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This collection of Dutch architecture with landscape methods is a summary of a course I was able to teach in spring 2009 at TU Delft. It is deeply related to both the teaching and research subjects we pursue - therefore it may serve as an example of our current work.

I first proposed the research subject of architecture with landscape methods to Clemens Steenbergen and the three headed Research Group of Landscape Architecture Inge Bobink, René Van der Velde and Steffen Nijhuis. It was shortly after my arrival in Delft, and we still knew little of each other but we instantly fell for this subject. The subject, which I will outline in the next article is fascinating not only because of its relevance and potential impact in architectural theory and landscape architecture - We assumed that it would be a great subject to work on with students - this book will hopefully prove that we where right about that.

We wanted to involve the students into research using a method we call research by drawing. One could understand it as a reverse design process. We consider such exercise crucial not only for understanding architecture and landscape but also for being able to design. This exercise is part of design education and architectural research at once.

This is a collection of student analysis of architectural works. The purpose was to test a research framework with different analysts and on different projects - Although the method is scientific not all the results are of equal value - some projects proved to be not as rewarding as expected - others surprised by multiple unexpected landscape qualities. Some students easily found material and objects others encountered various difficulties in their work. All of this is part of the true nature of an experiment, as it was intended. And the mass of materials also indicates that this is a collection of sometimes refined and sometimes raw data. Nevertheless we found it worth printing to give a overview of our current position.

It was important that the students might form their own critical position from the experience of the buildings on site. Therefore we chose only building within reach of a day-trip and with the Dutch student railway card. This proved to be a lucky coincidence: The Dutch Lowlands are not only a very special landscape, because most of it is artificial and not natural. I seems that this artificial landscape provokes their inhabitant designers to be very inventive in creating landscapes as part of architectural experiences. So the this could be a reason why Dutch architecture might be particularly connected to landscape methods.

Groups of two students where are asked to work together on the analysis an comparison of two projects. They compared their projects to different reference projects, mostly from Architecture and Landscape, by Clemens Steenbergen and Wouter Reh. The students where asked to use the categories Steenbergen and Reh developed for analyzing landscape architecture, the 4 layer model, which is to be explained in this book and in the next article. We asked the students to testing a research method for future use by applying it onto several cases.

In a eight five week course the students attended weekly seminars exchanging on their findings. The students documented the projects from publications or with the help of the offices or archives and visited most of the projects themselves around march 2009 taking photographs and measuring space with their own personal experience. Partially I could attend these visits, partially I had to rely on the students as remote sensors and test pilots of our experimental methods.

This analysis was part of the last courses of the villa urbana format, teaching the relationship of architecture and landscape to master students of architecture and urbanism. This course will be replaced by our own master track landscape architecture within the next couple of years. The question of how a Delft school of landscape architecture will look is part of passionate discussions and intense preparation. Hopefully this course could be seen as an experiments in connecting a strong tradition of architectural design and urbanism into a new understanding of landscape design.

Teaching this course has been an extremely rewarding experience - we often talk about the value of analysis in both architectural education and research - but it is still surprising how much compassion and interest student designers can evoke towards other designs - I think the relation of making and perceiving architecture and landscape is crucial to valuable analysis - and strong analysts will be even stronger designers.

I would like to thank all of the involved architecture firms and their architects and public relations staff for providing plans and other material either to us or to other publications beforehand. I thank the owners and custodians of the buildings for giving access to our students. I express my gratitude to all of the students of this course and for their ideas, work and for their compassion in the subject. And I would like to thank all the members and staff of the chair of landscape architecture especially student assistant Koosje Vingerling and and critic Saskia de Wit for giving me this opportunity of teaching and research and for many small and huge advices on the bumpy road.

Hopefully our results are rewarding one or the other reader with new insights and that many more will follow.

Daniel Jauslin Delft Mai 2009
Contemporary architecture has been strongly influenced by the concept of landscape in recent times. The landscape analogy that accompanied architecture for a long time in tectonics or ornament is now transforming the concepts of form and space. The landscape analogy has moved from marginal subjects to the core of the discipline. We invite you to use the analysis assignment to rediscover some basic principles. A study of landscape as a means of architecture could lead to a basic theory, not derived from any ideology nor adopting philosophical terms to a practical field.

To introduce the subject we will summarize some observations about landscape that are important to our research. Then this we will evaluate the potential and critical position of five some selected projects. The goal is to establish a theory about landscape methods in architecture. We will explain how some projects using landscape are proposing a completely new approach towards the making architecture. This landscape oriented approach leads to very innovative designs, which implies fundamental critique towards some of the established rules and habits of architecture. In a second part our propositions should illustrate the use or relevance of that emerging theory for the practice of architecture and urbanism in our time and how a emerging field of work could change our profession.

The scope of our research is a series of buildings that would like to be landscapes. A number of architects use landscape not only as a metaphor but as a method to design buildings. An emerging theory is implied in this. A theory in architecture could ideally be established as “an analytic work that related what I had learned to see” [1]. So we first want to take a closer look to the projects to try to derive some rules. This is opposed to the mere import of a theoretical concept (be it from sciences or humanities) into the discipline of architecture.

Very briefly, the evolution of landscape and garden design is one from architecture related geometry and elements in the renaissance to a romantic imitation of nature in the late 18th century. The development of this art is closely related to the development of the term landscape. The word landscape was first used to describe a type of painting and only later for a designed or natural landform. Thus landscape always involves a pictorial quality – the picturesque. The landscape garden is the imitation of nature with the ingenious artistic intervention (nowadays we would call it design) that not only simulates but frames, relates and intensifies the natural experience of man. The romantic perception of nature and the establishment of the picturesque are key elements to the development of the landscape garden.

Whilst in landscape architecture the actual design of the natural landform is essential it is only a very select number of historical buildings that actually fully integrate landscapes. Architecture up to modernism (and beyond), in fact, has even intensified the opposition between landscape and the architectural object. Even many of the most important works of modern architecture express a very significant distinction between it, being an object, and ‘the landscape’.

In the history of famous architecture-landscape relations the presupposed opposition – despite all the correspondences and interactions - would remain predominant. This opposition would count for the main periods. The opposition can be seen as predominant despite some convergence in examples of the three periods: at Villa Emo, Versailles or Castle Howard. There is a basic duality between the formal systems of the garden or landscape and the architecture. This opposition counts for the Renaissance garden, the French formal garden and the English landscape garden. The disciplines remain separate in modernism in both architecture and landscape architecture. This could be illustrated by the iconic Farnsworth House of Mies van der Rohe, for example. Some rare exceptions would only confirm the rule.

This does not mean that there was no relation or interference between landscape and architecture throughout history but only that each defended the autonomy of their realm and that such simple differences as inside and outside, or red and green, seem to be perpetual. So incorporating landscape methods into architecture is a major conceptual shift (some authors already called it a revolution [4]). Buildings that start to become landscapes are establishing a new paradigm for architecture and this is definitely more than a fashion. The structure of landscape has become a model of thought about space that sometimes proves to be more effective or more adequate than other models (like for example syntax, the structure language as the predominant inspiration for architecture since the late 1960’s). Landscape has become important to architecture in understanding the temporality of experience, the contextual relations and the spatial and material development of individual buildings and the city. In innovative design practice methods and concepts that are traditionally used describing landscapes have been applied onto the architectural space such as mapping, folding, morphing and other process oriented morphological concepts. The temporality of space – always inherent in landscape – has become increasingly important for architecture. Natural elements like topography, routing, horizon, picturesque, planting or even growth and genetics have established important roles in the theoretical discourse. These concepts from nature are used mostly in a cultural and theoretical approach and thus tamed or filtered by landscaping. Not only do we see various imitations of landscapes or adoptions of landscape metaphors in many projects but there seems to be a more profound underlying current of strong (possibly even epochal) significance.

The 4 layer Model of Landscape Architecture applied on Architecture

To try to understand the architecture of landscapes Clemens Steenenbergen and Wouter Reh have established a set of layers - basic form, spatial form, metaphorical or image form and program form - and explained the composition designs out of a overlapping of these layers [5]. For our purpose we could define them like this : Basic form is the way in which the natural landscape is reduced, rationalized and activated. Spatial form is about the experience of the landscape space, including routings, framings and picturesque compositions. Metaphorical form is the use of iconicographic and mythological images of nature, always connected to the other layers and mostly represented in one of the others. Programmatic form is the division of functions and organisation of their relationships influencing the composition. The programmatic form incorporates the tension between business (negotium) and contemplation of nature (otium) in a constant search for balance.
from the classical landscape up to our times.

Steenbergen and Reh derived this architecture of landscape from the architectural theory of Frankl [6]—so if we use it back in architecture, we must make an important methodological distinction first. We will not use the terms of Steenbergen and others to defend the presence of landscape elements in architecture. Such an exercise could easily be unmasked as a self-fulfilling prophecy or be academically worthless. The fact that these buildings we propose are landscapes is evident. In practically all the cases the architects have been using the term landscape to defend or explain their building and/or the wish to create a landscape is obvious in the design process. If we use the layers of Steenbergen and others, it is only to identify the elements in connection to the layers, to better understand the composition of the landscape into the architecture and how actually similar compositional relations between the layers are being used in indoor and outdoor design.

You will apply these distinctions into layers on our selected buildings—analysing architecture with landscape methods. This should clarify if and where the landscape analogy is influencing the architectural form of selected projects.

Five Intenational Examples

In this reader, I will propose a short selection of five projects of the last fifteen years to illustrate the relevance of a phenomenon. An in-depth analysis is still to be started and this is why this is only a proposition of methods and a series of observations. In the next step, a profound and structured analysis of these examples should lead to deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

This short selection contains examples that best illustrate the spectrum of architecture with landscape methods. It is limited to buildings that want to be landscapes and that are intentionally imitating certain aspects of landscapes mostly to develop typologically innovative interpretations of various public programmes. Even under these quite closed criteria the list of relevant projects would be much longer than the format of this text, but this is no complete anthology nor catalogue but just a selection of most relevant choices.

One of the most striking and pure adoptions of landscape principals into architecture is the project for Two Libraries at the Jussieu University Complex in Paris by OMA 1992–1993 [fig.3-5]. Here they have used the integration of a sloping plane. A folded landscape is used in a programmatic change from the multidirectional and limitless; in a “vertical intensified landscape” the surfaces are “urbanized” [7]. The intensified landscape is a direct answer to the parvis in the adjacent complex of the existing Jussieu University Campus. The parvis was a huge surface on a plateau, slightly above ground level. It should be an all accessible and communicating platform in the original concept of the university building by Albert Steenbergen and others (and also fenced) after May 1968. It is now a dull and windy space under buildings lifted on pilotis devoid of any qualities as a public space. The project is deriving an action plan for a new type of building from a critique of the existing. They pinpoint the places where the relation of the parvis to the building goes wrong, question the whole concept of the elevated plateau as a separation to the urban space and criticize the inner circulation system of endless hallways in a grid, indifferent to space, position or direction. The actual process of folding a plane into a landscape was illustrated by a series of photographs and related as an opposing concept to the existing building. For the images the actual existing parvis is transformed into a landscape. The densification of the endless plane into a landscape is proposing a different sense of orienting a routing through a landscape or as a “Baudelairian flaneur” [8] in the urban scenario. This is a remarkably strong conceptual shift. OMA is introducing landscape into architecture as a remedy for late modernist architecture—a counter concept to Jussieu University’s opposition of ground plane and building. Actually the entry to the two libraries is situated in the centre of the section. Science is sloping into the ground and Humanities are moving upwards. By integrating the landscape into the building the object-landscape or figure-ground opposition is dissolved and integrated into one continuous form. But an other opposition is dissolved by one simple move as well: the design is associating the landscape experience with a particular way of urban experience. The flaneur—who is exploring the urban space like a wanderer would explore a landscape—is of course connected to Paris, the city of the flaneur of Charles Baudelaire and the derives of the Situationists. The seams opposition between urban and landscape is deliberately abandoned. The inside building is composed following scenarios of flow and the endless strolling through a city of books on a single trajectory. The Building becomes an architecturalized route or promenade architecturale in a size and complexity that has not been seen before. Although unrealized this project could be seen as one of the keys to our question and certainly was a very influential trigger for a number of later inventions in architecture. Interestingly enough the Landscape metaphor is deliberately chosen by the architect. It seems to be the most appropriate term to describe a continuous surface that can be experienced as one space.
box. And the structure is simply a grid of columns. One advantage of this pure abstract elements is, that the main element – the plateau folded into a landscape – gets clearly visible and each facade is a display of the most interesting feature of the building: it’s section.

If we use the distinction into layers of landscape architecture according to Steenbergen and Reh we can see the reason for the conceptual dominance of the folded plane it is unifying the basic form and spatial form into one. The folded plane is depicting a landscape in the metaphorical form – and also including the programme form of the composition - the arrangement of books in an urban landscape for flaneurs. Basically, this one thing unites all the aspects of landscape while other needs are reduced to unframed glass and minimized columns. Endless furnishing that appears like a miniature city on the endless plains of the artificial ground is colonizing the landscape.

This project of OMA although not built has made a big impact on other projects – in our opinion it marks a period of change in architecture. The change is even more apparent if we think that Kooolhaas as always cherished urbanity as a sort of maximum contrast between programmes and promoted cross-programming to establish urban qualities with pure horizontal layering or other forms of serial staking. With the continuity of the spatial system within a building he makes a new proposal to deal with the conflict of building and city. The tension between architecture and urbanism was always a big concern of Kooolhaas. Landscape as universal spatial system is importing urban qualities into a building.

Seeing Villa VPRO in Hilversum 1993-1997 of MVRDV only as a postcard greeting to the master, as Ilka and Andreas Ruby [9] put it, is not quite adequate. Sources studied by the author at the OMA archive in NAI [10] showed that Jussieu was a very fast competition project and that Jacob van Rijs and Winny Mass (the later founders of MVRDV with Nathalie de Vries) where strongly involved into it’s creation as part of a compact team with later support of their mastermind. This is opposed to the long and carefully prepared design of Villa VPRO which as an early MVRDV work got all the care of a first project. Also the Jussieu project is much more of a short and linear design (assumedly due to lack of time) than other OMA projects that are emerging out of endless series of different concept models.

So Jussieu can be clearly explained as born from an original idea within OMA. It would be adequate to see Villa VPRO together with some of the late 1990ies buildings of OMA (and with other members of the Jussieu Team like Christophe Cornubert in Educatorium Utrecht 1997) as one possible realisation of the Jussieu concept. The VPRO design started in the year 1993, the same year that the Jussieu Project was not further developed. So there is a clear continuation of the main idea which is “the landscape is the building” [11]. But Villa VPRO is much smaller than the Jussieu project (and still more complex). So the strong formal ideas are slightly too big for the size of the building. The idea of landscape involves bigness and the risk of reducing it to postcard size (that would fit) is not only that the slopes are then too steep to become spaces but also that the picturesque becomes weak. To express that kind of landscape grandeur MVRDV first had to grow above that scale. The landscape analogy is one of the constant elements in a wide range of work of MVRDV. In the late 90’s up to now projects like Metacity Datatwow [12] or even their latest vision of Rotterdam South Korea near Soul (Competition Design 2008) is a project for a new city centre with high density mixed programme [fig.6-8]. It is sited in an interesting scenery of green hills and lakes, being under high pressure of urban development with redoubtable quality. MVRDV proposed to insert a highly artificial landscape, the size of six or seven Manhattan Blocks, into the relatively large site. Landscape is playfully designed, the kind of landscape interesting for the site is derived from a series of comparisons. To bridge a gap between two hilly ridges (the valley) a third mountainous ridge is added. skyscraper high Dutch Mountains look like on a historic Korean landscape painting ‘Mount Kumang Viewed from Danbalryomy Peak’ by Lee Byeong-yeon [13]. The landscape seems very stylized and it’s phallic appearance becomes almost surreal reminding of Meret Oppenheimers famous Fury Cup or Pelztasse. The surreal technique is quite powerful in establishing desirable qualities in undesirable circumstances. The green artificial insert with huge programme is like a life saving act for the urban landscape that would definitely be overwhelmed by the pure size and density of the inserted centre. If we seriously want to defend our landscape from urban sprawl such a green high density centre is a very interesting urban model. Could we not use this as a model for urban development? A new typology could prevent at once the collapse of centres with a artificial green heart and the surrounding landscape with introducing high density green instead of low density sprawl.

