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abstract concept

Bucharest, Romania
1. Introduction

In this project I take begin from two points: the frame, and a particular site in Bucharest, Romania. The specific site is the territory surrounding the House of the People, whose construction started in 1986. This building is the third largest building on earth, and built as part of a project for a new civic centre, for which the preparations and construction resulted in the destruction of a third of the old urban fabric of the city. This project ended with the revolution in 1989, and left the site a mixture of old city fabric, late communist blocks, and unused, abandoned and overgrown lots. The frame is that which separates. In this project, I detach the frame from what it is, and focus instead on what it does. The frame separates and distinguishes something from its surroundings, and thus creates a condition of inclusion/exclusion. The frame permeates all aspects of this project, from theory to urbanism to strategy to landscape to detail to the very process of design and production itself.

From these starting points, my investigation was guided by four questions:
- What are the mechanisms of framing?
- How can the frame provide a tool for understanding and intervening in a contested landscape immanently?
- How can a landscape architecture project be framed into a landscape?
- How can landscape architecture elaborate landscape in both a critical and open ended way?

STARTING POINT: POSITION AND VALUES

Position on landscape architecture
The project involved not only an investigation into the frame, but also into landscape architecture. Landscape architecture is tasked both with intervening in a landscape, as well as determining and framing what is the territory that it considers landscape. Landscape architecture is tasked not only with designing solutions, strategies, expressions, elaborations but framing situations, posing problems, and putting into question the framework behind a situation, including the very framework of landscape architecture itself. In other words, the determining of the parameters of a project - that is to say, the framing of a project - the limitations, choosing what to include and not include of a design-problem - is as much as part of the design as the proposed materializations of the intervention itself. This being said - the landscape architect as instigator of this intervention process is accountable for its frames.

Values that inform the project
- Landscape consists of both natural and artificial, urban and non urban. these are not separate but continuous; nature cannot be considered separate from humans
- City as fragmentation of landscape, not agglomeration of constructions
- Humans are not the only actors and agents in a landscape/shift away from human-centric understanding of world
- Design is always for a public but not limited to it. This public cannot be assumed - it is a yet-to-come public
- Life must elaborate itself and thus produce the new.
- Openness to change, elaboration, further differentiation
- Fixed identity, fixed structure limit openness
- A material situation is neutral/has no inherent judgement but as myself i am not - i am responsible to stand for justice

STRUCTURE OF PROJECT

The process of the project was non linear, having two separate starting points. The process involved the saturating of a field with intuitive steps forward from the initial question coupled with a framing of the results according to initial goals, and new insights to generate the next current 'state' of the project. Rather than each part (experiment, research segment, design idea) adding up in a linear fashion, the addition of each subsequent part reconfigures the entire project to a further state of thinking.

The project has two main aspects that inform each other: the theoretical research, and the design project. These reflect the two starting points (the frame, and the particular site), but also their intersection and interaction. The theoretical research (frame) as a final product consists of an essay outlining the results of the research concerning the mechanisms of frame and framing, as well as how this can relate to landscape architecture, as well as a glossary, that collects relevant terms, definitions, examples, and tangent. The design project (specific site) involves for a strategy and design proposal of the site that elaborates itself in both space and time. This document focuses on the design project, and accompanies a drawings set of the design.

A supplement includes some of the experiments, research segments, design ideas, etc that informed and made up the project but were not part of the narrative of the project as research or design.
From my research: the mechanism of framing involves three parts: and inflection, or specificity, a vector, or tendency, and a frame, or interval, that acts as selection process.
When we look at the frame, right away a number of ambiguities appear. Not only are there many ways of framing,
The separation process in itself is not always so clear. For example, if we are to consider the framing of space immanently and without a fixed external scale, it becomes hard to determine when exactly is the frame...

... and once we move away between rigid structures, it becomes even more unclear.
Furthermore, how a framing is materialized affects its experience as well. A building and a forest, despite having some similar spatial characteristics, offer a totally different way of framing.
so then how to understand landscape? we can think of landscape as a composite, or landscape as continuous
In order then to identify specificies in the landscape, or frame it, we can do so either through aggregation, or delimitation. These can be thought of as two main ways of framing.
How is the landscape event of football framed?

