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Abstract
The shaping of the transitional zones between town and country is a field for landscape architecture which has gained more and more importance. „Zwischenstädte“- periphery – edge city – these areas are shaped as much by open spaces as by built up ones.

On the north-eastern border of Berlin three landscape competitions for such areas have taken place and have been partly implemented already. The predominating agricultural use will continue to be important because otherwise the open character of the „Berliner Barnim“ (approx. 1400 hectares) cannot be maintained economically.

The question of how deliberately designed nature (third nature) can be made to blend in with agrarian areas (second nature) ran right through all the procedures. The aim was to turn cleared out landscapes into attractive recreational spaces for the neighbouring large-scale and suburban developments in the north-east of Berlin. Designing within agrarian landscape is a relatively new task facing landscape architects although there are historical precedents like Wörlitz or Muskau.

The urban peripheral landscapes we are dealing with here and now are, in contrast to the classical ones, rather heterogeneous. They include implants of the city for whose functioning they are of course necessary, but which have been relegated to the outskirts.

The conceptional and design problems will be exemplified by showing design schemes and partly realised areas. A demand for new images, a new „Leitbild“, for peripheral landscapes is discussed. While historic landscape gardens and traditional cultural landscapes can’t be aimed at anymore because of changes in agriculture and economy the underlying principles can still be helpful. A new concept of the picturesque has been discussed in the art sciences and this concept can be applied to some of the projects shown.

The foundations for landscape design in the Barnim area on the outskirts of Berlin were laid as early as the end of the nineteenth century. Although, at the time, the Berlin city area was much smaller than it is today, it was recognised that open spaces in the catchment area of a growing city could be threatened. To safeguard the options for nearby recreation and sewage disposal, woods and estates outside the city limits of that time were bought up. The forests were given a special protection and in this way they were secured until today.

At this time the understanding grew that there is a connection between hygiene and epidemics. Reformists like the medic Rudolf Virchow and the civil engineer James Hobrech developed a new sewage canal system and got its realisation through parliament. Open sewage disposal was abolished. Sewage was now transported in canals to the outskirts where it was cleaned by seepage in so-called “Rieselfelder”. At first, these sewage fields were also used for agricultural purposes; later on, this was no longer possible. 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. 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. Some, however, survived until the 1970s, mainly in the eastern half of the city.
In March 1933 Berlin possessed 25,000 ha of forest areas and 27,000 ha of country estates, within the city limits as well as outside. This was a very good basis for regional planning today. Many of these sewage farms were located to the north-east of the city, on the Barnim plateau. Once their use as sewage farms was discontinued, the expanses were used by LPGs as extensive fields and meadows. The landscape was largely empty and unstructured.

Post-1989 developments

Due to the island-like situation of West Berlin and state planning in East Berlin, Berlin differed from comparable western cities in that a suburbanisation process had hardly occurred at all. In the northeast, in particular, large housing developments bordered directly on fields, and a clearly defined urban edge could be recognised.

Even so some making up for this is inevitable, at the same time a lot of consciousness exists for this unique situation which is a result of the special history of Berlin. The immediate vicinity of city and open spaces is a unique potential, the preservation of which was the goal of the regional park concept developed in 1996.

Regional parks are no legal category like national parks but a voluntary union of local authorities. Their landscape character is rather diverse. On the one hand side they consist of forests and lakes whose amenities are obvious. But there are also open agricultural landscapes who are more in need of improvement. This is especially true for the regional park Barnimer Feldmark.

Regional Park Barnimer Feldmark

In this region activities had begun even before the regional park concept was developed, in Berlin as well as in Brandenburg. They are very necessary because this area doesn’t look well neither in reality nor in its image. Though there are some beauty spots there are many more parts in need of enrichment. This region is still waiting for the recognition of its specific attraction which lies mainly in its openness.

The regional park is well suited for bicycle tours because of its flatness. Also it is easily accessible by local trains. The Barnimer Feldmark society developed a system of paths of which there are four different kinds:

1. From train station to train station
2. Circuits
3. Local walkways
4. Bridle paths

Barriers like motorway and railway rings are a problem with regard to their implementation because there are few passages through up to now.
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1 Ermer et al. 1996
2 Landwirtschaftliche Produktionsgenossenschaften – the agricultural production co-operatives of the GDR
3 See also MUNR 1998.
The Barnim

Barnim is the name of a plateau north of the Spree glacial valley. There are two regional parks within its territory, Barnim Nature Park and Regional Park Barnimer Feldmark, west and east of the development axis in the direction of Bernau.