In the design the basic form is filling the whole competition site to the maximum extents – the architects know now that landscapes need more space than the size of a villa. The spatial form is a refined composition of mountains with a valley and a series of grottos. Of all layers the metaphorical form is predominant through the strong image of the landscape in its analogy to the Korean pictorial tradition. This is one truly original cultural connection via imagery. The client’s programme is distributed in a quite pragmatic manner though grottos inside the hills endless balconies with green framings. The sky-high rooftop parks are another innovation. Still in this design the strength of the image is more important than the strength of the typological answer to the question.
The mere size and exaggerated heights make the design also look like a caricature. Strong pop art imagery of MVRDV is not always sustainable in the sense that the humour will be strong enough to become a timeless cultural achievement. So the critical impact and ability to change our profession is still uncertain. Although declared a sustainable building, the project will have to prove the sustainability in terms of people’s acceptance, spatial qualities and social impact. There is no doubt that the realisation process of this design will be one of the most thrilling stories to be continued in the near future.

A third important project to our subject was developed very shortly after Jussieu in the time where Villa VPRO was still in planning phase. The competition design and building of the Yokohama International Ferry Terminal 1995-2002 by Foreign Office Architects [fig. 9-11] was probably one of the most striking and influential projects of the 1990’s [14]. A series of planes interwoven to continuously build surfaces and walls – actually dissolving that opposition – could only be described as a landscape. Not unlike Jussieu many other elements are subordinated to that continuous landscape as if they where furniture. The constant flow of space is articulated through many elements to underline the dynamics. The programme of the transitory space is translated into a park like public space on the roof – which a landscape with spatial references to the movement of the sea and detailing references to a ship deck. If it had to be compared to garden history the French formal garden would fit. Not only because if the playful symmetry and axiality but also because of it’s repetitive forms of (in this case very innovative) folds in space and structure. The key difference to the Jussieu project is, that here that the primary construction and skin of the building are not detached from the landscape concept but integrated. Further separation between inside and outside is reminiscent of brutalist spatial experience like the Aula of TU Delft by van den Broek and Bakema, 1959 - 1966.

All the layers of a landscape composition are present. The basic form of Yokohama is still a rectangle but since it is laid down as a peer in the harbour this is clearly a full occupation of a existing (even if man made) landscape element as land in the sea. Also the distinction here between topographical ground plane and topographical design is blurred – the most intensely shaped topography on top becomes the public passage across the roof. The spatial form is connected to the axial flow from land to sea and from underlining it with its symmetry, dynamics and long stretched spaces. The imitation of landscape shapes instead of vertical walls and horizontal floors is most strongly influencing the space. The metaphorical form consists very strong images of waving hills that could be land or water using inclined furnishing, ship detailing and greenery to increase the metaphor into a kind of dazing spatial composition, in an approach of total design all elements are subordinated to that continuous landscape as if they where furniture. The constant duality between strong and weak forms and clear agenda to alter our perception of architectural space. Not unlike the Jussieu project it crated a completely new typology, even though it’s programme might have been more apt to such a spatial intervention than others. The purity and radicalism of creating landscape space with a strong orientation to pictorial qualities might also be connected to the consequent use of 3d-cad-simulations, which already where present in the very first presentation. Their power was not only suggestive but they integrated the spatial and sensorial experience. Working with landscape as a means of spatial communication with humans to create orientation in a highly functional environment was giving the landscape method a strong impulse to become a ruling force in architecture.

The incredible scale of Peter Eisenmans’s City of Culture of Galicia 1999-2012 [fig. 12-14] was illustrated in the competition-design with a scale comparison of the project to the size of the whole existing city of Santiago de Compostella. Not only did Eisenman Architects use the image to show the scale, they literally took over the structures of streets and houses from that operation. The design of a landscape seemed to be an adequate response to gigantic ambitions of two museums, two libraries, a music theatre and visitors facilities with a bus terminal and shuttle service to keep the masses of pilgrims in a controlled flow. The architectural design is much more approached in a conscious composition of layers than any other exaple. The Design process itself is described as the adding up of layers [15]. A shell form is imported from the Icon of Santiago introducing flow lines of pilgrims streams, a mapping of the city centre structure onto that first layer, a filling in of the program into a seemingly arbitrary form and finally a deformation of the existing topography in formal manipulation of a topographical model to design the envelope. Eisenman uses the concept of the Palimpsest [16]: Ancient manuscripts, which has been written and overwritten many times to illustrate the design process could also be understood as tectonic layers or architecture. In a sort of reverse erosion, a summing up of new layers, the architect generates form. Just like in the MVRDV design, the landscape approach is a generated in a sort of surreal panic reaction of the architect facing an enormous multiplex program that represents outrageous ambitions of the local authorities. One can imagine mountains of square meters piling up on the drawing board threatening to destroy the site. But the composition is deeply worked over – arbitrariness is a deliberate move to not impose strong order where unnecessary and display the constant duality between strong and weak forms
so typical for Eisenman's work. Besides the theoretical framework – to honour it this whole article would not be long enough – the formal composition is one of the most interesting landscapes in architecture. Through layering and transformations, chance encounters, shifting operations and mutual deformations of each of these processes the design is reaching a kind of epic quality, underlined with the constant presence of orderly structures, grids and tiling that seem to be following divergent rhythms but introduce an architectural syntax with the virtuosity of a master. Not only does its natural stone cladding make this building appear like a rock – it's the deliberate insertion of time related design and processes that are introducing parametric design analogous to geomorphological forces. So in terms of composition the architecture of Peter Eisenman is integrating landscape not only as a willingly applied form but as a willingly applied process – designing transformations (into landscapes) rather than forms (of landscapes). The aim of leaving things to chance is establishing significance by interpretation. One could almost compare it to a process as the emergence of landscape from nature – architecture like a second nature derived from a revered erosion process.

The basic form of a shell is overlaid by several other forms: the town map, the flow lines and the deformed topography. All are integrated to build up to the spatial layer or rather a multilayered space. The metaphorical form of landscape is of course represented with the image of topography and the natural stone cladding but most importantly this whole process in it's density and petrifaction of processes is a landscape in itself. The programme form is more inspired by urban situations but creeks become streets, and creek-crossings become squares. The architectural programme is filled up into shapes that result from land forming processes – which is an almost archaic way to treat functions. Form and space are the essence of architecture as opposed to function or technique. This could shortly describe the programmatic intentions of this composition.

It is not disputable that the theoretical work of Peter Eisenman has had a great influence on contemporary architecture. Eisenman is known for his, sometimes quite specific interpretations and adoptions of contemporary philosophy for architecture and for eloquent critique of modernism. His build work is always strongly related to theoretical concepts. The mind-driven structures might even lack a relation the human body. The City of Culture of Galicia might become Eisenman's most powerful work, creating a whole landscape out of one's mind might overcome the gap to the human experience. It seems like landscape metaphor is introduced in the design not only in relation to the site but also to give visitors a clue to understand the complexity of the enormous composition. We can hope that the visitor's experience will not only be one of scale and monumentality but also touch the viewer's soul.

For the 'cloud' or Blur building of Diller + Soffidio for Expo.02 Yverdon-les-Bains 1997-2002 the design process could certainly not be qualified as a quick linear process like Jussieu. In an almost 400 page monograph ‘blur: the making of nothing’ [17] the architects themselves give an insight into the long story of this ephemeral building. Various artificial landscapes with hills dripping off the ceiling, tilted water planes or landforms moving on and off the water. All of these where issued out of an interdisciplinary team Extasia [18]. The role of Diller + Soffidio in that team was initially named “immaterial design” only for the paperwork of competition procedures. The Blur building – finally - was an artificial cloud hovering above lake Neuchâtel and becoming the objet du desir in a theme park about sexuality and sensuality. For the visitors of the exhibition the Cloud would not only represent an ideal paradise inaccessible for earthlings. They would be able to access the Cloud. The building would actually be the climax of the sensual experience for visitors dazed and confused by a psychedelic flower-hill landscape beforehand.

The basic form in this design completely dissolved. The long process only illustrates that Blur is the negation of occupation of the lake. The initial competition brief asked all architects to build onto the lake as the muddy coast was too weak to bear the necessary surface loads. So lifting up the basic form into the sky is a nihilist approach to the basic form. With the detailing of the Blur building, the architects are also deliberately loosening control of the spatial form. While using a quite technical language of construction, the sensational water dust itself is steered by a system of nozzles. The most impressive spatial experience was actually first being inside a cloud and then hovering above the lake on that cloud – looking back onto the exhibition and towards the other three sites framed between the Jura Mountains and the Alps. The metaphoric form is very clearly the cloud in the sky any admirer of landscape painting especially in a context of Dutch masters like Jacob van Ruisdael would agree that the clouds are probably the most important element of sublime in the landscape – designing clouds is actually the most original invention with only a few, much smaller, mostly ground related and less iconic precedents in landscape or architectural design [18]. The program form is pure otium – the business is only sponsoring. There is no other program that the experience itself.

The building of nothing (though very poetic) is the most radical intervention an architect could ever propose. It seemed almost like a complete negation or as if the authors where saying to their client or team partners that architecture does not make sense for this
situation. Still Diller + Scofidio approached it like an architectural task and not like a piece of land-art.

Of course a cloud is not a landscape. But in a painting of a landscape the sky is essential to the composition. The horizon is introducing the relation of human eye and the landscape. The Cloud is transforming its surroundings be they buildings or hills into a landscape. Of all designs discussed here this one is most radically changing spatial experience. Although extremely popular and appreciated by critics this piece also provoked some irritation – especially among architects. It’s radical opposition to any kind of shaping or wrapping for the purpose of exhibitions left everybody else in a quite ridiculous position.

**Design Research**

If we sum up the possible classifications of landscape elements in architecture into basic form, spatial form, metaphorical form and program form we first realize that architects are mixing up a lot of these distinctions. We also can see that there is a huge variety of using the layers within the wide field of landscapes imitated by architecture. It seems like the landscape composition is a pure play in an ideal space of almost infinite possibilities extending to the horizon where as architecture is struggling with increasing complexity, constraints and limitations with earthly frustration. Landscape seems to be a trigger for imagining ways to think out of the box. All examples are redefining the typology of their programme with radically new design approaches.

This text is only a starting point. We are describing in words and illustrating in pictures what will have to be done from now on. Several ways to improve our method need to be followed. We are inviting the students of this analysis to improve the tools of our analysis. Firstly, there should be drawings made – analytical drawings, de-compositions and re-compositions to fully understand the mechanics of each of the designs. Secondly, the layer model should be tested against other models, at least in some cases, to see if there might be better models (although it is very comfortable for the author to be involved in a whole group of researchers working in one coherent terminology). As a third point, the landscape references need to be named more precisely and attributed to each element. Analysis should help refine the tools of each project by constant comparison and feedback. Through this kind of comprehensive research and structured results we hope to be establishing a more profound knowledge and to sum up our findings into a theory of use for both disciplines. After some work of this kind we should be able to answer the big question: What does the adoption of landscape into the field of architecture mean for the definition of contemporary and future architecture?

We are also asking you also to become involved as designers – not to act as art historians. So we are willingly asking you not the look for a boundry between designing and analysis but the derive new concepts while designing your analysis. Objectivity is a requirement for a clear working strategy but not a goal. We ask you constantly think about your own methods of drawing while developing them and the reconsider the proposed method and enrich it with your own interpretation. We also ask you to consider both uniqueness and comparability of the object of your analysis within the group. Hopefully we can conclude our exercise not only with much more experienced students but with some deeper understanding of the phenomenon of Architecture with Landscape Methods.

**Practical in theory**

This exercise could lead us to a theory about why and how (and by what means) landscape is influencing architecture and how the human experience of space in landscape is influencing the making of space through the means of architecture. That is, if our hypothesis of a coherent phenomenon can be proven.

What is sure is that this analysis will expand the discussion of architectural theory from known categories into new fields: These architects have been highly innovative in their understanding of the discipline some by deep understanding others by good intuition. The juxtaposition of their context and first comparison might help you to establish your own approach.

So what could be the use of an architectural method derived from landscape for our built environment and urbanism in our time? That’s something we are quite sure about.

The antithesis between town and country is vanishing in both directions. The boundaries between town and country are not only being built over, they are merging in our heads. Spatial antitheses are turning out to be an illusion. Landscape has been a concept held by people living in cities since the Renaissance. As long as something like landscape exists in art it is a cultural concept that refers to an ideal. For the era of the industrial revolution that ideal was a positive counter-concept to that of the city. Landscape promised something pure and unspoilt, recuperation and rest; above all, however, it offered the individual space for self-determination, which had been lost in the dense cities with their mechanical rhythms.

Landscape should not be equated with nature. If we regard the concept of landscape as an ideal notion of human living space, it can also be transferred to the city: we can read the city as landscape. This approach has many advocates, but some of them seem to lack a deeper understanding of these cityscapes. Nowadays many people use the term ‘urban landscape’ or ‘cityscape’ as a pretext for spreading rapidly informed architecture at high speed over the landscape like butter on a slice of bread. Or the urban landscape analogy is taken as an excuse for erecting immense buildings.

It is not our aim to simplify the landscape concept in this way. We rather propose to expand both urban and landscape space by shifting our perspective. Instead of looking down at the map (or the slice of bread) from above, this approach requires an atmospheric and intellectual position in space. Our perspective of landscape is a human perspective. It relates to the perception of the real living space. People perceive landscapes and cities from their individual perspectives.

Landscape could go beyond the opposition between the architect and the user. Bazon Brock sees Petrarch’s ascent of Mont Ventoux on 26 April 1336 as a turning point in the history of ideas and the beginning of Humanism. He refers to it as ‘the discovery of landscape as a piece of nature that is transformed by the subjects’ perceptions, experiences and actions ... Thus [Petrarch] discovered something that is taken for granted nowadays, landscape.
as a relationship between the subject and nature.[18] This kind of understanding of the relationship between subject, perception and space has influenced the work of recent architecture. While contributing to our understanding of the world and the arts, Bazon Brock explains a difficulty: “In the normal practice of culture, discoveries of this kind are not valued as much as books, pictures, pieces of architecture or tools of civilization.”[19] Hence dynamic, subject-related views – as we like to characterize our landscape approach to architecture – are only coming on gradually.

We do not promote the landscape theme as a universal solution: But we can combat urban sprawl with densification and urban densification in the wrong place by overcoming the theoretical boundaries between landscape and architecture. The integrated approach to architecture, urban planning and landscape is the subject of careful consideration, not a panacea.