Consider the landscape event of football as an example. A football game can be framed through the physical delimitations and demarcations of a field, or through the assemblage of players, ball, rules, game time interval. As any child knows, a football game can take place anywhere... but without a spatial delimitation, the interval of the game might be interrupted.
The framing of football as a relation or assemblage of game components (spatial and non spatial) is not dependent on the existence of a subject that frames it: the space of the field itself is can be similarly understood.
Frame and framing not only determine a spatial specificity but also specify an interval. This interval is both supported by a materiality and allows for the materiality to potentially unfold. The materiality involved in framing takes two forms, and always brings in an excess to the framing. This manifests:

- either through delimitation - its materialization as boundary
- or through assemblage of components - which can the potential to further unfold materially
‘FRAME’
boundary
striated

‘FRAMING’
assemblage/meshing
smooth

The frame can operate in two main ways: either through the meshing/assemblage of the components (which I refer to as framing) such that they make this inclusion/exclusion through the intra-action of the components, such as, or through the imposition of limit (which I refer to as frame), such as in the frame of a classic painting or the walls of a hortus conclusus.

We can think of these two ways of framing within the context of landscape architecture as gesture - the delimitation - and germ - the meshing that has potential to grow. These two terms are not perfectly clear cut, and involve inflection, vectors, and frames, but they describe two ways that framing can operate to elaborate a landscape.

Germ is folded up framing, assemblage with catalytic potential, inflection + vector + quasi frame, it is the smooth space of emergence.

Gesture is a frame that allows for the germ to germinate - its the stratification which allows for the smooth to unfold.

Germ and gesture are operative words to describe how the interventions on the site articulate and elaborate the landscape, and provide opportunities for new frames.
For example, the enclosed garden is framed both by the outer boundary, but also by the practices of cultivation of the plantings inside.
A river can also be said to ‘frame’ its riverbed, with the difference in soil along the edge and the river’s meanders creating boundary conditions, but the river itself is also a germ, bringing water and sedimentation for the vegetation to grow.
3. Site summary

PROBLEMATIQUE/SITE DESCRIPTION

Site:
This research project has as starting point a particular city (Bucharest) and also a particular site Casa Poporului as part of a project for a new civic centre, that resonates at the scale of the city. Casa Poporului (‘House of the people’, today also known as the Palace of the Parliament) was a grandiose project built by the Ceausescu regime. Its construction started in 1986, and was interrupted by the revolution of 1989 - the building not yet complete. Following the earthquake of 1977 that destroyed a large part of the city fabric, a series of ‘cleaning up’ and demolishing operations were undertaken on the city of Bucharest. While part of this was required because of the earthquake, it was also used as an excuse to get rid of older city fabric that did not match the ideas of the regime, and to give the city a new socialist face. Casa Poporului was built on the site of Uranus neighbourhood on a hill, both which were partially destroyed to make room for the construction. Today the Casa Poporului houses the Parliament and the Contemporary art museum. The lot also houses an exclusive tennis court, as well as the partially buried former Republicii sports stadium. The site also host the Catedrala Neamului (‘Cathedral of the nation’), a mixed use religious complex, in 2015 still in construction. The space left over on the site is partially landscaped on the north east, east, and south east sides, while the west side is overgrown.

Problematique:
The site I have chosen is far from a neutral one. As the site of a heavy handed political operations acting directly onto space - destroying both geography and city fabric - as well a human patterns and human lives. The question faced by this project is how to intervene on a (landscape) site of violent identity making - where the violence also only onto territory? More specifically, how to intervene through the elaboration of this landscape (landscape architecture). The project aims less to pass judgment (although it does take a position) on the forces that recently shaped that landscape but to rather prevent and displace the definitive fixing of judgments while still allowing trauma to heal. For this specific reason is the concept of failure important to this project. The site has ben subject to numerous large scale operations - responding with another totalizing project will only mimic the same structures of power that have been applied to the site. Part of this research is also to see what kind of projects are possible - and to what extent are the possible, given these conditions.