The Berlin Barnim

From the very earliest zoning plan considerations after re-unification onward, the goal was to develop here, especially in the eastern part, a fourth recreational area for Berlin to supplement the forest and lake areas in the three other corners of the city. The north-eastern sector was the area with the most building activities going on even in the 1980ies in the GDR. The large prefabricated building estates of Marzahn-Nord and Hohenschönhausen are in the immediate neighbourhood.

After reunification building in the catchment area of the local railway lines continued, in Karow-Nord, Buchholz and Buch. At the same time there were not nearly enough spaces for recreation on a larger scale for people living here. The existing agricultural area had few attractions. This is mirrored in preferences of people looking for recreation with regard to specific destinations.

Therefore it was quickly evident that “landscape four”, with changing denominations, had to become a centre of landscape planning activities. The main objective was to keep the existing population, living in large scale settlements, to win new ones for the new estates, and not to loose these taxpayers to the neighbouring country of Brandenburg. Money invested in the landscape of the Berliner Barnim serves also in the competition for inhabitants between Berlin and Brandenburg.

Agricultural use is to be kept up because only in this way can such a large area (1400 ha) be maintained with justifiable and, even more, financially affordable expenditure. This is to be supplemented by amenities and elements which structure and embellish the landscape.

What model?

After many preliminary studies a workshop took place in the summer of 1994, on the theme of the „Barnim park landscape.“ The initial concept developed at this workshop made it clear that this was a new type of task. The heterogeneity of landscapes resulting from the disparate character of land uses on the outskirts makes any reference to known models or to any single underlying idea difficult. For this reason, a patchwork concept was developed. Besides showing up this fundamental problem, the results of the workshop suggested basic spatial structures: centres for recreation with more or less intensive character (with regard to design and maintenance requirements as well as intensity of use), large scale spatial structures like forest strips, regional pathway systems, locations for riding stables and similar things as well as sites for landmarks.

Between 1996 and 2000, three competitions were held to deepen these initial considerations. As an immediate effect, these competitions produced landscape design concepts. As a side effect, a discussion process was initiated concerning the design of peripheral landscapes in general. This debate profited greatly from the large number of competition entries with their
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4 Cloos 1998
5 Ermer et al. 1998:604
6 Schröder 1994
7 In this workshop participated: Becker Giseke Mohren Richard; Planland Planungsgruppe; Stoeckli Kienast & Koeppel; Werkgemeinschaft Freiraum and the relevant local authorities.
great variation of concepts, which made contributions of far greater scope than the location directly addressed by each competition.

A common theme to all three competitions was: how can the third nature, designed deliberately according to aesthetic considerations, be made to blend in with the second nature, the cultured landscape adapted for human use? The goal of all the competitions was to turn unstructured peripheral landscapes into an attractive recreational area for the neighbouring large-scale and suburban developments. But how? Is it right to make striking interventions that contrast deliberately with the existing agrarian landscape? Or are less conspicuous solutions that merge with the existing situation preferable? What formal language, what materials can stand the test of time? Considering the limited funding available, should a few highlights be made to achieve an intense effect in a few select locations or should the resources be spread more evenly throughout the site?

The model of the classical landscape park could claim only very limited validity, since the area of 1400 hectares can only be maintained and cared for if a large part of the land continues to be farmed. Examples such as Castle Howard, Stourhead or Wörlitz can offer stimuli, but in the end, the Barnim is a completely different type of landscape. “Zwischenstadt”, Edge City, periphery: these are the terms used to describe the transitional landscapes of the areas of urban concentration. Neither town nor country the unbuilt is at least as important as the built in these areas.

Designing this kind of landscape constitutes a relatively new task for landscape architects. There are historical precedents, but these cannot readily be applied. An analysis of the conditions under which “Landesverschönerung”, as the insertion of embellishing elements into agricultural areas at the end of the 18th / beginning if the 19th century was called, is necessary before simply taking them aboard. Examples such as Wörlitz and Muskau were located in purely rural areas, where landowners of large estates tried to combine the useful with the beautiful in accordance with Enlightenment ideals. Fruit trees were not seen only as ornaments but also carried a yield. Hedges protected against erosion, avenues and clumps of trees gave shade. In addition, preindustrial agricultural production was based on much smaller plots than it is today.