Theory and practice in architecture are interlocking. The constant flow of ideas, concepts and methods between the theoretical and the built can sometimes be confusing for even the most scientific of all approaches will never have complete objectivity - there is no exception made by the author. But isn’t just that very relation, that architecture is about “building ideas”, which makes the discussion so interesting and probably life-long.

Looking into the position of the five projects shows us, that the landscape metaphor is always used as a means of changing the discipline of architecture by bringing it closer to the human experience. We are looking at two or three generations of architects that grew up with radical criticism of modernism (if they where not even part of the critics). They would certainly refuse any ideological premise in their own work. The landscape method is not about criticism – we are witnessing the raise of a new humanism in architectural design. Not an ideologically driven humanism but a artistically driven one. New designs seek to operate from an internal order but are extremely willing to communicate with a wide public. The use of landscape as a method seems to be new means to relate spatial architecture to experience again – to design the very living environment in a time of freedom, without didactic or regulatory interventionism.

Notes

4. Francesco Repishti Green Architectur Beyond the Metafor in Lotus 135 2008 p. 34-41
8. op. cit. p.1323
10. OMAR archive at NAI Rotterdam
11. MVRDV Villa VPRO, (Barcelona: Actar 1999)
13. For a deeper discussion about the korean term punggyeong and english landscape see SPACE 480 Pursuing Landscape Soul: Space Magazine 2007) The image is discussed in Kang Young jo in When Entourage (thic) is a Landscape architect (Byun Duk-yong, ed.) (Seoul: Daehan Saemaul, 1999)
16. op. cit.
18. “The Entlelung of Landschaft als einem Stück Natur, das von Wahrnehmungen, vom Erleben und Handeln der Subjekte überformt wird ... So entdeckte [Pietrana], was heute selbstverständlich ist, die Landschaft als Beziehungsverhältnis von Subjekt auf Natur” Bazon Brock, Ästhetik als Vermittlung, Arbeitsbiographie eines Generalisten (Cologne 1977)
Villa VPRO.

Project credits:
Sumatralaan, 49
1217 GP Hilversum, The Netherlands
1993/1997

ARCHITECT: MVRDV
MVRDV was founded in 1992 by Winy Maas, Jacob van Rijs and Nathalie de Vries, it is based in Rotterdam. Their work ranges from the large scale to the small one and is extremely varied in nature. Besides designing and realising buildings, the firm is involved in developing master plans, supervising projects, and designing interiors and furniture.

MVRDV was founded in 1992 by Winy Maas, Jacob van Rijs and Nathalie de Vries, it is based in Rotterdam. Their work ranges from the large scale to the small one and is extremely varied in nature. Besides designing and realising buildings, the firm is involved in developing master plans, supervising projects, and designing interiors and furniture.
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VPRO
It is a Dutch "artistic" broadcasting company.
This new building meant leaving its present accommodation of separated villas - villas that throughout the years had played a vital role in the identity of the VPRO. People accustomed to working in suites of rooms, offices, conservatories, and bel-étages will have to find their niche in a new and truly office-like environment.

"VPRO is a publicly founded organisation, providing a wide audience with a more challenging alternative to commercial radio and television."
ground floor, the sinuous surface of the folded plan is visible from the main entrance.

Redundant spaces, distributional and operational areas are not separated.

Concrete panels cover the horizontal structures and ceilings; this is one of the ways chosen to show the balanced contrast between vertical and horizontal elements.

Television studio, minimal and essential spaces; smoothly curved walls represent an attempt to give more dynamism.

Common area in the basement light effects.

Contrast between horizontal and vertical directions; how the building faces the outdoor space.

Rounded window with a view to the garden.

Basement level; the corridor is enlightened because of the vertical light.

Ground floor plan level (+11.60 m): parking, entrances, office spaces.

Basement plan level (+6.80 m): installations, files, studios, off lines rooms, office spaces.
the main meeting room is conceived like a glass box, so it is not as a private space, this room relates to the main attitude of the new building.

ramp or slide?
different possibilities to climb the building.

can the architecture become landscape? wood, concrete, facade, landscape.

VPRO gadget

VPRO: working and living

one aim to realize was to recreate the domestic atmosphere of the precious villas.

common spaces are enriched with furnitures, sometimes designed by the architects themselves.

folded plan: blended back

second floor plan
level [+16.40 m]
main entrance, office spaces.

third floor plan
level [+19.60 m]
office spaces.
Euclidean forms on the facade: thanks to mirror glasses the building reflects the outdoor space not completely, interpreting the first idea of MVRDV.

The outer skin becomes the way to show the materialisation programme: concrete, wood, glass express the rational structure.

The transparent lift tower reaches the roof, another way to bring the inside to the outside.

Fourth floor plan 
level [+22.80 m] 
restaurant, office spaces.

Fifth floor plan/ roof level [+26.40 m] 
restaurant, gardens.

Plastic and waved panels covering the inner surface inside the restaurant area: light effects.

Detail of the tilted structural column.

Inside space/ outside terrace: different directions.

Restaurant on the top floor: chairs and tables are positioned on different plans that go down from the top, like a stair.
Villa VPRO / Elevations.

The building entrance...

View of the surrounding garden designed by the architects...

The facade as an allusion to the theme of transparency...

Relationship between the garden and the building...

The volume is compact and light is brought in from above by means of elevated light courts as well as from the sides...

External walls have no less than 35 different kinds of glass, carefully chosen according to orientation and aspect, internal use and character...
Villa VPRO / Sections.

Concrete and steel: solidity and lightness.

Dark and light: use of clear plastic fibres and empty space behind the panels.

Media Park urban landscape: is the glass surface a barrier or the element of connection? the floated plan modify the view to the outer space.

Maximum integration between the structure and the functions; metaphor.

Pink room: new flanged material. We can find out a large amount of innovative materials into the building especially into the studios (TV, radio, broadcasting).

Confused intersection of surfaces.

Innovative acoustic insulation technology.
Villa VPRO / Architectonic grammar /

**Geometry and Basic form.**

Villa VPRO seems to hide a centralized shape but its plan is due to the town planning restrictions on the site, such as zoning plan boundaries and maximum building heights combined with the wish to make the smallest possible intrusion in the park. It resulted to be the deepest office building in the Netherlands.

**bigness**

The squared form is not the outcome of a research for hierarchy. It is fundamental to say that the cube shape represents an important feature of the construction because it plays an important role compared to the idea of community and to the idea of a common space without different scales of measurement or classifications. An example: the daylight can cross the building without preferences and only some rooms with a specific role are not directly crossed by that one.

**labyrinth**

The building wants to be a sequence of "open fields", the Architects use this open space without a defined route inside to more underline its specific feature of a not ordinary building. The absence of hierarchy it is also made visible using different kind of connections that clearly show how the space is considered.

**Spatial form.**

The seven floors are interconnected by various spacial means: ramps, monumental stairs, mini-hills, slopes, so forming a route leading from the surroundings up to the roof.

**the building is the landscape**

MVRDV took the idea of the synthetic landscape into the realm of cultural production (in this case broadcasting), cutting open the interiors to generate a new sort of environment for work. The result is a literal Bürolandschaft where the difference between outside and inside blurs.

**voids**

Voids are part of the project, they give outline informal and intimate connection between inside and outside, allowing levels and spaces to flow into each other.

**glasses / grid of columns**

The floors are supported by a grid of columns and stabilising props which together with the completely open elevation provide the building with the greatest possible transparency. External walls now have no more than 33 different kinds of glass, carefully chosen according to the orientation and aspect, internal use and character.

The spatial sequences can be regarded as promenades architecturales, braided double helix-like, which gradually spiral up to the roof.
Metaphorical structure.

new concepts

‘Office work’ has become an umbrella term for a great variety of activities. Some of these are specific, others very much related to everyday acts such as reading, discussing, talking and so on. Increasing number of people are working at home for part of the time. This means that more spaces might have a double or even triple function, since they could be used by more part-time workers. The use of computer and the increased importance of communication with its demand for teamwork offices and meeting rooms, is leading to boarder buildings with more extended open plans.

Office buildings can therefore become more compact, creating spaces that can be used for communication or leisure purposes, which could once again encourage use of the office. These processes have been examined in the VPRO headquarters building in Hilversum.

domestic spaces

The brief of the new building called for an evocation (but not a reproduction) of the atmosphere of the former eleven villas, where the independent broadcasting organization grew up, with a variety of spaces, easy and informal connections between interior and exterior realms offered by domestic buildings. The new building was to be a big villa.

Form of the programme.

eleven / one

For the VPRO, the Dutch ‘artistic’ broadcasting company, a new building means leaving the present accommodation of some eleven separates villas. Villas, which thought the years have played a vital role in the identity of the VPRO. People who used to work in suites of rooms, attics, conservatories and bel-étages will have to find their niche in a new and truly office-like environment.

urban density

Floors can be ‘urbanized’ by the changing demands of the company: a range of office tipologies such as the salon, attic, corridor, patio, and terrace offices presents a retrospective revue of the existing villas. The form of the program is the density.

The study of the urbanization of each floor is accompanied by the definition of distribution elements. They are not organized in a hierarchical way, their placement inside and outside the construction wants to underline the idea of flows crossing in different directions.
Villa 1.

Project credits:
National Park the Hoge Veluwe
Bennekom, The Netherlands
2005/2007

ARCHITECT: POWERHOUSE COMPANY
The office was founded in 2005 by Charles Bassard, Nanne de Rue and Alexander Sverdlov deliberately as an international office for Architecture, Urbanism and Research. In 2006 Sverdlov left them.

PARTNER IN CHARGE: Nanne de Ru
DESIGN: Nanne de Ru, Charles Bassard, Alexander Sverdlov
TEAM: Nally Vos, Wouter Hermanns, Anne Luefftenhues, Bjorn Andreassen, Joe Matthiesen
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site plan.

As is often the case in the Netherlands, seemingly natural types of landscape are actually artificial. This area has been protected as part of Holland’s environmental heritage since the ’70s, when deforestation was arrested in favour of conservation. The office was to take a creative stance from this paradox.

"...the site was a big piece of forest at the end of a dirt road ... there was a little wooden ‘datja’ on it..."
Villa 1 / Plans.

1. living room
2. hall
3. kitchen
4. study
5. terrace
6. atelier
7. ramp
8. patio
9. toilet
10. entry
11. staircase
12. bathroom
13. bedroom
14. walk in closet
15. garage
16. storage corridor
17. guestroom
18. sliding door
19. structural bookshelf
20. light gardens

program
240 mq above ground
240 mq below ground

orientation
optimal configuration of functions on views and sun

central hall
a central hall with views on the entire plot is the heart of the house.

The staircase leading to the basement floor is a statuesque block clad with oak panels.
The garage is a unique space with silver coloured walls and a reflective black floor and ceiling.

View of the atelier in the west wing; curtains are the only mean to hidden interior space from outside.

View through the main patio connecting the ground floor and the basement.

Ramps communicating with the right area.
North facade

South-east facade: the access road to the house leads not to the front door but directly to the underground garage.

The roof and the walls are made using a steel structure of minimal proportions. A floor-to-ceiling truss (bookcase) lends the structure the necessary rigidity and stability.

An inversion of what one usually sees: the sliding door in the glass wall of the living room is made of marble; when closed, the door seals to a steel cruciform column wrapped in rubber.

South-patio designs pay homage to the great masters of the modern movement in their attention to construction details; the sliding door’s stop is a cross-shaped pillar.

View from the northwest facade: the top floor is a modernist glass box which completely exposes its interior at night.

South-east facing veranda: the roof is larger than the y-shaped plan, creating two covered patios.
The Y-shaped appearance of the house and its placement inside the woods were defined because of the morphology of the site and its sun exposure. The area has a slight inclination and offers beautiful views on the forest and great sun exposure; the architects use three main axes defining the orientation of the house and of its distribution to compare the building with the cardinal points; the three wings are in that way optimally oriented on the terrain and to the sun. These directions determine a meeting point, the centre of the composition, that in plan correspond to the main hall of the house.

This fractal shape does not only show a formal appearance but its functionality is completely visible in the inner distribution that becomes the expression of that geometrical appearance. We can affirm that the three wings are built over the existence of a most important area inside the house.

Through this strong geometrical definition the house can show its own plasticity because the centre and axis are the elements that explain the building’s mass form. Euclidean proportions are not used as a basis for the composition, in that way the form of the building appears accentuate along the horizontal direction and the shape of the house results to be asymmetrical.

The villa lands on the ground and affirms its dominance and autonomy over the environment determining the way to construct it. The first impression we have is that the building wants to be perceived as a superimposed object instead its thin and light shape consent to integrate it into the surrounding with the result that the whole is a landscape of different spatial perceptions. The diagram of functionality becomes a support of this method. The building, as we have said, is geometrically defined and it expresses an own autonomy. But one of the most important aims is to establish this connection with the outer space: the spatial form consists on the research of this interaction and of course also in the expression of that.

From the ground floor the observer can take contact with the environment, there are not preferential points of view but inside the house the presence of some furnishes [in different materials] blocks the view. Walking along the perimeter or between this pieces you can watch outside through glass windows choosing your preferential view.

From the basement the observer can not have a direct contact with outside space. He can not choose, he has only some defined possibilities, the architecture shows the contrast between dark and light but there are only some place where you can have a look to the outside. A dicotomy of perception is showed, daylight can enter from larges patios and windows, instead the connection with the ground floor is made by two dark small corridors.
The location selected for Villa 1 is tightly connected with the new life of its owner who took the choice to radically change his way of living. So this is a house for the new life of a man and his new partner, the building has to represent at the same time the present but also the necessity to remember the past.

Interaction
To explain better this topic it is necessary to focus the analysis on the choice of the location. The complex relationship between the two identities starts at the moment in which the building landed into the forest and the villa became a piece of land, placed in contact with the surrounding, through its programme.

roots/route
These are two key-words to describe the role of the building and the metaphor it expresses. The family needs to be re-rooted. The villa wants to be the representation of a root that with its shape is trying to anchor what has around. It is also a fragment of an hypothetical route in the sense that it wants to state the attempt to become part of the landscape.

