

Graduation Plan

Master of Science Architecture, Urbanism & Building Sciences



Graduation Plan: All tracks

The graduation plan consists of at least the following data/segments:

Personal information	
Name	Barbara Prezelj
Student number	4314875
Telephone number	06 45 174 113
E-mail address	barbara.prezelj @ gmail.com
Studio	
Name / Theme	ExploreLab 21
Teachers	Inge Bobbink, Heidi Sohn
Argumentation of choice of the studio	Fascination in particular topic (disturbed sites / nuclear landscapes) and research theme (the unfamiliar, territory, posthuman landscapes) that could be more thoroughly explored if given the freedom outside the structure of the Landscape Track Studio (Flowscapes).
Graduation project	
Title of the graduation project	Unfamiliar Territory_approaching posthuman landscapes
Goal	
Location:	Fort de Vaujours, Vaujours, France
The posed problem,	When dealing with disturbed sites landscape architecture through remediation techniques masks signs of toxicity, pollution and other disturbances in order to give rise to another familiar landscape. Remaking them into 'useful' and 'comprehensible' landscapes, even more fixates our image of the 'natural' and holds off their constant redefinition and evolvement.
research questions and	<p>Inside an expanded field of landscape architecture, how can one read an unhomey landscape and through defamiliarization/destabilization/deterritorialisation productively engage with disturbed sites, now seen as landscape architecture's 'other'? How could reading the site in terms of territorialology move from 'landscape-as-image' to landscape-as-process? What would be the role of an intervention and how could it destabilize the narrow understanding of territory as strictly physical, political and legal grounding of the state?</p> <p>The aim of the project's research component is firstly to propose a methodological transgression of reading (unfamiliar territories) in order to locate and describe 'the specific' on site as a basis for</p>

	<p>future intervention. Secondly, the goal is to explore alternative modes of representation and propose alternatives to the 'common language' of landscape architecture. The project therefore touches three aspects of approaching disturbed sites: 'reading', 'intervening' and 'representing'.</p>
<p>design assignment in which these result.</p>	<p>Design assignment follows from the understanding of the site's 'specificity' (material and affective) acquired through the research part of the project. It works with the site, proposes direction, duration and new territorial markers that act as definition and further elaboration of the territory.</p> <p>The proposed intervention is an exploration into how a landscape architecture project could be subservient to processes, how could it be experienced as an action not a thing.</p> <p>The design site is Fort de Vaujors along with the gypsum quarries and their immediate surroundings. The proposed intervention takes all of the present interests connected to the site into account, proposing a design framework inside which they will take place. It largely focuses on present potentialities and tangible and intangible realities of the site in connection with the role human plays in the landscape through movement and interaction.</p>

Process

Method description

Research begins with exploring the concepts of territory and 'the unfamiliar' and their relation to landscape and landscape architecture. This involves examining Deleuze & Guattari concepts of the refrain, de-/re-/territorialization and further elaborations by Grosz, Shapiro, Brighenti, Halsey and others. Next to this, ideas of post-humanism and new materialism are explored to provide a new view on disturbed sites and on thinking about the territory as relational, process-driven and open-ended mode of organization.

From here on the research is divided into four parts that further elaborate the process and the outcomes of territory-making. These parts follow the four points on territorialology as discussed by Brighenti: a) Who is drawing, b) How the drawing is made c) What kind of drawing is being made and d) Why the drawing is being made . These aspects of territory are translated into following chapters: Territories are territorialized assemblages, Territories are continuously produced and reproduced, Territories are affective and From territory to landscape. Each of these points involves looking deeper into the concepts of territory, 'the unfamiliar', disturbance, landscape. First chapter focuses on the processes and relations that make up the territory, second one focuses on territorial markers as a form of definition and temporal stabilization, third component touches the affective dimensions of territory and its qualities (such as 'the unfamiliar') and the last point examines the relation between territory and landscape and further elaborates on the role of an intervention inside an unfamiliar territory.

Each of these components deal with all three aspects - 'reading', 'intervening' and 'representing' and each challenges common modes of representation inside landscape architecture (through diagrams, mappings, experiments).

Moving to design, the design methodology starts in the 'second chapter' by looking into existing territorial markers through scales and exploring how a future intervention could be envisioned as a series of 'territorial markers on the move'. The design experiments are informed by site analysis and insights gathered from all components of the research part.

