now, at least according to sociologist Ulrich Beck, is less heroic and absolute and more self-reflective and pragmatic. Also it has a much more complex view of the world than the often over-simplistic convictions of the first modern movement. Insofar, the concept of landscape urbanism is typical of the second modern movement because it is much more complex and self reflective than the approach to landscape architecture in the 1920ies.

Although most people don't believe any more in the post-modern "anything goes", which was a reaction to the "inalienable" values of the first modern movement, people nowadays know that their values and rules are rooted in history and habit and may have to change to accommodate people from other backgrounds in the more and more globalised world. Values are not absolute but have to be discussed and bargained within societies. Public spaces are places where nearly everybody meets and are therefore especially ordained for these processes. Public space has to become potential space, a space of possibilities for everybody.

Therefore it is very important to integrate people back into the landscape concept. The legacy of the Romantic Movement and the landscape garden is not only a fixation on an outdated image of the picturesque. Another problem it left is that it literally moved active persons out of the picture. While paintings from painters like Brueghel the Elder (16. C.) were full of farmers doing their work, and Lorrain (17.C.) still had shepherds in his landscapes at least, C.D. Friedrich and his contemporaries in the 19. Century only present people who gaze at landscapes without doing anything to it. The old German meaning of "Landschaft" as a unit between physical sites and the people living in them has some potential for this revision of the term landscape.

For landscape urbanism to become successful two other changes have to happen. One is the redefinition of the picturesque. As John Dixon Hunt said, the fixation on the landscape garden is not only leading to cultural stagnation, but it also hinders landscape architects from dealing satisfactorily with elements in landscapes which came up later, like technical and traffic infrastructure. New landscapes need new aesthetics. I quote Corner: "The subsequent re-creations of previous worlds might not offend anyone were it not for their absolute absence of hope and invention ... For all of their apparently innocent effect, landscapes without portent sound a death knell for any form of – and perhaps desire for – a truly modern and enterprising landscape" (Corner 1999:9).



The second requirement for these enterprising landscapes to become reality is another attitude to ecology. At least in Germany, but I think not only there, exists a very backward, static, sentimental and ideological notion of nature conservancy and the protection of habitats, as well in the profession as in the NGO's and the general public. This will inevitably lead to failure because of climate change alone. But also it does not acknowledge that biotopes depend on and develop with certain uses. If these change the dynamics of ecosystem start again. They have to be regarded more under scientific and dynamic aspects to become a valuable tool for constructing the landscapes of tomorrow.

The reflection on the concept of landscape urbanism is a useful occupation for finding new ways to work and think in landscape architecture and in interdisciplinary projects whether one subscribes to the term or not. It requires complex thinking and also what writer Robert Musil called a sense of possibilities, in this book "man without qualities". That means not only to consider the present reality but also alternative realities, what might happen, now and even more in the future. A well developed sense of possibilities, creativity and imaginary, the ability to think always at least in three dimensions, better even in four, including time, are necessary constituents for the creation of attractive spaces of possibilities where human beings and nature have the chance to develop not against each other but together.

Thank you.

## Literatur

Pierre Donadieu (in JoLa, autumn 2006, Donadieu, Pierre. 2006. Landscape Urbanism in Europe: From Brownfields to Sustainable Urban Development. JoLa, Journal of Landscape Architecture (autumn): 36 – 45

Bart Brands in Kerb15, S.3. Interview

Kelly Shannon writes about similar attitudes in " From Theory to Resistance: Landscape Urbanism in Europe" in the L.U. Reader, Charles Waldheim (Hrsg.): The Landscape Urbanism Reader. New York 2006, Princeton Architectural Press.

Abbé Laugier, 1735, essay about architecture:

Christopher Gray, Kerb 15, 2007, mac Laren press, Melbourne. Turning the field. Contradictions in Landscape Urbanism.

James Corner in his essay "Landscape Urbanism" in the book with the same name published by the AA (58 –63)

James Corner: in terra fluxus (2006:32), James Corner: Terra fluxus. In: Charles Waldheim (Hrsg.): The Landscape Urbanism Reader. New York 2006, Princeton Architectural Press. S. 21 – 33

(Corner 1999:9) Corner, James. 1999. Recovering Landscape as a cultural practice. In: Recovering Landscape. Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture. edited by James Corner, New York, Princeton Architectural Press: 1 - 26.

Siebel, In: Kornhardt, Diethild; Gabriele Pütz; Thies Schröder: Mögliche Räume. Hamburg 2002, Junius.

John Dixon Hunt, Hunt, J. D. 1993. The dialogue of modern landscape architecture with its past. In: *Modern landscape architecture*, edited by Marc Treib. Cambridge, Mass., London, The MIT Press: 134 – 143.