Form of the programme:

The client liked old farms with no windows and modern houses with maximum transparency at the same time.

context
The forest in which the house is settled is completely man-made. Mostly Douglas Pine were planted there in the '50s for the production but also a typical datija construction was founded close to the site to remember also in that sense the artificial. Can this landscape be considered a piece of nature? And consequently, can the building be defined in contrast with the surrounding?

restrictions
The site falls under the local “building in nature” regulations, which include a number of prescriptions, among which height limitations for the gutter lines and volumetric restrictions for what could be built above the ground. Since the spatial need of the house called for at least twice the volume allowed by the regulations they designed it upside-down: all day functions above ground and all bedrooms below, but with ample daylight access.

metaphor
The fractal shape of the house completely confirms the idea to create this family space as a part of a route perfectly anchored to the surroundings. The woods are an homogeneous area in which the villa wants to be hidden and, at the same time, wants to become part of.
Villa VPRO, a building designed to host some 400 employers from the independent Dutch broadcasting company, with its inner landscape made of “open fields” intertwined with each other - like in a scenic route of a picturesque garden - where different spatial means link the work areas, can be regarded as a landscape. Even if it can be located wherever, since the main vistas and connections play a strong role inside of it and the relation with the outside is more theoretical than actual. The path that goes from the surroundings up to the roof, the folded plan and the use of voids in this project are an attempt to link the architecture with the environment. This task seems to fail because of a lack of character of the outer space, which puts the “Bürolandschaft” in foreground. This Dutch “synthetic landscape” is been compared with another Dutch building, a private house located in the middle of a forest area (that of course is not natural as we may think at first glance, it was planted in the ’50s to provide straight grained wood for beams and in the ’70s deforestation was arrested in favour of conservation). In this case the man-made landscape is the one that stays outside the building and with its Y-shape is trying to imitate the surrounding. The mere functionalism behind the geometry of the composition is no longer in foreground if we think about this architecture using the landscape method. The shape is due to the mimesis of the hidden path that lies on the site area: the Y is just a piece of an ideal route that goes through the forest and the vistas the we have from the inside of the building are guided by the furniture that as a trunk of a tree is an obstacle on the path. The spaces inside are of course on a different scale of Villa VPRO, so there are no monumental stair to lead the route but punctual elements around which who is visiting this space is bound to go around, like the trees of the forest outside. Villa 1 working on this metaphor gives a stronger relation with the surroundings, even if there is no real correspondence between each facade and the area that each of those is facing - like in Villa Capra by Palladio - and the result is a piece of design, the white UFO landed in the forest, that seems to have no connection with the landscape around.

Behind the frames

MVRDV and Powerhouse Company show in their design the will of making such a connection with the reality outside the architecture, behind the window frames. That is why originally - in Villa VPRO - the architects wanted to make a building without a material exterior by using hot air like the ones that guard the entrances to department stores. Doing that they could have given more emphasis to the Corbusian “plan libre” but they ended with having no more than 35 different kinds of glass to close their euclidean box. This is perhaps the only point in which they fall. On the other hand, Villa 1 has this Miesian remembrance of the frame, used to cut the landscape and put it - like in the master’s collages - in foreground. Architecture is just the media to do that.

Conclusions

There’s a dichotomy we may say - and it is was we understood from this analysis - that the approach used by the two firms generated two different kind of landscapes or at least made possible a double perception of the spaces: one that from the inside allow us to become aware of the architectural spaces, using the path - a landscape design feature - to achieve this goal and, the second one, that is the connection between the inside and the outside - but the effectiveness of this last one is also related with the quality of the space that surrounds the building - going behind the frame, not only with a visual connection but also with a spatial perception that starts from the inside.
Hawkstone lies between Shrewsbury and Whitchurch, on the A49 to Liverpool and Manchester, in rough sandstone hills with steep slopes and deep ravines that jut out above the Shropshire Plain.

**History.**

Hawkstone is one of the few landscape gardens that can be rightly be termed ‘picturesque’ and was one of the most visited gardens in England at the end of the 18th century. It lies on the Welsh border, since time immemorial the disputed boundary area between the English Midlands and the highlands of Wales. Hawkstone Hall was first mentioned in the preserved Pipe Roll of 1185 (an ancient annual record kept by the British Treasury). In 1227 (at the time of Henry III) it was built on a solitary steep-sided cliff the Red Castle that by the end of the 16th century was a already a ruin.

Rowland Hill (1705-83) inherited the estate in 1727 and together with his son Richard created the landscape garden. In 1756 Red Castle was added to the land at Hawkstone. Richard Hill (1733-1809) inherited the estate in 1783 and immediately set about extending the landscape garden with great gusto. On his death in 1809 Hawkstone Park was one of the sights of England, visited by droves of people who often stayed for a few days.

**Placement.**

Historical Reference.

Hawkstone Park
Architect : R. Hill and R. Hill
project year : 1727
site : Marchamley, Shrewsbury, UK

Placement.

Historical Reference.

Hawkstone Park
Architect : R. Hill and R. Hill
project year : 1727
site : Marchamley, Shrewsbury, UK
Hawkstone Park / Architectonic grammar /

The core of the landscape garden was formed by four sandstone hills, 220 meters high, that dramatically rise above the seemingly never ending Shropshire Plain, some 80 meters above sea level. Hawk Lake or Hawk River, which has a serpentine form, was made between 1784 and 1787 by William Emes, a follower of Brown. The lake has an unusual shape, about two kilometres long and roughly 40 metres wide, it was intended for boating. It lies like an eyebrow around one end of the garden, linking the house with Redcastle Hill and thus visually integrating the contrast between the horizontality of the Shropshire Plain and the steep ledges of the hills into the garden.

The walk began at Hawkstone Hall from where the visitors could not entirely see the steep ledges, which only came into view standing on the edge. In 1790, at the west entrance of the garden, Hawkstone Inn was built (now Hawkstone Park Hotel) to accommodate the evergrowing stream of visitors. This Inn, with commanding view of the steep ledges, marked the starting point of the route through the park, so that the original effect of the surprise was lost.

The geometry of this landscape garden is dictated by the geomorphology of the site, where new natural elements have been added and new architectural elements have been built.

Basically we can refer to Hawkstone Park as a circular path.

Visitors could take the circular walk via Grotto Hill, Fairy Glen and Terrace Hill, where the Hermitage was located, to the Menagerie and back.

Many points of interest along the way were directly linked to the natural landscape, such as a vista, a rare planting or an unusual type of rock.

The Grotto, high in the hill was dug out by Sir Rowland, possibly on the basis of an existing one and was opened in 1783. The hill was climbed originally from its west side. Later an entrance at Terrace Hill was made. Sir Richard had the Grotto, a narrow cave on the north-east side of the hill, made deeper and a tunnel dug out to the grotto, the inside of which was lined with cinders. After an adventurous exploration of the grotto, the visitor emerged onto a ‘balcony’ and was suddenly confronted with the Awful Precipice, a ravine on the edge of the plain. Grotto Hill was crowned by a ruined Gothic Arch as an eye-catcher, through which the visitor had a view of the fortress to the south.

On the ledge of Terrace Hill, not far from Grotto Hill, was the Hermitage.

In 1795 an obelisk was erected on Terrace Hill in Memory of Sir Rowland Hill, the founder of the dynasty. The statue on the column looks north across the Shropshire Plain. In 1832 new Pleasure Grounds were laid out.

This scenic walk can be seen as the last phase of a development that involved different English gardens and made Hawkstone park a picturesque garden.
Hawkstone Park / Architectonic grammar //

“A kind of turbulent pleasure between fright and admiration”
Dr Samuel Johnson, after visiting Hawkstone in July 1774

In the 18th century landscape garden the concept of the topos, the hallowed places in the mythic landscape, collided with the locus, the rational foundation for the Anglo Saxon development and the Georgian Lanscape. The mythic landscape mingled with the natural landscape and the man made landscape in the architecture of the landscape garden.

In the landscape garden the genius loci was a hybrid concept that encompassed both the topos and the locus, and sought to connect them with each other.

Hawkstone lies on the Welsh border, since time immemorial the disputed boundary area between the English Midlands and the highlands of Wales: traces of fortifications from the Bronze and Iron Ages can still be found.

Some picturesque elements have been setted long the scenic walk, such as the Swiss Bridge and the Gothic Arch.

This park with its natural features and the man made ones is considered a picturesque park. The will of this specific kind of park is to amuse the visitors.

Form of the Programme.

Many elements have been added during the time. Without changing the structure of the park. The anenction of those elements may have caused a different development of the scenic walk but its nature didn’t change.

In 1832 new Pleasure Grounds were laid out with the help of William Gilpin. The scenic drives of the 2nd Viscount incorporated the landscape around the steep hills into the the design of the landscape garden.

In 1853 a new approach was made from Weston, through a ravine between Grotto Hill and Terrace Hill.

Along the upper edge of the terrace and the southern steep edge an avenue was laid to Hodnet. The link with Weston on the south side of Hawk River was kept as a public road. On the south side was the route to Hodnet running along the Managerie Pool, the obelisk at Terrace Hill and the citadel.

The programme of this landscape garden involves the different natural features presents in the area and all the ones that have been designed to amuse and entertain the visitors. Those features can be named landscape architectonical image-types. The cliff, the tunnel, the grotto, the percepce are the one involving natural elements, Temples of Patience, Swiss Bridge, Hermitage, the White Tower, the obelisk are the one that belong to the architectonical image-type and work as reference points along the path.
First thing to say is before starting this comparison is that the two elements that we are going to compare belong to two different realms: the first one, Villa VPRO is an office building built in the Netherlands at the beginning of the 1990s by MVRDV and the second one, is a landscape garden designed through the years starting from year 1727 by Rowland Hill and his son Richard, above the Shropshire Plain, in the UK.

The shape of Villa VPRO is due to the town planning restrictions on the site and to the idea of bigness that involves the design: the building wanted to be a sequence of “open fields” in which office work could be done in a domestic-like environment, since this new building wanted to evoke the atmosphere of the former villas where the Dutch broadcasting company grew up, in Hilversum. It resulted to be the deepest office building in the Netherlands with its final volumetry of 53.7x53.7 meters on seven floors.

Considering now Hawkstone, the geological composition of the site is the main reason of its shape: the park is settled on the Shropshire Plain and on the south side there are four sandstone hills.

VPRO headquarters presents as well as Hawkstone Park a scenic route or better a promenade architecturale, which means that the spaces have been regarded as a flow of events where spatial means play the role of connectors. Ramps, monumental stairs, mini-hills and slopes form a route leading from the surroundings up to the roof of the building. In the landscape garden the same route is designed using natural elements or man-made ones. Hawk Lake or Hawk River, made between 1784 and 1787 by William Emes, links two elements of the composition: the house and Red Castle Hill.

At the mean time it helps to visually integrate the contrast between the horizontal of the Shropshire Plain and the steep ledges of the hills in to the garden. Other means have been used in Hawkstone: the Swiss bridge (one of the picturesque elements of the park) connects two cliffs as the metal stairs (hanging from the ceiling) connects two office area inside Villa VPRO.

On the scenic route of the landscape garden we can find a Grotta and some Tunnel connections, in VPRO we can find something like that when we go down-hill from the monumental stairs used as sitting area for small presentations and continue our walk in the basement level, where the radio studios are set. Grotta Hill was crowned by a ruined Gothic arch. On top of Villa VPRO there is the pure volume of the elevator that stands up from the green grass of the roof level. Different similarities can be found in this two so different examples that we have analyzed. Without going further on this list of correspondences we can firmly say that the building of the Dutch broadcasting company is comparable with the English garden analyzed and to be more specific to a picturesque garden of the 18th century. Not only because of the presence of those elements on the scenic route but for the presence itself of this kind of routing that connects and make possible the spatial perception of the building/lanscape.
Historical Reference.
Villa Capra, “La Rotonda”
Architect: A. Palladio
project year: 1566
site: Vicenza, Italy

Placement.
The Villa is located on a small hill close to Vicenza, about 500 meters south-east of the city. This beautiful position allows the observer a 360 degrees view from the building. Traveling along Strada della Riviera the landscape is revealed little by little. A varied environment tells us the history of the place: the city of Vicenza, a little church, the River Bacchiglione and the Monte Berico represent the scenario in which the Palladian masterpiece is included.
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Villa La Rotonda/ Architectonic grammar /

placement
The villa stands out in the landscape because of its location on a plateau so in that sense it becomes an autonomous object in comparison with the natural topography. The plan is rotated 45° to the north and the importance of the four facades is declared also with the orientation of the plan: in fact all the facades of the house receive sunshine all day long.

gerearchy
Centralized symmetrical shape. A radial system. Two perpendicular symmetry axes even if one axis dominates almost imperceptibly, being slightly wider. Palladio thought of strict uniformity as literally un-natural. The dome makes the structure crablike.

proportion
The design project keeps full control of width and depth as well as height in relationship with the central block, the four lateral blocks and in the interrelationship of all of these to the whole aspect. Both in elevation and in the plan. The design is thus tightly knit as an organism. Palladio researched the 3D approach with this relation of proportions.

proportion: relation between two quantities (x:y), height/width or length/breadth.
proportionality: to extend a proportional relation into three dimensions, so how the plan and the wall can be integrated.

Spatial form:

role
At a first sight Villa Capra suggests to be an isolated object that overtops the land around it so it appears apparently autonomous, but the villa is placed with care in the landscape. What it is really interesting is that the construction is gradually revealed approaching the site.

connections
On the contrary the building is perfectly positioned and related with all the elements that we can find in the landscape. It is one of the Palladio’s “villas urbane” because it is positioned close to the city, but at the same time in the countryside. It was not projected with an agricultural purpose even if a barn is placed in the estate and its garden has not a specific function. A little chapel stands opposite the villa. On the other hand it is also connected with natural elements, as the river and the mountains.

border
Due to the articulations of border elements, the building is related with the surroundings. The integrazione scenica is guaranteed because these borders are not existent, because the garden has not a specific function. **the way in which the centralized plan of the house is stagemanaged in the landscape is to treat each of the four direction of the plateau differently and to determine a different influence on the terrace wall**
Metaphorical structure.

Palladio describes the Villa...

"... a theatre which presented a changing but always beautiful spectacle on all sides..."

The symmetry of the building is not explicit to the outside in the sense that the centralized shape is only used to approach the villa as reference point (centre) and not to create the unique object in the landscape intact.

Palladio himself wanted the villa as part of the environment. In that sense the villa becomes the scene from which the observer (actor) can discover the outer space.

Tempietto

The dome (as in the design of Palladio, never realized) would have made the Villa a salient feature in the landscape and fixed it as a centre of the panorama.

Nowadays the villa stands on the plateau, relating its shape to the landscape and becoming a part of it because of the design process that deconstructs elements. We can affirm that two levels of space exist, one level that gives the identity to the villa and the other one that, like a continuous flux, is able to connect the building to the outside creating an unique space without distinctions.

The natural plasticity of the landscape is determined in the interaction with the Villa because Palladio had chose to draw the land with a formal architectural system.

Form of the programme:

Client

The specific placement is due to the client’s requests because the building was ordered by the papal prelate P. Almerico after having served a lot of popes in Rome. It was designed and located to guarantee otium at his owner.

ratio/genius Loci

This project stood between two worlds and was to prove both of them, it wanted to show the contrast between “ratio” and “genius loci” not only the divergence but also the contradiction. The final significance of the building in the architectural theory lies in the fact that the credo of Western thinking is based on this dialectics.

mutations

This contrast of meanings is showed in the relationship between the villa and the environment, so we can understand how the surrounding becomes a fundamental part of the construction: it is the ensemble that creates the space and that makes the composition.

The villa represents the rational and architectural element that organizes and gives the structure at the composition: the environment is what changes the experience (different directions).

genius loci refers to “...the manner in which the design anchors the basic plan in the topography and connects it with the natural substratum...”
Comparaison/ Villa 1 v. Villa La Rotonda.

The comparison becomes more interesting if we consider the different periods in which each building was designed. Using landscape method of analysis this gap remains not visible.

The geometry is defined by axis and by a centre that consent to give a strong identity to the buildings in the sense that they acquire their own plasticity. The squared form and the Y shape are constructed using two different ways. Palladio uses proportions that in Villa La Rotonda give the idea of solidity and compactness as well as a static form. But this does not only express the venustas using rational use of numbers, this masterpiece also becomes a contemporary building in the way that these numbers are used to assign a role towards the surroundings. Contrastwise Powerhouse Company decides to not declare this relationship between dimensions; apparently the firm does not want to give importance to this aspect. But it is due to this lack that the construction acquires the idea of instability and lightness compared to the outside and subsequently it uses this feature to establish a connection with the outer space.