Nowadays, in contrast, urban peripheral landscapes are heterogeneous; they include elements which have nothing to do with agricultural production but are urban implants, cut off from the city, but necessary for their functioning. Moreover, the cultivating and the observing subject, the farmer and the visitor, are no longer identical; thus aesthetics and economics, the beautiful and the useful, can no longer be reconciled in one person. Reconciliation must be newly achieved through negotiation between conflicting interests in society.

Some ideas may be taken from some contemporary examples collected for this aim in a study: the Parc du Sausset and the Parc de la Plage Bleue near Paris, Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord, Parc Migdia in Barcelona and several others. These examples show how technical elements can be integrated into landscape design and how embellishing features can be inserted into areas which are not design-intensive. The difference with regard to the Barnim area lies nevertheless in the fact that all these green spaces are officially dedicated parks which are much smaller, they don’t have areas put to economic use. The influence of local interests on the general conditions for agricultural production is relatively small; the important decisions are made at the European Union level. Modern forms
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8 See Hunt 2000, chapter 3 for a detailed discussion of the concept of the three natures.
9 Embellishment of rural areas
10 Gruppe F 1996
of production require large fields, especially on the relatively poor soils of the Mark Brandenburg.

This is reason enough why the traditional small-plot rural cultivated landscape or the English park landscape cannot serve here as models for landscape design. In those places where such landscapes already exist, they can usually be maintained only with the help of subsidies. To consider building one from scratch here would be to ignore the economic facts.

Dealing with farming posed a problem for many competition participants. Many still maintain a romantic vision of agriculture. As Girot (2003:38) has it: “... we still let us be enticed by idyllic imaginings of a pastoral urban model of times past.” The wish to specify flower fields, small sectioned structures and ecological farming methods in a competition entry leaves reality out of the reckoning. Landscape design can exert its influence only on the structure of the area, the framework of routes and public spaces and the distribution and shape of the farmland. The farmland itself remains a blank page for others to write on.

A further consideration in the development of a model was the question of the location of intensively designed areas. Should they be concentrated on the urban fringe, near to settlements, thus preventing an otherwise possible extension of building construction? Or was it preferable to distribute highlights throughout the entire Berlin Barnim area in order to make it more attractive for longer excursions and to lure visitors far into space?

“Neue Wiesen”

Sometimes, competition entries that did not win a prize are more influential, in the long run, than the first prize. This applies, among others, to the fifth-ranked „Station concept“ of Becker Giseke Mohren Richard from Berlin. It takes the unequivocal position to occupy the whole of the area with designed elements. Beside attractions in the proximity of the residential area, it also offered places of interest, or stations, in the wider park area, at differing distances from the various starting points, thus offering staggered goals and places of sojourn so that according to preference and time budget, many different ways could be selected to take through the park. This approach became the guideline for the following competitions: to put in deliberate singular accents and at the same time to establish a framework open to further developments.

The first prize-winning concept of Schirmer & Kernbach, Berlin, makes striking interventions in a few places and spreads a network of tree-lined paths through the remaining areas. Workable farmland is preserved in the process, the role of farming is accepted. The use of forms is clear and straightforward; it picks up the grid of the former sewage fields underlying today’s large-scale field structure and re-interprets it. This is a logical solution for a space that was an empty, flat landscape as a result of major earlier interventions.

The only existing elements that could be picked up were the poplar grove and the natural course of the Laake brook, which is accompanied part of the way by the man-made Karower Rieselfeld-Graben, or ditch, flowing parallel but in the opposite direction. The 700-meter strip of new parkland, an element of the third nature in the second, stretches between these two poles. As an urban element it is clearly set off from the surrounding meadows. The housing developments planned in the north-west remain unrealised today due to lack of demand, causing the reference point for the strip of parkland to remain an imaginary one. And so it lies there today, an UFO in the landscape, which is definitely not the way it was intended. When making its decision the jury did still assume that the park strip would anchor “like a ship at the urban edge”11. The alienation effect that set in because urban development failed to appear

11 Aufmkolk 2001:10
was unintentional. And yet it has a charm of its own. Rising in the midst of fallow fields overgrown with tall herbaceous plants, meadows and farmland, the strip of parkland stands out clearly, supported by pale concrete and gabion walls. A granite-paved square with sculptures on the ground for skaters is certainly used by young people. The rhythmical series of planes raised at staggered, slightly different altitudes lends the park a subtle tension both inside and outside. The pronounced contrast between urban and rural, concrete and lawns, highs and lows make the park what it is. A further highlight takes the form of a lookout dam. Stairs lead up to it. A low wall tracing the slope provides seating. The vista is unexpected in such a flat area. The dam also lends itself to sledding in winter and biking in summer.