Literature and general practical preference

- Barad, K. (n.d.). Meeting the universe halfway.
- Barnett, R. (n.d.). Emergence in landscape architecture.
- Bennet, J. and Chaloupka, W. (1993). In the nature of things. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Bonta, M. and Protevi, J. (2004). Deleuze and geophilosophy. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brighenti, A. (2010). On Territorology: Towards a General Science of Territory. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 27(1), pp.52-72.
- Brighenti, A. (2014). A Territoriology of Graffiti Writing. In: C. Musso and F. Naldi, ed., *Frontier : the line of style*, 1st ed. Bologna : Damiani.
- Chan, P., Baker, G., Banks, E., Friedli, I. and Venanzoni, M. (2014). *Selected writings 2000-2014*. Basel: Laurenz Foundation, Schaulager.
- Chiew, F. (2014). Posthuman Ethics with Cary Wolfe and Karen Barad: Animal Compassion as Trans-Species Entanglement. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 31(4), pp.51-69.
- Czerniak, J., Hargreaves, G. and Beardsley, J. (2007). *Large parks*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- De Landa, M. (2000). Deleuze, Diagrams, and the Genesis of Form. *Amerikastudien / American Studies*, 45(1), pp.33-41.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., Tomlinson, H. and Burchell, G. (1994). *What is philosophy?*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and danger*. New York: Praeger.
- Ellsworth, E. and Kruse, J. (2013). *Making the geologic now*. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Punctum Books.
- Engler, M. (2004). *Designing America's waste landscapes*. Baltimore: J. Hopkins University Press.
- Grosz, E. (2012). *Chaos, Territory, Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Guattari, F. (1989). The Three Ecologies. *New Formations*, 8, pp.131-147.
- Halsey, M. (2004). Environmental Visions: Deleuze and the Modalities of Nature. *Ethics & the Environment*, 9(2), pp.33-64.
- Halsey, M. (2006). *Deleuze and environmental damage*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Harrison, A. (2013). *Architectural theories of the environment*. New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kristeva, J. and Roudiez, L. (1982). *Powers of horror*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Meyer K., E. (1997). The Expanded Field of Landscape Architecture. In: G. F. Thompson and F. R.
- Morgan, L. (2011). The monster in the garden: the grotesque, the gigantic, and the monstrous in Renaissance landscape design. *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes*, 31(3), pp.167-180.
- O'Sullivan, S. (2001). *The Aesthetic of Affect: Thinking art beyond representation*. CANG,

6(3), pp.125- 135.

- Rawes, P. (n.d.). Relational architectural ecologies.
- Raxworthy, J. (1997). Specificity: the impossibility of not projecting. *Landscape review*, 3(2), pp.43-50.
- Raxworthy, J. (2003). Landscape symphonies: Gardening as a source of landscape architectural practice, engaged with chang. In: *The 20th annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney: Society of Architectural Historians, Australia & New Zealand, pp.258-262.
- Shapiro, G. (2004). Territory, Landscape, Garden: towards geoaesthetics. *Angelaki, Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 9(2), pp.103-115.
- Shaviro, S. (2014). Twenty-two theses on nature. [Blog] *The Pinocchio Theory*. Available at: <http://www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=1253> [Accessed 21 Oct. 2015].
- Shklovsky, V. (1997). Art as Technique. In: D. Richter H., ed., *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*, 2nd ed. Bedford Books, pp.774-784.
- Steiner, ed., *Ecological Design and Planning*, 1st ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp.45-79.
- Whatmore, S. (2002). *Hybrid geographies*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Wise, J. (2000). Home: Territory and Identity. *Cultural Studies*, 14(2), pp.295-310.

Reflection

Relevance

The goal of the project is to find new ways of 'reading', 'intervening in' and 'representing' unknown territory of post-human landscapes that are increasingly growing.

The aim of the research part of the project is to propose a methodological transgression of reading the site in terms of processes and relations present on site and to look at landscape's specificity in the context of territoriality and from there form the basis of a future intervention. Both, research and design component of the project strive towards an understanding of landscape architecture project as an action not a thing, exploring ways in which landscape architecture could better engage with contingency to work towards novelty rather than pure change inside predetermined and fixed boundaries.

Second aim of the project is to explore alternative modes of 'representation' that would embody the character of the site instead of relying on conventional landscape representational tools and heuristic devices.

Third aim of the project is to propose an alternative to the current trend in landscape transformations of post-industrial sites and discover new ways of approaching places that could potentially harm us, in this case nuclear contaminated landscapes. As nuclear landscapes are now largely left unspoken about and untouched, despite the fact that nuclear technologies are part of our everyday life, the aim is to bring such landscapes inside the discourse, problematize them and present them as important areas of present and future research and possible intervention.

Time planning

Week 1.1 - 1.10 (10 weeks)

research question, beginning of research / site selection, site visit, design question

Week 2.1 P1

P1 document (problem statement, research topic, site analysis)

Week 2.2- 2.7 (5 weeks)

continuation of research, research draft / site analysis, preliminary design experiments

Week 1.12 P2

P2 document (research draft, research outcomes, design experiments)

Week 2.9 - 3.6 (9 weeks)

finalising research and research outcomes / site research, site analysis / design experiments, site plan

Week 3.7 / P3

P3 document (final research, site research and analysis), outcomes (site plan, working model(s) / experiment)

Week 3.8 - 4.3 (6 weeks)

design, design experiments

Week 4.4 / P4

P4 design outcomes (design drawings, site mode, experiments)

Week 4.5 - 4.10 (5 weeks)

design refinement, reflection

Week 4.11 P5

P5 outcomes (final research and design)