The spatial analysis is fundamental for this comparison: apparently Villa La Rotonda seems only to decalque its dominance over the surrounding, instead Villa 1 seems to hide itself inside the woods. The Palladian villa defines a visual relationship with the river, the city, the mountains and the chapel because its natural terraces and elements along the border that act as intermediaries. We admit the role of the villa as a strong landmark but it is perfectly integrated with the surrounding thanks to directions and frames that the same building is able to create and use within acomponing landscape method. The role of Villa 1 is more complex and ambiguous: more aspects have to be considered. First of all, the site expresses the man-made land (the ancient data) founded close to the area and the artificial woods around are proofs of that), for second instance the same villa wants to be recognized as a design object (because its pure external appearance) and this external appearance does not reflect the real soul of the construction. At the same time we can not miss out that a good amount of expediency are used by the firm to create a strong relationship with the land around of it: the glass facade and the contrast between the horizontal lines and the vertical ones (of the forest) but also the choice to have the main entrance (for pedestrians and cars) in the basement, so going along with the morphology of the site.

Comparing their meanings we can also define other attitudes. Both are the expression of a metaphor and, if Palladio uses the villa to show the contrast and the contradiction between ratio and genius loci, Powerhouse Company uses their project to demonstrate the specific condition of the owners. In that way we can affirm that the contrast is expressed using the building rationality compared with the outer space; on the other hand fragility and emotions are shown composing this different and white spot inside the omogeneous woods.

The programme of both of them is really linked with the idea of frame and it appears as a translation of the specific meaning of the buildings. The architects expressed two different ways to intend the frame, Palladio’s idea is more focused to indicate something clear that happens between the building and the surrounding space and Powerhouse Company use opened and glass facades to anchor the building to the environment, looking for certainties.
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THANKS.
The basic geometrical consideration of the building is to put the programmatic layer of the closed and private archives discretely on top, while it can be understood as a constructional beam. Then the floors are hanged underneath this layer, leaving as many space open as possible for the architectural landscape to evolve.

The new urban plan of Apeldoorn contains strict building blocks, streets and alignments (2), so the building is by no means freestanding. The urban alignments partly shape the building.

Hertzberger had to solve the urban ambiguity of a harmonious connection to the direct context and these strong alignments.
Geometry

The two compositional ‘fragments’ of the CODA building and the ‘Huis voor de Schoone Kunsten’ are formally linked and held together by the ‘artificial’ geomorphology. The shape of the adjacent building continues, so to speak.

The courtyard with its curved roof of the exhibition hall, the steps of the ‘Huis voor Schoone Kunsten’ and the mirrored steps of the CODA museum, are shaping a landscape, almost as an accident.
Spatial Form

Visual relationships are very dominant. Almost all the different functions are visually connected. The many different perspectives (1) are even crossing one another, making the spatial experience chaotic.
Spatial Form

Different floors are not experienced as such. Ramps and voids are interconnecting all the walking surfaces, thus creating a single 3D space. There are no vertical slabs that create borders. While normally, a space is defined by its surrounding walls, here the space is not defined like that. From any point inside the building, many different perspectives can be distinguished. The CODA museum is conceived as one space.

situation in traditional museum (limited space)

three different views from a random floor

the borders of the views are undefined (unlimited space)
Methaphoric Structure

An important function for the CODA Museum is to make a bridge between art and culture on the on side, and the people on the other side. The building has to become a place where people feel at home and connected to. It could also serve as a hide-away. References of prototypes for public spaces and meeting places are crucial in Hertzberger’s designs. Examples he himself uses are the Greek amphitheatre Epidaurus (1), Rockefeller Plaza in New York (2) and the interior of churches drawn by the painter Saenredam (3).

There are some very clear examples of these places in the CODA Museum like the courtyard and the staircases.

Another very literal metaphoric structure is the use of a green roof (5), which is a direct reference to landscape (4).
Form of the Program

Instead of the visual relationships this diagram is now showing the physical connections, so the route, between the main functions like the exhibition area, auditorium, entrance, and café. The entrance (S) is really the junction of this diagram. The single programmatical elements all have their own identity within the building’s landscape. There are many different routes possible.
Geometry

‘De Uithof’ is the campus of the university in Utrecht next to the city centre (3). Fifty thousand students are studying at the campus. Since 1990 the area is restructured by OMA and Art Zaanier Architekten. They have added student housing, public buildings and a vegetation structure, to create more activity in the evenings, weekends and holidays.

The geometry of ‘De Uithof’ is based on fast public transport. Three horizontal lines in West-East direction are the basic geometry of the university campus.

The main direction of the urban area of the campus isn’t connected to the lines of the area around the campus. One can say that the basic form of the campus is autonomous.

The Basket Bar is in its scale a lot smaller than the surrounding university buildings. The Basket Bar with its public functions is connected to one of the adjacent buildings though. The geometry of the building by NL Architects is a square of 25 by 25 meters with an organic public space at one side.
Spatial Form

Like already pointed out on the geometry page, a fast and clear routing was one of the most important starting points of the urban plan of the campus. Therefore an orthogonal structure was chosen. The infrastructure, but also a water axis is designed according to this grid. The main axis of the campus is nonetheless crossed twice by structures that form bridges, connecting the North and South side of main axis.
There is only one diagonal line recognisable in the floor plan. This is also the only line that was taken from the surrounding area.

Vertically, it is important that the building adjacent to the Basket Bar is the highest building in the campus. By positioning the Basket Bar underneath this high building, the human scale is brought back to the campus to a certain degree.
The Basket Bar serves as an informal centre of the campus of Utrecht. It should be a relaxed meeting place for students and staff. Architects like to refer to the project as an urban conversation pit (3). A metaphor for this sunken surface in the building is of course the Dutch ‘sit pit’ from the sixties (1). At the same time the organic orange shapes refers to a hilly landscape (5).

The basketball field is of course a literal reference to a very urban public space. The footprint that the building occupies is given back by the building by positioning this urban function on the roof.
The program of the Basket Bar, a basketball field and a grand café, are two public functions, that together with the organic pit, should form the informal centre of the university campus. It is true that just because the Basket Bar is of a much smaller scale the building literally stands out on the campus. It is visible from some of the high university buildings that look down on the orange pit and the basketball field (for instance from the new library of OMA). From the street the building is on eye-level (2), and because it is next to the university’s bookshop and alongside the main axis, the building won’t go unnoticed by students and other passers-by.
Geometry

Stourhead is developed in three steps. For the scope of this assignment it is the most interesting to look at the second phase of the development of Stourhead. The basic form is here very much determined by the route alongside the water. A circuit of rational and formal composition elements (such as the different temples) are held together by the morphology of the landscape.

Spatial Form

The routing is the most important connecting system. The architecture is only furniture in this project. Another spatial feature is the manipulation and framing of the perspectives. The structures are really put alongside the route to enjoy the (panorama of the) landscape from these points.

Metaphoric Structure

In terms of the metaphoric use of landscape it is fair to say that everything is subordinated to the landscape. An important reference and metaphor for this landscape project are the paintings of Lorrain and Rosa with images of an Arcadian landscape.

Form of the Program

The program of Stourhead was designed as an accommodation of an rural life for the aristocrats. The Arcadian life is idolized, and translated into the English landscape.

Phase 1:
Development villa-garden and circuit walk around the Great Oak Pasture

Phase 2:
Composition of scenes around a lake with large scale spatial relationships

Phase 3:
Carriage-paths on an even larger scale, without a cohesion of composition
Geometry

It is not easy to compare the basic form of a park and garden landscape to an architectural design, but at the same time it is interesting to point out the differences. The geology of the landscape is in Stourhead a very strong structurizing element. In the CODA museum it is much harder to find such a dominant basic form, perhaps this can be found in the interwoven layers of the different functions.

Spatial Form

In Stourhead, a route is formed by a circuit. The morphology of the landscape is the dominant factor. All the different elements or functions are subordinated to the route. Views are designed as part of the experience one has in the garden.

In the CODA museum there are many possible routes, with the entrance as starting point. The landscape is translated and transformed in architecture. The different functions are all autonomous. Innumerable views are disturbing one another and accidentally formed by the landscape within the building. In Stourhead the frames are designed, while in the CODA the frames are sort of missing.

Metaphoric Structure

The reference to the ancient Greek world is present in both designs. In Stourhead the paintings of Lorrain (1) where used as a very literal example, while Hertzberger only translates a certain element of the Arcadian life, the amphitheatre (2).

Form of the Program

Accommodating is an important function in both designs. In Stourhead the accommodation was only meant for the aristocrats. The CODA claims to be a cultural meeting point for all citizens.

Concerning the route, it is clear the Stourhead offers only one way of walking. The CODA offers plenty of possibly routes.
Geometry

The geometry of the Boboli garden is secluded by its borders. The outline of the park area is organic and the different forms of the landscape are very characteristic. There are two main axes in the garden, one perpendicular on the palace and one east-west orientated.

Spatial Form

The most characteristic spatial form of the garden is to be found in the scale of a larger area than the garden itself. In the drawing you can see the relation of Boboli to the centre of Florence. At the realisation of the garden it was really important to show the garden to the people who lived in the centre of Florence. Because of this starting point they created two axes from the old centre to the garden. The first one is the Ponte Vecchio, it is a bridge crossing the river Arno. The second one is the Uffizi, this is an axis directly taken from the centre and the main church.

Metaphorical

In the back of the palace the yard starts with some kind of an amphitheatre. It is not really a theatre but in the plan it has the same shape and the borders are made of lift seats. The seats can be used to enjoy the views to the palace, the waterfountain and the public garden. The function of the ‘theatre’ is to give the visitors the possibility to meet each other.

Form of the program

The program of the garden is nowadays for public use. From the plan the routing looks straight and geometrical. This is a clue to recognise the Renaissance garden. In reality the experience is different because of the different heights of the area and the opened en closed spaces in the garden.
Geometry

The geometry of both projects is really different. In the Boboli garden the geometry is secluded by the garden like a typical renaissance garden, designed with size schemes and different axes. The geometry of the garden as an element of Florence is more an organic lobe added to the city, and is following the lines of the existing morphology of the landscape. The geometry of the Uithof in Utrecht is based on three parallel axes. The main starting point of this area is the accessibility from the centre and the highways. So contrary to the Boboli garden this area is not connected to the surrounding and existing landscape. The campus is placed like a stamp in the landscape.

Spatial form

The spatial form is hard to compare for both projects. The Basket Bar is a small ‘icon’ in the campus, and competes with the other higher buildings. The shape of the Basket Bar is the same as the other buildings, the only difference is the scale.

In the Boboli garden the spatial form consists of an organic public garden on a hill, because of the height of the garden there are nice views to the city and from the city to the garden.

Methaporic Structure

In both projects there is a clear methaporic element of the public space. In the garden and in the grand cafe there is a space created to let people meet one another.

In both projects a bridge-structure (in Florence crossing the river Arno and in Utrecht the main axis of the Uithof) are litteral bridges but also buildings. In Florence the bridge, Ponte Vecchio, has as second function as a shopping street. Inside the bridge of the Uithof there is a lounge for students.

Form of the Program

There is a similarity between the projects for the form of the program. As we already analysed, the bridge is an important element for the connection of the Boboli garden to the centre of Florence and the bridge in the Uithof a connection between North and South. In terms of program these elements are really structural for the area. Without these bridges the grand café and the Boboli garden aren’t functioning as good.
Geometry

In both buildings a volume is lifted up to create more freedom in designing. In the CODA museum this volume contains the archives, and in the Basket Bar this of course is the playing field. Elaborating on this strategy both Hertzberger and NL Architects explored the possibility to let the surrounding landscape continue within the building. A difference is the fact the the lifted space of the Basket Bar is part of the public space while in the CODA museum it is not.

Spatial Form

The CODA museum is really about creating openness and one space. The means to do this is the use of surfaces. There are hardly any vertical elements. The Basket Bar is about connecting different volumes.
Metaphoric Structure

A very strong similarity is that both the CODA Museum and the Basket Bar are public meeting places.

Form of the Program

Within the programmatic form, both buildings have the characteristic and capability to bring different programmatic layers together. In the CODA Museum, with the entrance as pivot point, different functions are connected, and in the campus of Utrecht, the Basket Bar intermediates between (the people from) different buildings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Elements / Notes</th>
<th>Sketches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Geometry and Basic Form** | 1) Urban alignments partly shape the building  
2) The shape of the adjacent building continues  
3) The closed and private program is lifted up |
| **The Spatial Form** | 1) The building can be conceived as one space  
2) A chaotic routing connects the different functions, while there are also a lot of visual connections  
3) There are no vertical slabs |
| **The Metaphoric Structure** | 1) A very literal metaphor for a landscape: the grass-roof, and less explicit: all the floors  
2) The metaphor for the courtyard is the amphitheatre  
3) The building as a meeting place and hide away |
| **The Form of the Program** | 1) The entrance hall is the junction of the building  
2) Accomodation for culture  
3) Single programatical elements have their own identity within the landscape |
| **Which Elements of the Architecture are NOT approached with Landscape Methods** | 1) The constructional grid  
2) Urban alignments  
3) The uppermost, closed floor |
<p>| <strong>What is the (unique) architectural composition of these layers</strong> | The spatial form is the structurating layer. By omitting as much structurating elements as possible the only layer that is leftover to create a union is the landscape, with a lot of visual relationships. |
| <strong>How is the concept of landscape understood by the architect(s) of this project</strong> | The building is an autonomous micro landscape within a (urban) landscape and at the same time a continuation of this urban landscape. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Methods in Architecture</th>
<th>Sketches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geometry and Basic Form</strong></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Sketch 1" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Three horizontal lines dominate the basic form of the campus-area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The geometry of the campus is autonomous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) There is a big difference in scale between the Basket Bar and the other buildings in the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Spatial Form</strong></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Sketch 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) In the spatial experience the orthogonal grid is very dominant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The human scale is to a certain degree given back to the site by the small Basket Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Metaphoric Structure</strong></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Sketch 3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Informal centre of the campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Urban conversation pit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sunken organic space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Form of the Program</strong></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Sketch 4" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Because the building is smaller a lot of buildings look down upon the basketball field, which makes the building very visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Close to the bookshop and adjacent to the main axis the building won’t go unnoticed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which Elements of the Architecture are NOT approached with Landscape Methods</strong></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Sketch 5" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The rational measurements of the square-shaped bar and basketball field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The facades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the (unique) architectural composition of these layers</strong></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Sketch 6" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The combined program of the urban function of the basketball field and the grand café underneath give the building its uniqueness. The form of the program and the intermediate scale of the building are shaping its main architectural composition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is the concept of landscape understood by the architect(s) of this project.</strong></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Sketch 7" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The urban plan of OMA consists of a compact clustering of university related buildings, leaving the intrinsic qualities of the existing landscape intact or even reinforcing them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After having analyzed one contemporary project in the Netherlands, the CODA Museum in Apeldoorn by Herman Hertzberger and an historical example, the English garden of Stourhead, it is now time to give a personal perspective on the subject of landscape methods in architecture. The foundations of the point of views that come forward in this text are strongly leaning on the analysis and comparisons in this booklet. The perceptions and opinions are crystallized during the process of studying and analyzing.

It is also important to know the background of this assignment. The guiding principle has been a set of four layers, established by Clemens Steenbergen and Wouter Reh in their book ‘Architecture and landscape’. They distinguish the geometry of ancient Greek form, the spatial form, the metaphoric structure and the form of the program. These layers are applied on the formal French garden, the Renaissance villa and the English landscape garden.