The politician in the jury probably liked the design concept because it has still some similarities to familiar city parks. The rethinking that is necessary, the willingness to accept new images of landscapes was partially pronounced only weakly. The project thus marks the transition from the city to the country, from urban parks and traditional cultural landscapes to the new type of landscape that has to be invented for this new type of space, in more senses than one.

For this reason, the concept is undoubtedly controversial. But the periphery contains other urban implants as well; adding a landscape architectural element of like character is a possible and entirely legitimate approach.

The entries that won second (Lohaus/Carl, Hannover) and third (Weidinger, Berlin) prize also had interesting aspects. The two concepts share the fact that they take up elements belonging to the landscape (avenues, slabs of earth) and process them artistically, defamiliarising them in a certain way and thus bringing new facets to the surface\textsuperscript{12}. That takes some getting used to but should be followed up.

„Gut Falkenberg“

The insights gained in the “Neue Wiesen” competition were of considerable help to the following competition, „Gut Falkenberg.“ Here, there were also more points of reference for the landscape designing task: the remains of an old manor house park, old fruit tree stands, an intact village fringe, more topographical movement and valuable nature reserves in the historical sewage fields. For this reason, the contribution from Atelier Loidl, Berlin, was most convincing, which achieved its goal principally through a slight overstatement of elements already to be found on the site. The entry is based on three elements which were “read” from the existing situation: the lines of decreasing urbanisation from south to north, the landscape lines which follow the topography from east to west throughout the entire park landscape and the islands of valuable relicts mentioned above. The design concept relies on relating these components to each other.

Only a few careful interventions are made in the arable land. The paths running from east to west are emphasised by more dense planting than those running from north to south. Platforms inviting the passer-by to rest are put up at important viewpoints and crossroads.

Another interesting approach was demonstrated by third prize-winners Ruoff landscape architects, Munich. The leitmotif here is gardens, which are placed not only in the old estate park but also in the landscape in strategically important positions. The further the individual “gardens” are from the urban fringe, the more robust and less maintenance-intensive, the more rural in character. Here, a theme and its variations are spread across the extent of the park, thus emphasising the interrelation between village fringe and open country.

\textsuperscript{12} For more detailed information on other contributions to the Neue Wiesen project, see Jirku 1997 and 2001
„Wartenberger Feldmark“

The „Wartenberger Feldmark“ competition completed the trilogy. The first prize-winning entry by plancontext, Berlin, took up the geometrical structure of the landscape and filled it with new content. The requirement that the space be lined to the right and left by forest strips had its origins in the original workshop for the entire area. This space was open in a special way; the challenge lay in structuring the expanse without breaking it. “Landscape with a view” was the motto. Structuring the “forest fractals” that enclose the space required an exact analysis of the many diverse views that can be taken in while passing through 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 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. Rather than being traditionally picturesque, however, these images demonstrate a new aesthetic quality, one that recognises that which is and does not attempt to disguise the technical elements of the periphery but, rather, takes them into consideration.13

Another approach worth taking is demonstrated by the contribution of Rosenstock with Bauer and Hermann. In this entry, the height of the dams of the former sewage fields is overstated and used as a structuring and graduating element. This related to a very differentiated system of path ways which allows many different circuits.

With the conclusion of „Wartenberger Feldmark“ competition, a design concept for a large peripheral space exists. Hopefully, the swift realisation of the concepts will continue. Then a decisive step will have been taken from idea to reality.

Land marks

To improve orientation in these empty, unstructured landscapes establishing landmarks is helpful. Simultaneously they create goals to head for. In an ideal case they also serve to identity building by becoming distinctive elements of a specific site. Lynch distinguishes mainly two kind of landmarks: those which can be seen from afar and those which contrast with their environment by their form and/or their material.14 An example for the first case exists in the lookout dam in Neue Wiesen while the platforms destined for Gut Falkenberg are more an example for the second case.

In all three competitions, the design of stations or landmarks provided ample space for experimentation. Urban and rural elements, kitsch and art, fragile and robust components - all were to be found in this field of tensions. The most convincing components turned out to be those that made use of characteristic elements of the landscape, such as plants and earth, and that in their use of forms took into account the varying distance from the city. This result was further backed up by the requirements of low maintenance cost and a certain degree of resistance to damage.

Path ways network

A further important objective is connecting peripheral spaces and overcoming barriers which result from inserting infrastructure either at random or from planning only one-dimensionally.