One of the strongest way the conditions of the site present a problematique is through the issue of scale. Ceausescu’s actions on the centre of Bucharest destroyed a pattern of scalar relationships (street-yard-house-neighbourhood) as making of cities and introduced urban void that implies a fixed scale on the landscape. While the experience of landscape is never bound by scale - the leaf touching the hand is as much as part of the experience as the horizon - the destruction of the fabric and the (partial) construction of the civic centre - including the House of the People

VISION
3.1 The ridge

The most significant ridge in Bucharest is the southern ridge carved out by the Dambovita river floodplain, once a marshy area. The city developed around and within the area carved out by this ridge, the highest points occupying important functions (arsenal, churches). The ridge is a continuous edge, but other important topographical features (namely the hills upon which almost all old churches were built).

The ridge currently ranges from Lacul Morii (acumulation lake with area of 246 m² made in 1986 to protect city from floods and regulate flow of dambovita through bucharest) to groapa vacaresti (excavation made for a port/new lake/flood mitigation also begun in 1986, but never completed. the area is fed by underground water sources, and in time became an important biodiverse area bearing the characteristics of a delta home to a large amount of rare birds, and other animals). both of these points are within the current boundary of Bucharest.

Careful observation of satellite imagery will reveal a thin ribbon of green that delineates the ridge.

Today the ridge has been largely absorbed by public institutions, incorporated into parks, or left unbuilt. Several neighbourhoods (older) incorporate the ridge, and use stairs as ways to navigate the topography.

Institutions grounds absorbing the ridge:
- Palatul Cotroceni
- Academia de Stinte
- Palatul Bragadiru

Institutions grounds ‘framed’ by the ridge
- former ‘Semanatoarea’ Factory
- water Reservoir
- Politechnical university campus
- Universitatea Nationala de Aparare Carol I
- Ministerul Aparari
- Casa Poporului/Palatul parlamentului
- Academia Tehnica Militara

Parks along the ridge
- Stadionul de Rugby Ciurel
- Parcul Grozavesti
- Botanical garden
- Parcul Rominceanu
- Stadionul Cotroceni
- Parcul Carol
- Parcul Tineretului
- Parcul Lumea Copiilor
- Groapa Vacaresti

Neighbourhoods ‘framed’ by the ridge
- Cotroceni
- blocks near Tineretului metro
- blocks near Martisor neighbourhood
- Metropiliei area

Neighbourhoods incorportating ridge
- Filaret

Other spaces incorporating the ridge
- The site (area surrounding the House of the People)

The ridge is very important for the historical development of Bucharest, but its absorption by large plots of land (institutional grounds, parks) divides the experience of the continuity of the ridge, and the relation to the Dambovita river (today channeled through the city, the bulk flow of water passing through underground pipes, the surface water of the river being mostly decorative). At the same time, for the areas that do incorporate the ridge, the ridge is a powerful spatial device that marks the boundary and gives specificity to that environment.

The site is located along this ridge, where the ridge presents a fairly large corner into the city. The project of the Civic Centre involved not only modifications to the urban fabric, but also to the ridge itself. (see ‘Site as process’).
3.2 Bucharest as continuous landscape

Bucharest: the landscape interrupted by the city.

To think of landscape through the frame is to also consider landscape as continuous and at the same time endlessly open to further articulation and elaboration. The city becomes a fragmentation of landscape rather than a conglomeration of constructions.
Green space in Bucharest, framed by the built
3.3 Landscape specificity: frame of frames as analysis

This project is about framing -- how things become specific. This framing is encountered pattern of difference that is either diffuse, where the materialization of the framing is spread out within the pattern of difference itself, or concentrated, where the framing is materialized separately as the frame. The analysis takes as starting point the reversal of the primacy of the built environment over the unbuilt environment. The city is not a agglomeration but rather a fragmentation of the landscape. The series of maps presented here start with the city framed by the landscape and zoom in on a particular area: that which surrounds the Palace of the Parliament and site of the destroyed neighbourhood of Uranus.