The most important characteristic that makes landscape architecture different from mere architecture is the fact that landscape architectonic projects are always contextual. Within the scope of this text it is interesting to find out if the model of the four layers can be applied on architecture, and where this theory might lag behind.

Firstly, the basic form will be reviewed. This layer consists of structurizing lines, the rationalization of the landscape and the fitting in on the site, the layout of the building and the basic geometrical shape, including the starting points derived from this. When applying this to architecture, the aspect of the context immediately catches the eye. The way the building reacts to its surroundings is often a starting point for further design. For instance at the CODA Museum the urban alignments have highly influenced the building’s basic form. Furthermore the inventions of pulling the exposed volume of the archives on top, and letting the slope of the adjacent building rise again and continue in the building have been influencing the geometry to a degree where the building already had its layout.

The architect of course hasn’t used the theory of the layers during the design-process. This is also why the layers are mixed-up, but at the same time, the basic form can be abstracted from this building very well, despite the overlapping of other layers. In the classical example of Stourhead, the natural geomorphology sort of puts in perspective the geometry of the basic plan. The linking of rational and formal compositional fragments becomes more important than real structurizing lines or a design grid or matrix.

Because this first layer is also covering the metaphorical sense of activating the landscape it is logical to start with this layer.

The spatial form, more about the experience of the landscape and the three-dimensional aspect, covers views in the building and the landscape, the definition of spaces and its boundaries and the use of framing and perspectives.

Despite the difference in scale there is a similarity here between landscape and architecture. Both disciplines always make use of views and the definition of space. Because of this apparent similarity this layer can appropriately be applied on architecture.

In the CODA Museum it is very striking how the definition of space is conceived in such a manner that there is actually just one space. The construction allows a real architectonic landscape to evolve; there are hardly any vertical boundaries. It is possible to see the spatial form in this building has an overlap with both the geometry and the form of the program. This is why the term chaotic has been used in the description of the spatial form. A very free and therefore complicated routing and the almost excessive use of visual relationships are the cause of this chaotic spatial experience. In a way it is hard to indentify the layer of the spatial form, but at the same time it is omnipresent and dominating the human perspective within the building.

In Stourhead the spaces of the landscape where seen in motion. The routing is the most dominant spatial feature of the garden. Because this routing is inherent to the landscape morphology – it is almost literally following the outline of the lake – one can uphold the statement that the spatial form is strongly overlapping with the geometry of the landscape.

Of course the layer model is not restricted by a clear separation of the layers itself. When two or even more layers have equal features, it is possible that they either enrich one another, or disturb one another. There will be a short elaboration of this topic at the end of this text.

Most architectural projects carry a concept, and this concept is often connected to a certain metaphor or meaning of the building. The metaphoric structure is really about this concept and other references to icons and (mythological) stories. Sometimes the architect claims to give a building additional meaning by adding a metaphor.

We have seen that Hertzberger makes use of different references. The literal metaphor for landscape is the green courtyard that continues within the building. This metaphor is thus represented by the geometry. The meaning of the building in terms of a cultural home that connects people is mostly defended by references to other public spaces like the ancient amphitheatre and Rockefeller Plaza. Hertzberger tries to copy and translate certain spatial features of these references to enrich the building.

The people for whom Stourhead was originally designed were aristocrats in England who wanted a worthy alternative for living in the city. The metaphor to achieve this wish has been the Arcadian landscape that the aristocrats themselves knew from the paintings of Lorrain. It is obvious that this ancient Greek life was glorimized, but despite the literal copies of certain architectonic styles like temples it gave the place a certain dignity, and the connection with nature has been made in a very subtle way.

In an ordinary analysis one is inclined to start investigating what different functions there are in the (urban) landscape or building. Now this comes last, after the analysis of the other layers. This provides extra knowledge, and now it is also possible to see the organization of functions in a broader sense, for instance how the relationships between the functions have influenced spatial relationships. In their book Steenbergen and Reh stress the tension between ‘business’ and ‘nature’. Business (negotium) is referring to the daily life, while the nature (otium) is referring to enjoyment of cultural occupations and nature. This is a very theoretic tension field, where in the classical examples there was always a distance between the two. In contemporary projects you see that they get more entwined in an urban context.

In the analysis of the CODA museum the focus is more on the identity of the different functions and their mutual relationships. This layer overlaps with the spatial form. In Stourhead the circuit dominates the organization. Maybe the aristocrats were used to a very univocal and well-ordered life and the circuit reflects this.

The application of the four layers to architectonic projects has both advantages and disadvantages. It is true that more and more temporary architects are making use of landscape analogies and these are translated into concepts that also highly influence the form and space of their buildings. Landscape is so to speak used as a metaphor, but not always as a real method. This is where some architects, maybe also Hertzberger, start mixing up traditional architectonic methods and inspirations from the (urban) landscape. This phenomenon can most clearly be seen in the layer of the spatial form. In the English landscape garden the place breathes an atmosphere of peace and rest, while in architecture the spatial form can be very disturbing. There are two main reasons for this. The first one is the fact that some architects want to put too much ideas into one project. The second one is the difference in scale between most architectonic projects and landscape projects. In order to design a architecture with landscape methods, one should perhaps first define the four layers, before letting them overlap.

A building that is approached as a landscape can be analyzed using the model of the four layers. Because of this approach, certain architectonic and structural aspects will be underexposed, like the facades, the construction and the complete materialization of the building. When you are interested in just the landscape methods, this is not a problem, but it is clear that an architectonic design cannot be done by the layers alone.

Only when more architects become aware of the qualities and layers of the English, French and Renaissance examples in landscape architecture, they will be able to design buildings that have landscape qualities.
For my critical review to the course Analysis Villa Urbana (AR0063) I use two projects from the course as foundation for my review. The first project is the Boboli garden in Florence. It is an old sixteenth century Italian garden. The second project is the Basket Bar from NL Architects. This building accommodates a grand café at the campus of Utrecht. Because of the small size of the building I didn’t take only the bar as reference but the entire campus of Utrecht (the Uithof).

I will first reflect on the definition of the theory of Clemens Steenbergen and Wouter Reh. They speak about the use of the model of Paul Frankl and how to reach a composed and layered design. Steenbergen en Reh are defending the theory to approach architecture divided in four notions, ‘Geometry’, ‘Spatial form’, ‘Metaphorical structure’ and ‘Form of the program’. The use of these notions would, or let’s say, should lead to a clear vision on the different layers of a design and to discover elements of landscape architecture. I think it is to use this model in architecture and landscape projects. The given projects are selected by Daniel Jauslin. In his article “Why Architecture with Landscape Methods?” he mentions “the fact that these buildings we propose are landscapes is evident”. I would like to make a critical note to this statement. I am wondering about one aspect of the term ‘landscape’.

The dictionary is defining the word ‘landscape’ as:

1. The traits, patterns, and structure of a specific geographic area, including its biological composition, its physical environment, and its anthropogenic environment.
2. An area where interacting ecosystems are grouped and repeated in similar forms/ 3. The human perceptions of the surroundings.

The first two definitions are clear and I can understand their meanings. The definitions are broad and free to interpret. But the third definition, a ‘human perception of the surroundings’ is an unclear statement. If it is true what they are saying, the definition isn’t a definition any more: everything could be a landscape. In this world almost the whole ground surface is cultivated. We can get through almost every piece of nature and the whole world is recorded by public satellite images. Maybe the most important is the temporary status of the notion ‘landscape’. The updates of navigation and computers for cars or ships are changing continuously, and when we look to the nature it is also changing. Five years ago I visited the Bryce Canyon in the Utah. When I would visit it today again, it would be real different; the rocks are warded out by rain (1).

For this course it would lead to an undefined analysis where every aspect of the building or garden can be defined as ‘landscape’. So, I’m happy with the four layers from the book of Steenbergen, but the definition of ‘landscape’ is still not totally clear to me. In the next paragraphs I will reflect to the projects from the four layers. I will also explain - using examples from our booklet - how the notions are implemented and how it leads to discovering landscape elements in architecture and a better definition of the statement ‘landscape’.

**Geometry / Basic form**

The Geometry of the Boboli garden is determined by an architectonic matrix. The rational matrix is laid conceptually over the natural landscape. The components of the landscape which fell within the matrix were ordered geometrically. These can be found in almost every Renaissance garden. More specific to the garden itself is the geometry shaping the relation of Boboli to the old centre of Florence, the ‘none-geometrical’ shape of the garden and the strict rectangular grid of the centre. It is interesting to see how both these characteristic elements of Florence are connected to each other and what kind of methods they used in the past. With methods I mean the architectural additions as the Uffizi and the Ponte Vecchio.

For the geometry of the Basket Bar we looked to the scale of the campus (the Uithof). We concluded that the geometry is based on a programmatic starting point. Because of the fast and clear connection to the centre and the highways the campus is constructed by three main axes. The different buildings of the campus, like the faculties, student housing blocks and facilities are situated in rectangular or square shaped volumes between the axes.

I can conclude from these observations that the aspect ‘landscape’ hasn’t been a starting point for the design of the campus. But after all, the principles for the Renaissance garden are also geometrical shapes which are placed from a matrix in the landscape. So, is there a difference? I think the difference of defining those projects is coming from the connection to the surrounding area. In case of the Boboli, the garden has his own shape and matrix, but the garden is integrated in the Italian landscape. For the Uithof it is also some kind of a matrix, but it isn’t related to the surroundings of Utrecht. Because of this phenomenon the campus is a landscape but is functioning like an island.

**Spatial form**

The spatial form of Boboli is about framing panoramas. Natural panoramas inside the garden itself, like the amphitheatre or some sculptures and urban panorama views to the center of Florence.

In the campus of Utrecht the spatial form becomes visible in the intervention of Bern Koolhaas and Art Zaatier. They made a concept of new buildings that create a new structure. A structure that combines the old buildings of the ‘south’ side to the ‘north’ side. On a smaller scale they also made interventions based on the idea of the human scale. The Basket Bar is one part of this idea. The café is making the largest building of the campus more attractive and less overwhelming.

I think the landscape element of restructuring the campus is visible in the details. Because we look closer to the Basket Bar we see the lifted basketball-field. By lifting the field, the public street is interwoven with the lowest level of the bar. Another example is the bridge next to the bar. The bridge is connecting the faculty with the University Library. The bridge is the spatial element that makes the campus functioning as a landscape.

By comparing these projects it became visible that in architecture the spatial form is also a kind of a landscape, in this case it’s about the detail, but I think it’s a general conclusion.

**The metaphorical structure**

In the Renaissance, architecture elements like the belvedere, terrace, pergola, stoa, portico and loggia refer to antique urban architecture, where cultural practice and the visual relation with the panorama were elaborated. In the garden it’s more or less the same, the elements witch are placed in the garden contribute to a garden with nice views. Straight axes connect different symbolic elements to one other. The Boboli garden is in this way really close to this principle.

The Basket Bar also has three important axes. But the axes are parallel and are only in use for dilatation. The axes aren’t made to connect symbolic elements or special places to each other.

Koolhaas and Zaatier kept the functional use of the axes, and placed attraction points to both sides. Two times they cross the axis but it’s still the main road to enter the campus. I can conclude that the method in both projects is similar, they both use lines and attraction points. The only difference is the way of handling with this principle. So, the metaphorical structure can be used in the landscape and architectural project.

**Form of the program**

The function of the Boboli garden is pure enjoyment. When it’s hot in the summer, the garden can be used for refreshment. And from the city the garden should be visible for the upper class to show of their recreational area.

The program of the original design of the campus is to study or to do specific research. Later it became more a working and living area. The goal of restructuring the campus was to let people stay at the campus outside the regular working hours. Koolhaas and Zaatier created a master plan with the idea to some attraction points. De grand café is one example of a function where people can meet and stay for a while. By analyzing the function of the Renaissance garden we discovered the function of the bar. The Boboli garden is something to attract people and to let people meet. It should be visible from the centre because otherwise nobody would go there. In the case of the Basket Bar it’s almost the same. The obvious roof (basketball-field) is attracting the people downstairs from the high buildings to the main axis and to the public functions like the grand café.

By comparing the landscape project to the Basket Bar and using the theme ‘form of the program’ we discovered some new layers in the design.
POSBANK PAVILLION:

Architect: De Architectengroep: Rijnboutt, Ruijssenaars Hendriks, Van Gameren Matsenbroek bv/ Design: Bjarne Mastenbroek(now SeARCH)
Location: Rheden, NL
Client: Vereniging Natuurmonumenten
Size: 735 sqm
Program: cafe, meeting,

HEDGE HOUSE:

Architect: Wiel Arets
Location: Wijlre, NL
Client: Mr. and Mrs. Eyck
Size: 420 sqm
Program: Art Gallery ,Chicken house, Greenhouses, Storage
the Geometry and the Basic Form:

**National Park Veluwezoom**  
Hoge Veluwe  
Gelderland  

80m above the sea level  
5000 hectare peace of nature, with a diverse type of landscape and vegetation. (Different types of woodland and heather fields) The pavilion lies at the top of a range of hills formed in the last ice age.

**Castle Wijlre**  
Wijlre  
Limburg  

80m above the sea level  
Close to the centre of Wijlre the castle was built by Wachtendonck in the 17th century. The Castle consist of a pleasure garden and is situated in an Arcadian landscape of Limburg. The castle located on the vellry along with river between two gently sloped hills (each 200m).
the Geometry and the Basic Form:

The pavilion lies 80m above the sea level at the top of a range of hills formed in the last ice age.

The castle is located 80 m above sea level, on the velvry along with river between two gently sloped hills (each 200m).
tha Geometry and the Basic Form:

**POSBANK:**

The powerful geological upward thrust and folding that gave birth to the hilly landscape of the Veluwezoom national park, served as a model for the design of this restaurant. The volume pushes up out of the top of a hill and arises itself in a spatial form above the landscape.

- **Building form:** From the entrance, the visitor ascends a gentle slope past three restaurant areas, finally ending up one floor higher in a cantilevered, glazed belvedere with a spectacular view of the surrounding park. This spiral movement unfolds around a tree that has been left standing in the open middle section of the plan. This spiral maximizes the length of glass facade giving maximum panoramic views around.

- **Building-landscape:** The basic geometric plan of the Posbank dissolves into the physical geographic lines of the landscape. The motion of the building refers to the motion of the landscape. The helix movement in the Posbank is a continuation of that movement of the slanted nature of the surrounding.

- **Landscape-Building:** The nature, ongoing in the pavilion, is wrapped around the core of the building. This movement can be seen as a motion from the nature into the building as well as from the heart of the building into the landscape around it. A spiral effect.

**HEDGEHOUSE:**

Different programs are connected to one another by a "folded" linear route. The gallery space slots into the orthogonal grid of hedges in the garden, creating outdoor spaces between the gallery walls and the pattern of hedges. The building’s entrance and exit are part of the routing through the park.

- **Building form:** Three-dimensional right angel zigzag, forming a covered path inside the garden plan, with maximizing the length of walls for flexible art gallery.

- **Building-landscape:** The building is a part of the garden. The basic form of the Gallery follows the square pattern of the pleasure garden belonging to the Wijlre Castle.