13 See Cortesi 2000, p. 47-52 concerning the definition of this new concept of the picturesque.
14 Lynch 1960:78, see also Hauser 2001, p. 281 - 284 on the significance of landmarks.
To make all of these attractions accessible, along with the landscape itself, the expansion of
the path network plays a central role. For each competition area, participants were required to
expand and detail the existing main path network, not only creating a finer mesh of paths, but
also offering options for various speeds and means of transport.

**New Images – old models?**

During the three competitions described some new images of landscape have been conceived
and, in the case of Neue Wiesen, have even been realised. Yet they have not been accepted
everywhere. Neue Wiesen has been criticised harshly by local activists in the nature
conservation movement. Other visitors accepted the area more readily and use it quite often,
especially on weekends. Professionals also mostly thought well of it when it was finished in
1998. In 1999 it was even honoured by the German landscape architecture award for its new
approach.

For local activists landscape design should look to Peter Josef Lenné’s cultural landscapes as
a model if the result wants to claim the quality of being beautiful. Even some landscape
architects and many architects and townplanners take the same view and accept only the
traditional images. This goes together with little knowledge about the economics of modern
agriculture. Either the idea of an ideal farm is formed by the picture book farm they knew as
children or by an alternative ecological farm whose owners get by only with considerable
self-exploitation.

Dealing with technical historic traces also poses problems sometimes, in spite of the success
of IBA-Emscher-Park. In the Teltow Regional Park it was possible only with difficulties to
protect some elements of the sewage fields technique and to consider them as an enrichment
of the landscape. In other areas also there are discussions whether traces of a former use
should be integrated into the new design, especially when they are linear in character. Quite a
few people still consider the straight line as ungodly\(^{15}\), at least in landscapes.

As Giseke 1999 stated the production of desired landscape manifestations en passant by just
cultivating the land steadily decreases, especially in agriculture or forestry. Landscape in the
beginning 21\(^{st}\) century fulfils the ideal picture of traditional rural cultural landscapes less and
less. Therefore trying to keep up the old images only leads to disappointment. New ones are
necessary, new images of landscape and new images of agriculture. The ongoing discussion
with regard to urban agriculture hopefully will be of use for the necessary transition.

Nevertheless, for “inventing” new landscape images going back to the classical landscape
garden may be quite helpful but not by superficially reverting to the formal vocabular
belonging to the period but by looking at its basic principles. In the art sciences there exists a
new definition of the term “picturesque”\(^{16}\) which does not orientate itself on the term of the
painterly or paintable and a formal language that is organic and defined by curving lines.
Rather it concentrates on the aspect of the continuously changing view point during walking
around or through a work of art or a building. In this newly defined sense for instance the
Barcelona Pavilion by Mies van der Rohe or the sculptures of Richard Serra are seen as
“picturesque” because with each changing of one’s view point, i.e. peripatetically, new vistas
and spatial formations open up which are not determined by a central perspective\(^{17}\). „Its
meaning is generated through the experience of a circuit that suggests parallels with those of
the English landscape movement“\(^{18}\). These are works which are anything but picturesque in

\(^{15}\) The artist Friedensreich Hundertwasser took this viewpoint.

\(^{16}\) see for instance Bois, Constant and Cortesi

\(^{17}\) with regard to the importance of walking for experiencing landscape architecture, see Conan 2003

\(^{18}\) Constant 1990:47
the traditional sense and have nothing in common with the formal language of the classic landscape garden. Yet common to the landscape garden is the absence of a central perspective and the necessity to experience them in the third dimension. If one follows this new definition of the picturesque the design for Wartenberger Feldmark keeps well within the tradition of the landscape garden.

And there are other aspects of the landscape garden which may be helpful for designing spaces in the periphery. Hunt (1992:5) mentions that at the end of the 18th century, "the picturesque had become another example of how humans came to accommodate potentially unprepossessing scenery." Now there is a lot of unprepossessing scenery in the periphery which could be transformed by aesthetic mediation from non-places into places. Only the focus isn’t directed any more to temples or statues but to water towers, pylons and other predominating elements of peripheral landscapes. Characteristic for the landscape garden is the integration of very different elements, fabriques, belonging to different stylistic periods and different geographical origins, into a “Gesamtkunstwerk”, a synthesis of the arts. This was achieved at first by means of integrating them into a sequence of scenes. Later on these were even included into a narrative, for example in Stourhead or in Glienicke. The landscape garden embodies an idea into which separate elements were fitted to reunify them on a higher level. Existing landscape features were worked upon to make them more meaningful (as in Gut Falkenberg). The landscape architect acts as “director” who stages a sequence of pictures with respect to an overlaying idea. In this he may let free reign to his imaginings often not without a certain eclecticism.