Rather than valuing the identity of this area as a fixed set of traces through singular objects (buildings, etc) or patterns of objects (building ensembles, gardens or parks, etc), these mappings seek to value its specificity, while at the same time allowing processes (natural and unnatural) to continue unfolding on the site, creating more difference, and resulting in a continually heterogenous and varied landscape. This approach allows to value and preserve the specificity of a given landscape, without monumentalizing it, and also allow it to change and grow, without erasing its past.
The landscape is understood as a series of frames-in-frames, which generates the specificities of a landscape.
Private residences

Single houses

Blocks

Post 90
ZONES

Collective housing

Pre 77

Post 77
Frame of Frames

Grading Report

Version 1.0

Element

Forest
sample variation across element

Maidan/unused/unbuilt/abandoned
ELEMENT

Parks, public green, markets, piazzas

sample variation across element
ELEMENT

Churches, cemeteries

sample variation across element
Institutional, private, sports fields

Sample variation across element
industrial agriculture, green houses

sample variation across element
A simplified look at making specific through framing in the context of landscape architecture. This understanding on framing takes as starting point the elaborations of the frame of Bernard Cache and Elizabeth Grosz on the writings of Gilles Deleuze. These two ways of framing often - but not always coincide. The discrepancy between the concentrated framings and the diffuse framings are one way to allow for new patterns and processes to emerge.
The patterns of framing in Uranus relate to larger processes that are framed by certain key events: the earthquake of ’77 and the following destruction of the neighbourhood in order to construct the civic centre, coupled with the construction of socialist housing block; the revolution of ’89, and the ceasing of the development of the Civic Centre, resulting in a number of half-finished demolitions and unconstructed lots; and the opening of the market and appearance of new private housing buildings.
Diffused framing

(1) road (2) sidewalk (3) public green (4) paved surface (5) dirt (7) rubble (8) rubble and vegetation (9) mostly vegetation (10) unmaintained vegetation (11) maintained vegetation
Uranus framing patterns sampler
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Post-90 blocs

Pre-77 houses

View

image source: maps.google.com

Satellite

image source: maps.google.com

Frames
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Pre-77 houses/Post-90 houses  Post-90 houses  Post-90 houses/empty lots
3.5 Site textures
To think of the site as a process requires a tracing back of that which structures the site or frames it in time. To determine the processes that have shaped the site, the site can be read in terms of its traces. What structures the site today can be thought of as the traces of past frames of the processes of landscape shaping.

The figure on the left illustrates this. A certain site can be understood as the traces (right column) left by a number of landscape shaping processes (left column). The processes are simultaneous and intertwine and leave traces on the landscape, in turn past traces are transformed by processes. The emergence of traces is less linked to chronological time and more to intervals of possibility permitted by processes. Some of these intervals (such as the destroying of part of the old city fabric neighbourhood) can be directly mapped onto a time line, while others, such as the growing of ruderal vegetation in unoccupied sites, are continuous and perpetual.

These processes can then be also be traced through in subsequent reconfigurations, as shown on the figure on the next page. Since 1791, Bucharest has been structured by a number of different components, which frame the landscape.
1791
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marshes
significant buildings
ridge

1864
orchard
garden
sanitization of river

1911
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street network
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1911
street network
church

1911
industry
army/defence
institutions
railways

PROJECT
unused lots
parks
church
yards
institutional grounds
gardens
infrastructure
grid
forest

1991
demolished site
other open spaces
new buildings

2015
parks
other open spaces

2015
demolished site
other open spaces
4. Design strategy

FRAME AND LANDSCAPE

To think of landscape through the frame is to also consider landscape as continuous and at the same time endlessly open to further articulation and elaboration. Thus, the city becomes a fragmentation of landscape rather than a conglomeration of constructions.