- **Landscape-Building:** The hedges of the garden transform into concrete walls of the Hedgehouse. Inside the garden the shape of the hedge refer to the Hedgehouse on one side (by following the straight lines of the Art Gallery) and to the classical Castle on another (by following the arch shapes). The dimensions of the areas and elements of the garden (hedges, paths, openings) are derived from the measurement schemes of the Castle and the Hedgehouse.
the Spatial Form:

**POSBANK:**

From the entrance, the visitor ascends a gentle slope past three restaurant areas, finally ending up one floor higher in a cantilevered, glazed belvedere with a spectacular view of the surrounding park. Nearly all facades are of glass, so that at every point in the building you are treated to a different view of the landscape.

- Routing is an important connecting system, as well as in the surrounding landscape as in the building program
- Idea of flowing space, the spatial dynamic that is inherent in landscape morphology
- Panoramic composition, an extrovert space
- Spaces of the surrounding landscape and the pavilion are in motion
- Natural elements (set of trees and a big stone) are the centre of the composition

**HEDGEHOUSE:**

The presence of the hedges and the stacking of the program have resulted in an introvert exhibition space in the basement. The more extrovert spaces are located above, together from the ceiling of the exhibition area; they filter the light entering the art gallery. Indirect light for the collection enters the building via light wells.

- Routing as an important connecting system.
- Exhibition is a part of the routing in the garden, taking you from one place to another, leading you to the Castle.
- Idea of flowing space
- Slowly transformation of an introvert core (The Gallery) to an extrovert space and an open garden

The building faces the woodland on one side and the hills on the other.
the Form of the Programme:

**POSBANK:**

**Building form:** A spiral wrapped around a set of threes in the heart of the plan.

**Building-landscape:** The basic geometric plan of the Posbank dissolves into the physical geographic lines of the landscape. The motion of the building refers to the motion of the landscape. The helix movement in the Posbank is a continuation of that movement of the slanted nature of the surrounding.

**Landscape-Building:** The nature, ongoing in the pavilion, is wrapped around the core of the building. This movement can be seen as a motion from the nature into the building as well as from the heart of the building into the landscape around it. A spiral effect.

Concluding from the characteristics mentioned above, the Basic form of Posbank can be compared to the English garden.

**HEDGEHOUSE:**

**Building form:** Three-dimensional right angle zigzag, forming a covered path inside the garden plan.

**Building-landscape:** The building is a part of the garden. The basic form of the Gallery follows the square pattern of the pleasure garden belonging to the Wijlre Castle.

**Landscape-Building:** The hedges of the garden transform into concrete walls of the Hedgehouse. Inside the garden the shape of the hedge refer to the Hedgehouse on one side (by following the straight lines of the Art Gallery) and to the classical Castle on another (by following the arch shapes). The dimensions of the areas and elements of the garden (hedges, paths, openings) are derived from the measurement schemes of the Castle and the Hedgehouse.

Concluding from the characteristics mentioned above, the Basic form of Garden of the Wijlre Castle can be compared to the Renaissance villa. At the same time the Basic form of the Hedgehouse follows the shape of its landscape, the pleasure garden, by the rules of an English garden.
the Metaphoric Structure:

POSBANK:
In the Building many natural elements are used as well as in the main construction as in the details and interior design:

A  - Heather as roof coating
B- Sheep wool as insulation
C- Rock, constructive and decorative
D- Atmosphere inside is as the same as in the forest
E- Glass facade reflects the shadow of the forests, melting to the nature,
F- Set of threes as the heart of the building
G- Oak as columns
H- Thin wood “leaf” as ceiling decoration
I- Oak in the floor (decorative and constructive)

HEDGEHOUSE:

Labyrinth, in which the visitors move to another reality, is the essence of the hedge field of the pleasure garden.
The building maintains the same movement and experience.
The concrete walls of the gallery correspond with the neatly cut hedge walls in the garden.

A - Narrow pass between the hedge, same width as the windows of the old castle (A)
Exactly the same rhythm continue to the building (A’), and also inside (A’’)

B- the carefully trimmed hedge wall has artificial beauty like the concrete wall inside.

C- Relation between the concrete wall and hedge wall, from outside, from inside, and from between.
History

After almost 300 years, the landscape of Castle Howard still makes an overwhelming impression on those approaching it for the first time. Castle Howard is the private home of the Howard family where eleven generations have lived since the house was built by Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle at the beginning of the 18th century.

The landscape of Castle Howard was regarded as a ‘masterpiece of the Heroic Age of English landscape architecture’ by Christopher Hussey, a direct architectonic evocation of the Elysium of Greek mythology. It surpasses the categories of ‘garden’ or even ‘landscape’. Visitors are confronted by a battle of building styles derived from Classical Greece, Palladianism and the colorful history of England.

The Carlisle landscape is a creative collaboration between:
- Charles Lord Carlisle, the owner of the estate. A initiator with a sixth sense for landscape
- Architect John Vanbrugh, conceptual genius who is responsible for the creation of exuberant and power theoretical compositions.
- Nicolas Hawksmoor, a skillful architect, was able to translate Vanbrugh’s dramatic ideas into pure architectonic creations.

Topology

Castle Howard lies 24 kilometers north-east of York in the Howardian Hills. North of the hills lies the Jurassic plateau of the Yorkshire Moors and on the south front the chalk plateau of the Yorkshire Wolds. The rolling Howardian Hills are formed of soft slate and sand with narrow seams of grit and limestone, varying in height between 150 and 350 meters. To the north the hills are bounded by the steeper-sided banks, which on the north-west side become the higher plateau of the Yorkshire Moors. The River Derwent flows past the south-east foot of the Howardian Hills and Malton. The central part of the Howardian Hills is saucer-shaped and slopes eastward. In the middle of this the house lies on a saddle-shaped tract of lands that ends on the east side in a round hill (Wray Wood).

The formal Layout:

Consist of a grouping of three different elements:
1-A cross of avenues
2-A formal arrangement of the house with the parterre
3-A Kitchen garden
Woodland Gardens:

The Woodland Gardens: Hectares of oak and beech dominate the entire site. Woodland garden made according to a labyrinthian diverting model. Series of spaces linked by meandering paths. Spaces like the introvert woods and extrovert hillsites. (This experiment was generally regarded as a turning point in the development of the English landscape garden, some 15 years before Kent created something similar in the Elysian Fields at Stowe.)

Veluwezoom:

Meandering paths through the woods and heather fields following the morphology of the landscape. Topography of the landscape is preserved in the formal layout of the garden. The Walk through these paths gives you different impressive panorama into the nature with different characteristics. (Extrovert heather fields and introvert woods).

Kitchen Gardens:

The kitchen garden, an 18th-century revival of the giardino segreto of the Renaissance villa, was fitted between the axial intersection of the lawns and the formal parterre. Much attention was given to the architectonic detailing. The contrast between this element and the open character of the landscape garden is striking. The labyrinth routing through architecturally organized hedges creates more a private, introvert space.

Garden Castle Wijlre:

Decorative hedge walls inside the garden. Architecturally organized, reflecting and respecting both the classical elements of The Castle and the modern lines of the Gallery (The Hedge House). Connecting these two buildings, by a labyrinth routing.
Objects: Building

Mausoleum:
This monumental building on Kirk Hills forms a visual climax in the informal architectonic route, the Terrace Walk or Grass Walk, which is absorbed by the Arcadian landscape. From this point there is an open view to the landscape garden.

The House:
The house is turned by a quarter so that the front façade of the house faced an open space. This aspect implied a radical break with the formal tradition. The starting point for the stage management was not a formal scheme but the view, and the morphology of the Howardian Hills. The house was modeled after Palladio’s Villa Trissino in Meledo, with a central block and protruding side wings which enclose the forecourt. The building mass is extremely articulated and lively-looking with a crescendo in the slim dome of the central block.

Posbank Pavillion:
The Posbank situated on the top of a Hill forms a visual climax in the Heather field of the Park. It is easily seen from the meandering paths in the Park and its open character allows a very open and wide view to the landscape.

Hedge House:
A part of the routing in the garden. Corresponding with the hedge walls of the pleasure garden. Its geometry and measurements follows those of the hedges, which on their part correspond with the proportions and scales of the elements of the Castle.
Concept: Routing

Castle Howard

The Great Avenue, stretching for more than six kilometers, derives its scenic architectural significance largely from the way it reveals the morphology of the natural landscape which would have been remained hidden in the east west setting.

It was designed with the visitors arriving from the York in mind, which explain why the screens were arranged from south to north. The pictorial scenography of the Great Avenue can be understood as 'decomposition' of the model of axial symmetry. It is largely determined by the stimulating ‘conflict’ between the avenue and the dramatic geology of the Howardian Hills.

Posbank Pavilion

Meandering paths through the woods and heather fields following the morphology of the landscape. (topography of the landscape is preserved in the formal layout of the garden).

The paths reveal the different geological structure of the Veluwe zoom, providing different impressive panorama into the nature with different characteristics.

Its length makes it possible to visually experience the scale of the National Park.

Hedge House

Built inside the pleasure garden of the Castle Wijlre.

The Castle is built next to the centre of Wijlre, between the hills side on one hand and the main (transport) routing and river on the other. It is easily approachable from the more urban side but yet an element of the surrounding landscape.

The routing inside the garden is much more architecturally determined and controlled. The view off interior paths are unlike the main path outside the Castle is extrovert, overlooking to the Wijlre’s hills.
Conclusions and a short reflection on the analysis:

I was extremely lucky to find two buildings, the Hedge House and the Posbank Pavilion, for our research. It was purely by chance that we picked out the names of these buildings from Daniel’s long list. However and fortunately, it was a great choice, I think.

Two buildings have many similarities, such as the size, the construction date, the height form the sea level, and strong concept of routing. A comparative study is more effective when the two subjects have much more similarities than differences. Of course there are differences, such as the program, the location, the surrounding, and atmosphere of inside. From the comparison of these similarities and differences, we could able to know about the building much deeper than when you keep thinking about only one building.

We travel a lot for this research, to the Nationalpark Veluwezoom,(3h by train, 2h on foot) and to the Castle Wijle (3h on Daniel’s car). And now I am convinced to say that when you research about the building, you should go to see the actual situation. When you see the site, touch the ground, smell the air, and then you get same feeling as the architect did. And then you can understand the reason of the design.

For instance, I thought the design of the Posbank was too much and egocentric when I only got information from the magazines and some sites on Internet. However, I realized that it was not a too much, but a suitable for the surrounding, when we finally reached the building after 2 hours of exploration. The building seemed to wants to melt into the landscape. The concept of the architect has been materialized admirably. And the same feeling is there in the Hedge House. The architect elaborated to use the element of the old garden, and it was extremely successes. It was a part of the secret garden, making the unreal mystic atmosphere.

Both building have the strong connection with the surrounding landscape. Both architects focus on how to connect the building and landscape and to find the most suitable form for the site. We also find in the old English garden, the Castle Howard, the same effort of the designers. We cannot think of the design of the building without consideration for the landscape.

Both analyzed buildings are a very good example of a landscape architecture. They are in fact the result of the interplay and articulation of the four design layers introduced by Steenbergen en Wouter Roh. These layers which work together and the balance they creat in the design are easily recognizable in the buildings.

Both buildings are very contextual. Both are a result of a design that finds its origin in the morphological characteristic of the natural landscape of the surrounding. In Posbank Pavilion it is the hilly landscape of the Veluwezoom and in the Hedge House it is the Hedge Garden of the Castle Wijre.

Both designs and their landscape architecture are in their very own way an example of an English garden: Landscape as the starting point of the design. Routing as an important connecting system and an important factor of the basic form as well as the spatial form of the design. The flowing space which is special dynamic in the landscape morphology. The building as one of the ornamental elements rather than the centre of the composition.

These are all important characteristics of a Typical English garden that are apparent in both designs.

Although the settings are very different both Buildings deal with the landscape the same way: The rational and formal compositional fragments are held together by the natural geomorphology. The basic geometric plan and the physical-geographic lines of the natural landscape from a unity.

Also the approaches are different but the purpose is the same. Fluid motion rotating from the landscape surrounding to the centre of the building or visa versa caves the building in the garden down of a hill or pushes the building up out of the top of the hill. Both wrap the nature in their design by an eccentric way, creating an introvert space in the Hedge House and an extrovert space in the Posbank. The smooth concrete wall of the Hedge House refers to the nature just as the broad range of natural materials in the Posbank refer to the landscape surrounding.

In short: Both Hedge House and Posbank Pavilion are examples of an (English) landscape architecture. Each approach the theme of landscape in a different way with the same intent. And as shown in this work, they succeed achieving their goal in their own exceptional way.
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KUNSTHAL
Rotterdam, The Netherlands
CMA 1987/1992

Site
The site presents a dual condition: the southern edge is bordered by Maasboulevard, a highway on top of a dike. The northern side, a level lower, faces the Museum Park – conventional contemplation.

Routes
The building was conceived as a square crossed by two routes: one, a road running east-west, parallel to the Maasboulevard; the other, a public ramp extending the north-south axis of the Museum Park.

GEOMETRY AND BASIC FORM

THE FORM OF THE PROGRAMME
The program demanded three major exhibition spaces—to be used jointly or separately, an auditorium, and an independently accessible restaurant.

FACADES

north
east
south
west
museum park
museum park
highway
naturhistorisch museum
THE SPATIAL FORM

With these given, and the fact that these crossings would divide the square into four parts, the challenge becomes: how to design a museum as four autonomous projects -- a sequence of contradictory experiences which would nevertheless form a continuous spiral, in other words, how to imagine a spiral in four separate squares.

THE METAPHORICAL STRUCTURE

Routing

Exhibition hall

Routing

Elements of facade
EDUCATORIUM
Leuvenlaan 19, University center De Uithof
Utrecht, The Netherlands
OMA 1997

The multifunction Educatorium is the centerpiece of a master plan made by OMA (Koolhaas’ firm) for the Utrecht University. Educatorium is made up with a factory for learning. In 1998, the building was awarded the biennial Rotterdam Prize.

Southern Side
- A more closed off environment
- Use of materials to express this
- Use of more structural columns to close space more

East
- Regular in form
- Examination/testing block is more rigorous
- Typical steel frame with profiled flooring
- Concrete sheet works as a connector between this side and the West side to bring the two separate systems together

West
- Maintaining the integrity of the concrete sheet
- Keeping the 25 cm thickness
- Concrete must remain continuous
- Has a constructive high point in the auditorium

North
- Maintaining openness
- Use of materials to express this openness
- Use of less obvious structure to express openness

GEOMETRY AND BASIC FORM
Point of departure of the design are two sheets which fold and interlock. The concrete slab is treated as a malleable surface which allows an optimum fit for each program.

THE FORM OF THE PROGRAMME
Composed of two planes which fold to accommodate a range of distinct programs including an outdoor plaza, two lecture halls, cafes, and a testing facility. Planes interlock to create a single trajectory in which the entire university experience – socialization, learning, examination – is encapsulated.

Ground Floor Axonometric | no scale
The columns in the cafeteria area decrease in quantity as you move towards the North. It appears that there are only two columns supporting the floor above at this end. However, the two columns create a hybrid truss with the slanted floor planes. The lower end of the truss is within the floor slab. Deformation of the space is created by this changing density of columns.

First Floor Axonometric | no scale
Throughout the building, the Northern end is treated openly while the Southern end is treated in a more closed manner. This is expressed through materials as well as levels of opacity and translucence.

Second Floor Axonometric | no scale
Third Floor Axonometric | no scale
THE SPATIAL FORM

Two pieces of paper which fold and connect to each other, the plane is both internal and external.