To deal in this way with the disparate elements of peripheral landscapes is much more promising than to mourn for the scenic pictures of vanishing rural landscapes. Anyway, Hauser says that the division of the visible environment into aesthetizable landscapes and something else, something invisible” is at an end, as well as “a long history of non-perception”. “The new landscape ... is no longer thought within patterns of reconciliation produced and an aesthetic ideal but by that which is found to be existing”.

Generalisations don’t swing

Although the problems facing peripheral areas in general are similar in nature, their solutions should not be. As different as they may be, the examples described here have one thing in common: they take the existing space as it is, along with its history, as the raw material out of which to create something. No attempt is made to completely change the form of the space, into a traditionally picturesque landscape, for example. Under the given circumstances, such an attempt would be destined to fail in any case. Each concept finds other aspects to take up, current physical ones or historical ones, nearby or distant ones, but in each case ones having some relation to the specific place. No solutions from other areas are transported to the Baring.

While in the architectural realm certain forms have become universally interchangeable, natural factors limit the interchangeability of solutions in landscape architecture. Factors such
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19 see Bois 1984:37; with regard to the non-centered, unihierarchical character of peripheries see Vöckler 1998:285
20 At the time this referred to agricultural sceneries which were not considered formerly as worthy of aesthetecisation.
21 this means the building programme within a landscape garden
22 Hoffmann 1963:112
23 (Hauser 2001:280; translation by the author)
24 What Hauser 2001, p. 160, writes about the conversion of buildings is equally valid for landscapes: “The old building is not only in its components but also in its conception a raw material that must be formed.”
as soil and climate prevent concepts from being taken over unaltered from other places. In addition, previous cultural and urban landscapes, the second nature, have usually left manifold, overlapping traces that can be used as a starting point for a new third nature concept. This makes it possible to find an individual solution for each place. The uniqueness of a place lies in the intersection of lines of development, both natural and cultural, supplemented by the specific demands of the present and the anticipated future. If this uniqueness can be developed into a special pattern which counteracts the ubiquitousness characteristic of peripheries, a pattern that swings, then we are prepared for encounters of any kind.
REFERENCES


Pictures and plans of the competitions described can be looked at under: www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/aktuell/Wettbewerbe/Ergebnisse, “vor 1999”: Neue Wiesen and Gut Falkenberg; “2000”: Wartenberger Feldmark.
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Résumé
L’aménagement des zones de transition entre ville et campagne est un sujet qui a gagné en importance dans le domaine du paysage. « Zwischenstädte » – périphérie – edge city –, ces endroits sont formés autant par des espaces libres que par des espaces construits.
À la frontière nord-est de Berlin, trois concours de paysage ont eu lieu et ont déjà, en partie, donné lieu à des réalisation. Il est nécessaire de conserver en grande partie l’usage agricole parce que, sans cela, il serait impossible de gérer économiquement une si grande surface (environ 1400 ha) et le caractère d’espace ouvert serait mis en danger.
La question de comment insérer la « troisième nature », c’est à dire un aménagement délibéré, dans la « deuxième nature », c’est à dire dans un domaine cultivé pour le profit de l’homme, était présente dans toutes les étapes de la discussion. Le but était de transformer le paysage vidé de ses structures antérieures en une aire de loisir pour les habitants des Grands Ensembles préfabriqués du voisinage.
L’aménagement des paysages agricoles représente un thème relativement nouveau pour les paysagistes, bien qu’il existe des exemples historiques comme Wörlitz ou Muskau. Les paysages des grandes banlieues auxquels nous sommes confrontés aujourd’hui sont hétérogènes, contrairement aux exemples classiques. Ils comportent des fonctions et des éléments qui n’ont aucun lien avec une production agricole et, simultanément, qui sont des implantations exclues de la ville ; ils lui sont pourtant nécessaires.
Les concepts développés seront exposés à l’aide des projets et des réalisations. La demande de « nouvelles images » ou nouveaux « modèles » pour les paysages des périphéries sera débattue. Si les paysages historiques traditionnels et les jardins anglais ne peuvent plus être le but recherché à cause des changements dans le domaine de l’agriculture et de l’économie, les principes qui lui sont sous-jacents peuvent être tout à fait utiles aujourd’hui. Un « nouveau sens du pittoresque », déjà discuté par le domaine artistique, mériterait d’être confronté aux nouveaux projets de paysages.