To read the landscape through its frame is to have a topological understanding of that which structures the landscape and its processes. Thus, a landscape can be understood as a frame of frames.

From the glossary:
FRAME OF FRAMES - the infinite nesting and entanglement of frames in frames, across and between scales, without finality. the very act of choosing a moment in the series of frames is a framing in itself...

From territory to any instance of greenery in the city, there are a number of elaborations and articulations that occur to make this specific instant. However, these articulations and elaborations, or sequences of framing, at some point cease to be variations of one another and become specific to a larger specificity in an irreducible way. In other words, certain framings resonate across other framings, in such that such framings are nested in one another.

Within these scales, there are also articulations such as making more specific without being a frame (for example the interstitial space between buildings, the garden of a house, the yard of a block). These articulations, although they can partake in processes of framing, are specific within their scales, rather than specificities to their scale. In other words, all the gardens in a neighborhood of houses with gardens are of course specific to the house that houses them, but a park is specific to the entire neighborhood, and to all the gardens. Each of these specified areas of these scales has ways of framing particular to them. These framings-with-frames are not to be understood hierarchically, nor absolutely. They are meant to be a starting point, a tool for schematic analysis of the city, deriving a set of scales not based on empirical dimensions but rather on frames.

These infinite series of frames describe a topological space. Rather than thinking the landscape as fixed in a set of pre-determined, metric scales, the idea of frame in frames allows to connect disparate elements of a landscape based on their framings - their shared intervals and shared consistency.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESEARCH AND DESIGN

The exploration of the frame structures this project and permeates all aspects of it, from theory to urbanism to landscape to detail.

The design aspect of the project unfolds through articulation, elaboration, and intervention of the site. It involves both the determining of the frames which make up the site, as well as the very frames themselves.

VISION

What the concept of the frame brings to the project is;
a) understanding of landscape as continuous but not unspecified
b) ability to read the site in terms of its framings and frames, and to recognize the inflections (spatial specificities), vectors (tendencies, processes, latencies) and finally frames (existing organizing and gestural structures)
c) provide an understanding of the site that determines the conditions for interventions to take place
c) provide a mechanism of understanding the kinds of interventions on the site in relation to both how they articulate the landscape and how they allow the continuous differentiation of the landscape to continue in new ways
d) provide two mechanisms for the interventions to be made:
   • gestures make openings - introduce intervals in which new durations (such as that folded up in germs) can unfold
   • germs begin between frames but hold the potential to unfold their operations beyond the frames in itself
   • germs can generate new gestures or further germs
   • gestures can generate germs

By combining germ and gesture, the interventions can operate beyond their frames while being localized as an intensity. Each intervention is both a frame and a framing in itself, but combines, overlaid, and meshed with other interventions produces frames at larger scales, reframing the site and the city.
4.1 Frame of frames as a design methodology

The design strategy introduces new frames to the site that are at once germ and gesture - frame and framing.

The design is a series of frames that are both frame and framings, germs and gestures which enable and support one another, and provide the potential of unfolding beyond their initial boundaries.

The aim with this methodology is to suggest that through the mechanisms of the frame/unframing/frameofframes in mind, one can intervene in a landscape's frames with precision and intensity yet 'generate' a variety of parks across scales that work together to further articulate and elaborate the landscape of an urban context.

The components are selected according to their ability to intervene, frame, unframe, etc in the existing framings of a site following the larger design goals, and can through of as the (infra) structures of the design project. These components not only have a materialization, but also an expression

The strategy involves 4 types of components, or frames. These components act as frames that are both germ/gesture. These components range across scales, and all operate at multiple scales at once.

The components of the project manifest as the following frames:

- point / infrastructure / utility (60x60m)
- surface / urban acupuncture / garden (x4)
- volume / massing / forest (1000 oaks)
- line / connectivity / slow mobility (1 long line)

These components work together to intervene both within the site and with the other components. Each of these frames both read the site and respond to it, generating new framings. The aim of this strategy is to use the mechanisms of the framing to intervene in a landscape's frames with precision and intensity to 'generate' a variety of parks across scales that work together to further articulate and elaborate the landscape of an urban context. Through their articulation in a site, the germs and gestures provided by the elements can then generate a number of park conditions.
To briefly sketch some of these parks, in quasi-chronological order:

- the localized garden-parks (the gardens in themselves)
- the linear park (central) (the ridge that concentrate slow mobility across the site near the House of the people)
- the linear park (territorial) (the ridge connecting the existing parks, institutional open spaces, other green or open spaces across Bucharest)
- the field park (the field with infrastructure as open-ended landscape)
- the (anti)-monumental park (the forest)
- the diffuse park (the abandoned, unused or otherwise open space of the city seen through the logic of the frame of frames)
- the central periphery park (main site of design intervention: intersection of four park components)
gardens as intensity activate ridge

points of intensity act as attractor to user

slow mobility connects points of intensity utility infrastructure provies opportunity to expand

each garden has the possibility and potential (germ) to expand beyond its initial gesture
STRATEGIES OF UNFRAMING

- germ + gesture
- intensity → infrastructure
- intensity → structure
- gesture
- cross bracing
- uses
- practices + germs
- movements
4.2 Site practices and site potentials

the site can not only be thought of as processes (as previously mentioned in section 3.6), but also in terms of the practices it involves. While the destruction and construction of the civic centre put in action a number of very fixed practices (parliament, art museum, ministries), beyond the cut out of the civic centre a number of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional programmes continue, along with their associated practices.
### Location of Inflections

### INFLECTION IN RIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>productive</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="productive" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="doing" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanging</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="exchanging" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="gathering" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socializing</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="socializing" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watching</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="watching" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitting</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="sitting" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="play" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchanging</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="exchanging" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathering</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="gathering" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watching</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="watching" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDED INFRASTRUCTURE

- cellar built in ridge with stair
- cut in ridge with ramp
- elevator
- dispersed stair

NEW FRAMES

- ping pong
- amphitheater
- bike path

BOUNDARY

- mowing frequency
- traffic
- tree nursery

PROPOSED PROGRAMME

- orchard
5. Design

to be continued...
mpleted
circulation/slow mobility
6. Planting

Located at the edge of the oak forest and the steppe, Bucharest used to be known as a city of gardens. Today, most parks are covered in lawns unfit for the hot, dry summers, requiring high maintenance that the city hardly provides. Communist appropriation of land have shifted attitudes to the landscape from being the livelihood of Romania’s mostly peasant population to being something that belongs to both everyone and no one. Various local and European funded initiatives have begun to try to value some of the area’s natural habitats and features, but at least in Bucharest, these regulations and plans are largely ignored by the authorities. However, the region around holds hints to what the natural landscape of Bucharest once was and what it can be.
Grassland meadows.
Meadows and clearings occupy a strong position in Romanian folklore and imaginary as enchanted places. Surrounding Bucharest, meadows often occur on fallow land that is no longer used for agriculture, but remains in private ownership and is therefore undisturbed. Many of these meadows are used for grazing, which occurs even in the periphery of Bucharest.

OAK FOREST

The area surrounding Bucharest used to be oak forest, with main species Quercus cernita and Quercus cerris. However, due to frequent human intervention and disruption of habitat, there are also a large number of ruderal species. The soil is generally dry, and there are very few to none natural habitats in the area surrounding Bucharest. The few forests around Bucharest are destinations for weekend visitors who use it for barbequing or bike rides, but unfortunately also used as dumping sites.

Garden orchard.
Bucharest is historically known as a city of gardens. Unlike western european gardens, Bucharest’s gardens, both private and public often included orchards and were sites of feasts and play rather than contemplation. Because of its lack of fortifications, Bucharest has historically been low density city that contained land used for agriculture and cultivation. To this day, parts of Bucharest have a distinct rural character.
overall site: inaccessible

- planted trees
- isolated trees surrounded by grass
- characteristic species: Quercus robur

- lawn
- high maintenance
- monotonous
- drought sensitive
- poor water retention

- grassland
- ruderal species
- few number of species
- scrubland
- ruderal species
- dry soils, especially in summer
- characteristic species: Prunus spinosa and Crataegus monogyna

- spontaneous woods
- poor, dry soil
- ruderal species
- characteristic species: Ailanthus altissima, Ulmus minor, Populus nigra
The meadows is built upon the existing scrubland, and involves first a series of plantings and processes intended to improve the poor existing soil quality. Then a mix of steppe and wildflower meadow grasses will be planted. A series of lifted paths is installed in order to “frame” the meadow and present it to the public as something not unkept, but valuable. The field, now with improved soil, is now ready for appropriation and cultivation.

**Year one: ground is prepared for soil regeneration**
1. evaluate existing vegetation
2. mow all existing vegetation except for trees use mown vegetation for compost on-site (to be used later)
3. clear ground
4. arrange grading away from buildings; dig furrows
5. introduce a lot of coarse sandy material, concrete sand, mixed compost and manure (obtained from area surrounding Bucharest)
6. plough area deeply with a subsoiler, parallel to contours of site.
7. seed entire area with clover, and when it is in full bloom cultivate it under, mixing it into the soil to add nitrogen and green manure to the soil.

**Year two: crops grown to enrich soil**
1. seed wheat and barley in areas of site, grow to height of 20 cm, and then cultivate under.
2. seed cold-season steppe grasses from grass list across site
3. mow at end of winter

**Year three: site soil is ready for further cultivation**
1. identify non-appropriated areas for planting intensification
2. in those areas, plough the soil, add compost
3. plant wildflowers, roses, etc
4. at the end of winter, mow down public areas grass. allow appropriated areas to be kept

top (left to right): Chicorium intybus; Medicago sativa; Phleum pratense; Stipa tenufolia
bottom (left to right): Stipa capitalata; Salvia officinalis; Hordeum vulgare; Setaria viridis
to be completed
7. Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$t_0$</th>
<th>$t_1$</th>
<th>$t_2$</th>
<th>$t_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- $t_0$: Initial state
- $t_1$: Transition state
- $t_2$: Mid-state transition
- $t_3$: Final state
8. Summary

Project parameters
The determination of the project parameters involved the issue of how not to fix or determine a version of “past” of the site to a particular time or set of conditions, but none the less take into account the destruction and displacement the site underwent. This was approached in two ways: As a designer, however, I am tasked to chose how to frame the site what to include/exclude in my determining of the project. Faced with an extreme situation of destruction, displacement, and death, I am furthermore accountable to my framing, the challenge is to do so in a way that does not reinforced fixed structures of understanding of space and maintain continual openness of the site. In order to address this, the project:

- considers the site in transformation/becoming a series of changes, tendencies, processes continuously unfolding every iteration of the past of the site is a legitimate materialization of forces, conditions, etc, and positioning my project between two sets of processes, between both the situation before the destruction, and the situation after
- employs an open ended strategy that works with smaller, precise components in order to generate new, flexible, frames at larger scales.

Spatial frames of site
The site is isolated from the city and forms a central peripheral condition of relative abandonment, emptiness, underused. At the same time, the site provides an unique condition and opportunity of vast open space in centre Bucharest. The project seeks to adjust the scale of the site, not by subdividing the vast site, which would in effect not change the scale of the site per se (that is to say, not affect how the site is framed in the city) but rather to make localized interventions at the same scale as the surrounding urban fabric and maintain the site’s large scale openness. The frame of frames strategy uses these localized, urban tissue scaled interventions, along with an infrastructural grid, a connecting path to connect with other similar sites in the city through patterns of use. This seeks to shift from scalar relation of landscape to a topological one. Furthermore, the site is located on a major urban axis the boulevard of the United Nations. The strategy of intervention seeks to reframe this axis on multiple scales:

- large scale: shift built axis to natural (meandering) line of ridge
- middle scale: turn from point on existing axis to an intersection between directions (orchard tree rows, forest)
- small scale: experiential disorientation (orchard experience of path/tree groupings, forest tree formation)

Topography as frame
The main re framing of the site is done through the means of the topographical ridge as the frame, rather than the built interventions. Although the ridge acts as a frame, its nature as continuous with the landscape makes it continually escape ‘capture’ by other frames: it cannot be fixed the ridge remains a quasi frame. The ridge furthermore connects the site to a number of major parks and green spaces in the city, and through its activation on the site, gathers these existing parks into a linear park (see section 3.1)

Site history
The site of destruction of 1/3 of historical city fabric of Bucharest (from 1977 1989), and involved a large scale displacement of population. The project itself is a megalomaniac building project, and due to the fall of the regime remained unfinished. It was built at the expense of hundreds of deaths and forced labour. The project thinks of the past not as a particular spatial configuration, particular set of frames (house garden neighborhood urban texture of historical city), often romanticized (‘... long winding streets, little gardens’) and therefore risking monumentalization but thinking of the past as a set of practices what activities were possible by that particular spatial configuration, vs what activities this new spatial configuration makes possible. The germ and gestures of the project are intended to provide the support for particular practices on the site, and at the same time encourage and generate a public yet to come.

Demographics of site
The systematic destruction of old city centre 1977 1986 resulted in a large portion of the population displaced. changes in political regime and uncertain ownership of areas results in further displacement as some former state confiscated properties become claimed by past owners (or simply owners claiming past), further displacing impovrished population living there now. The result of this is that the site itself has residential population

- residences limited only to perimeter, which because of the size of the site make quite large distances.
- require attractors to site that operate beyond the limits of the site (public programme)
- slow mobility connection and recreation (jogging, biking, walking)

Furthermore, the site sees uneven economic conditions: site adjacent richer areas (Cotroceni) and improvised areas (former Uranus)

- interventions that provide for employment (tree nursery, initial stages of orchard)
- intervention that provide for self employment/ entrepreneurial use (field)
- intervention that provide for semi collective production (orchard)

Public private ruptures
The communist regime radically changed public private relations. The imposed shift away from notions of private property as well as forced seizing and redistributions of private property resulted in a whole series of community derived notions of semi private property, shared (private)
spaces, commons were replaced by public space that is both everyone's and no one's and state imposed collectives. Following 1989, these nuances of public private slowly reappeared in the city, especially in housing blocks which found residents claiming small areas of greater public space for semi private use. Today there is an over emphasis on private property, often seen as a reaction to communist nationalization and materialized in the proliferation of fences, coupled with a distrust of collectivity and commons. Simultaneously, semi private spaces, semi public uses are creeping back into the landscape. In order to address this, the project provides opportunities for both semi private and semi public conditions

- orchard: semi public individuals or groups can rent storage areas and the use of a tree/trees for use
- field: semi private possibility to erect fences and ‘claim’ areas for use

Large structures & large open spaces
The site houses a number of very large buildings, surrounded by very large open spaces

- existing structure on geological scale: Casa Poporului, third largest building on earth, 100m below ground and 100m underground
- construction of Catedrala Neamului (Cathedral of the people) massive mixed use religious complex as tall as Casa Poporului (House of the people)
- existing but underground: Stadionul Republicii (Republic Stadium) that can be put into re use either as a Stadium, or public market, etc etc
- existing but unfinished and unused: Academiei (Academy building), can be put into re use

Programme
The site sees an existing patchwork of uses (park, church, tennis courts, parking, contemporary art museum, parliament, unused/overgrown lot) with distinct and occasionally overlapping publics seen as a positive characteristic of site. The design intervention participates in expanding the patchwork of uses through precise interventions which ‘charge’ the open space through adjacency. the new programmes revolve around landscape/open space uses and productivities that resonate with existing frames. The specific programed that are developed as the four gardens are determined by four main factors:

- inflection on ridge determines location
- existing context determines size and use
- location, dimensions, context and surrounding practices (current and past) practices determines the types of activity supported
- the specific programme determines the exact programme (ping pong, orchard, nursery, amphitheater)
9. Conclusion