On Utrecht University's campus, Ren Koolhaas creates a remarkable stage set for the daily drama of student life.
LINGERING GARDEN

The year of built: 1593
Area: 30000 square metres

Introduction: Lingering Garden is a renowned Chinese classical garden located in Suzhou City. In 1997, the garden, along with other classical gardens in Suzhou, was recorded by UNESCO as a World Heritage Site.

The Classical Chinese Garden is a place for solitary or social contemplation of nature. To be considered authentic, a garden must be built and planned around seventeen essential elements: 1) proximity to the house; 2) small; 3) walled; 4) small individual sections; 5) asymmetrical; 6) various types of spatial connections; 7) architecture; 8) rocks; 9) water; 10) trees; 11) plants; 12) sculpture; 13) je jing (borrowed scenery); 14) chimneys; 15) inscriptions; 16) use of feng shui for choosing site.

Lingering Garden was first built in Warring States 21st year (1593). Ming Dynasty. Then retired Xu Taishi invited stone master Zhou Shicheng to design and build a private garden, and named it "East Garden". In Jiaying 3rd year (1708), Qing Dynasty, Liu Shu had it rebuilt on the elevated relic of East Garden. He named it "Cold Green Village" after the verse "Clean cold color of bamboo, limpid green light of water". Meanwhile, it was also called Liu Yuan due to the surname of the owner. From Qianlong's 3rd year (1738), the garden was open to public, and became a famed resort.

GEOMETRY AND BASIC FORM

The form of windows
the form of stones
the form of falling water
the form of river

THE FORM OF THE PROGRAMME

The garden is separated into the middle, eastern, northern and western parts. The ancestral temple and the house lie to the south of the garden.

THE VIEW OF FOUR SEASONS

spring view of the garden
summer view of the garden
autumn view of the garden
winter view of the garden

The Minghai Pavilion is an important sight of middle part of Lingering Garden.
THE SPATIAL FORM

Basic scheme of Lingering Garden: followed a narrow, twists and turns road, the visitors go into a wide space.

A. The first yard after the entrance
B. Narrow and twisted corridor
C. Another courtyard
D. Narrow and closed corridor
E. The scenery seeing from the carved window
F. The last courtyard in the ending
G. Followed the narrow, closed, twists and turns corridor, the visitors go into a open space

UNIQUE CHARACTER OF LINGERING GARDEN

Permeability and Hierarchy

Chinese gardens were created in the same way as a combination of landscape and paintings together with poems - this was the so-called “poetic garden.” The design of Chinese gardens was to provide a spiritual escape for one to connect with nature, to come back to one’s inner heart, to come back to ancient ideals. Chinese gardens are a spiritual shelter for men, a place they could be far away from their real social lives, and close to the ancient way of life, their true selves, and nature.

In order to pursue the “poetic garden”, the designer use a way about the permeability and hierarchy.

Seeing after many layers, it can enhance the perspective.
Even seeing after only one layer, it is also more deeper than nothing.

the entrance plan of Lingering Garden
Through the pillar and balustrade, the scenery becomes more deeper.
Because of the layer of carved window, the scenery is more deeper.

the stone yard plan of Lingering Garden

Spacing and Tightness

In the middle part of Lingering garden, there is a beautiful landscape, which is made of water, stones and plants.
In the draft Johnson Wax (1962-1966) are two aspects of the program requirements of strong visual translated: the wax in the production were recorded if the sunlight did not shin on and also had the office a striking and recognizable business card for the company benefits. These two hard requirements explain the enormous contrast between the fully aluminum walls completed production 120 x 140 meters and the boomerang-shaped building by a pond was looseweeket hall. We see a return of the distinction between a representative office and functional architecture workshop that the industry had so long characterized. Rarely has Maaskant contrast between production and representation as sharp as designed here. "Purely by vornm," Maaskant said about the office and he apologized same for them: "Architecture is a related art and it is very difficult for an architect, when he was once a free art on them not doing so. We can not leave, which is also reflected in the detail of the interior."

Maaskant was decided straightforward: office and canteen were designed as rectangular volumes to the edge of another rectangular pond, connected to the plant by an air bridge. Although the firm eventually realized of course very different, is also on how many were already starting to evolve during the design process to known boomerang. In the first sketch was the office already drives concrete columns and floating with its curved bottom above the water. The plan had as its central element is a large entrance hall with both sides a series of office rooms. The design was certainly not abstract and documents such as the Tomado plant Flie or Nicholson, but strong and remarkably fashionable. There are more echoes to the so-called atomic style, international style known for the popular World's Fair in Brussels (1958), then to another work of Maaskant. The office facade the pond is a concrete list that stretched like a television screen to a back glass wall closed. A long ramp is the special entrance for visitors. The top and list were folded together and created a special concrete sculpture in the form of an X, an abstract representation of the logo of Johnson Wax. Although this perhaps one which is very literal effort to create a logo for the company to create it was clear that this attempt was to create a striking and on Dutch symbol.

In production, the 'Euro Plant, weekly were more than one million bottles, flasks and vases manufactured with faster wash themselves, stove polishers, air dryer operators, toilet cleaners, and insecticides wax. The factory area was up 1.5 hectare and even space was reserved for future extensions. Like the first part were their light through patios, direct light for access for wax fatal. The walls of the warehouse were therefore relatively closed and largely made of aluminum plating. The connection part to the plant as an air bridge in the back patio, so the plant traffic could settle in along unhindered. This section is located next to a trapezoidal loft with offices around the access for visitors. Those were great numbers expected since the establishment Mijndrecht as European headquarters of Johnson Wax as international sales service center would do. Via a staircase increase the visitor to 'a beautiful courtyard, a grand foyer where some secretaries behind their desks and the products are displayed. The blue ceiling, where a dozen starry spots are made, provides a remarkable theatrical effect. On either side of this square are the arms of the boomerang, the boardrooms in honeycomb pattern are sequentially switched. In the large conference room is a curious, also designed with a blue ceiling chandelier still most similar to Le Corbusier 'ship chimney' in the parliament in Chandigarh, but in miniature. The flowing lines and decorative style of the device called the baroque design Sybold of Ravestein in memory. The windows in this room and in the show room show another Corbusier-quot in the form of irregular narrow window rods as in the convent of La Tourette.

As in the first sketch is the office up as a frame with a filling, the setting of concrete brick is supported by pillars and a hyperbolic worm, while the middle as an arrowhead below the central hall is. 'Just' concrete is not in the building, there is a wide range of enhancement methods. The contrast between the concrete frame and the glass offices that it is completed is further enhanced by the unique edge on both sides. The concrete frame and most of the show. The doors of the office rooms have an elegant and sophisticated detailing in wood, each room as an individual volume recognizable as the circuit in honeycomb pattern to the outer wall is put. The canopy of the office rooms again to make a whole, is in the interior by the reduced ceiling and enables the continuity between inside and outside as a scale refinement in the office area. The same idea can be found on going out of the presence, partly green glass and brick, but of the ceiling are separated by a strip of glass. This solves the linearity of the corridor and there is apparently a series of separate small pavilion row. At the finish of the interior, choice of colors and especially the optimization of the contrast between the materials and surface treatments much attention. It result can hardly recognize as the office, there is a remarkable, subdued atmosphere in the building as it is below water and the empty high polished floors, the dark blue ceiling and the aquarium-like series of offices contribute to it. It was somewhat essentially free and aesthetically far thought atmosphere that some critics at the time led to irritation because of that 'extreme perfection Maaskant which many accused of repeatedly chill gets to hear.'
Litteral Methaphor

Boomerang

Bull horn

Starfish

Essential Concept

Reel Noun: Scatter Focus
Perspective on the treatment of oriental painting: a multi-angle, multi-perspective (mobile)
"Scatter Focus" performance artists to the subjective intent of an ensemble of space

rolling
shaping
putting opening
columns to elevate the main building
water with reflection
1. outside landscape as the attracting point
2. getting nearer to it
3. totally open to the landscape
4. outside landscape as the attracting point
5. getting nearer to it, one side open to the landscape
6. totally open to the landscape
original landscape

artificial changes - cutting down a few trees to provide an open space

adding the Villa

comparison with Villa Cetinale

original landscape

artificial changes - a man made rectangular lake

adding the Johnson Wax building
The spectacular garden of Villa Cetinale is arranged along a straight axis marked by a low wall crowned by marble busts. The axis continues along a boulevard defined by cypresses and leads to the villa upon passing through a monumental gateway. This is decorated in the internal part, on both sides, by two niches hosting statues and on the top part by obelisks and ornamental busts.

Villa Cetinale is a 16th century villa in the Ancaiano district near Siena, Italy. Designed by the architect Carlo Fontana, the villa was built in the 1600s by Cardinal Flavio Chigi for Pope Alexander VII — Fabio Chigi. The gardens at Villa Cetinale are renowned as being amongst the most beautiful in Italy. With the villa’s history, its gardens and the statues found throughout the property, Cetinale is a fascinating place that has been photographed and written about extensively.

Casa Vin Santo and Cembalo are the two separate and self-contained villas located at Villa Cetinale which are available for rental on a year-round, weekly basis. For information on accommodation, rates and the Cetinale gardens and garden tours, please browse through our website.
Introduction

The following text which is titled, analysis of blur building is the result of the educational process during the Villa Urbana/analysis course. It is attempting to analyse the blur building and the interconnection between architecture and landscape. Its basic structure is organised through four levels of analysis and two comparisons. Initially, there is a frame in which is defined the geometry and the basic form of the building. This frame is concerning the two dimensional identity of the building. Furthermore, the analysis is emphasising also into the three dimensions and the plasticity of the building through the spatial form anatomy. The next level of the metaphoric structure is rather a referential and allusive level. The last level is about the form of the program and the structure of the building. Additionally, there are two comparisons, one with the Johansson Wax building in Midjrech and another one with the historical example of Villa Celimene.

The final conclusion is based on this analysis and is attempting to define the architectonic composition through its multiple layers of significance.

Location and general description

Blur - building nothing - won the competition for one of the sites of the Expo02 in Switzerland. 400 metres off the shore of the Lake Neuchate: a lightweight metal structure was erected, 100 x 69 metres wide and 25 meters high. A suspended central walkway leading visitors from lake level past the angel bar to a deck on top of the cloud. The dense array of nozzles allowed the air to become saturated with moisture and transformed the surrounding atmosphere into mist, a blur. To achieve a similar amount of cloud during the 6 months of the exhibition, a sophisticated computer system was developed measuring atmospheric conditions (temperature, humidity, wind) and adjusted the jets accordingly. (www.designboom.com/en/full/blur.html)

Form

The Blur building is 100m wide by 65m deep by 25m high and is made up of the indigenous material of the site: water. This mist cloud is produced by an artificial fog making system lake water is filtered, and then shot through a dense array of high-pressure water nozzles, which is regulated by computer. The resulting fog mass is thus a dynamic form that combines natural and artificial weather forces.
With the detailing of the Blur building, the architects are also deliberately loosening the control of the spatial form. While using a quite technical language of construction, the sensational water dust itself is steered by a system of nozzles. The most impressive spatial experience was actually first being inside a cloud and then hovering above the lake on that cloud—looking back onto the exhibition and towards the other three sites framed between the Jura Mountains and the Alps.

(Daniel Jauslin, Why "Architecture with Landscape Methods"?)

Diller + Scofidio have concentrated on the undefined. It is almost as if they are reacting against their own desire to control and produce recognizable images, places, and objects by creating works in which one is never quite certain what one is seeing.

By making objects that have no presence other than as mutable, ephemeral, or indistinct images, it has become spatial and environmental effects, Diller + Scofidio seemed to be moving beyond their practice that has tried to rework architecture’s concerns in terms of the techniques of art to produce instead a form of critical display, domesticity, gender roles, rituals, and prosthetics are less important in their recent work than the delight in the confusion of edges, spaces, and messages that occur when technology is used against itself. Stories are broken off or impossible to understand, as in Travelogues at JFK, lips speak no longer with insistent messages but in an unintelligible language in the entrance to the Blur Building. Display is being directly denied.

Definitions
blue
(verb)
makes or become unclear or less distinct
(make)
a thing that cannot be seen or heard clearly
an indistinct memory or impression of events

The media project must be liberated from all immediate and obvious metaphoric associations such as clouds, god, angels, ascension, dreams, Greek mythology, or any other kitsch relationships. Rather blur offers a blank interpretive surface.

key words:
- atmosphere
- scotoma
- nothing
- disorientation
- artificial nature
- formless
- white noise
- white out
- the sublime

The metaphoric form is very clearly the cloud in the sky. Any admirer of landscape painting especially in a context of Dutch masters like Jacob van Ruisdael would agree that the clouds are probably the most important element of sublime in the landscape. Designing clouds is actually the most original invention with only a few, much smaller, mostly ground related and less iconic precedents in landscape or architectural design.

(Daniel Jauzlin, Why “Architecture with Landscape Methods”?)
The official directive from Expo 01 prescribes two structural systems: a space frame to be used for the platforms, and a tensegrity system to be used for the roof structure. The tensegrity system proposed is based on a concept devised by Buckminster Fuller at the beginning of the 1950s. The Blue building is conceived as a tensegrity structure. This means a spatial network of elements composed of discontinuous compression struts and continuous tensile rods that define stable volumes in space. The specific tensegrity structure here is called a bipyramidal system. The rigid tensegrity system is cantilevered in all directions from a central cylinder supported on a ring of columns that bear on piles beneath the water. The structure is connected to three compression/tension rings at the central cylinder (Diller + Scofidio: Blue: the making of nothing).
The plan of Villa Cetinale, in a first level shows a lot of differences with the blur building. In a deeper level, there are a number of similarities. The two of the most important are:
1. The introduction of a strong linear element (axis) and a sequence route between "heaven and earth" (the entrance and the routine).
2. The used materials in order the buildings to be constructed have a direct interconnection with the surrounding landscape (villas, mountain stone, blur, lake, water).

One can argue that the materials in these buildings are reflecting the landscape.

Decomposing the context from the object (concept)
- re-creates a new synthesis between architecture and landscape.
- The new "balance" shows that there are mutual relationships among the composition elements and the current landscape. This fact could be a new starting stage of design of the landscape.

the axis, as a route between heaven and earth
the active composition elements of the villa are partially organised in a line
the axis, as a route between heaven and earth

villa Cetinale

stone volume

blur building

steel grid structure with water skin
Background

Project Name: Stowe House
Location: Buckingham, England

Stowe House

Stowe is the name shared by an ancient village, country house and school (Stowe School) in Buckinghamshire in England. It is situated about two miles north-northeast of Buckingham. The breathtaking landscape gardens, including its many monuments, were acquired by the National Trust in 1990 and are open to the public. The National Trust are currently overseeing a complete restoration programme of the grounds, temples and follies.

In the early 17th century, the manor of Stowe was completely rebuilt by Sir Richard Temple, from the old medieval stronghold to what is now the core of the impressive mansion for which the area is known today. Having been redesigned and perfected subsequently over the years, the whole front is now 916 feet in length and is a breathtaking sight as you approach from the direction of Buckingham. The long, straight driveway that ran from Buckingham all the way to the front of the house, passing through a 60 foot (18 m) Corinthian arch on the brow of the hill on the way, made for a breathtaking approach that was really humbling and intimidating for visitor to the house. The driveway approach to the house is still in use today.
The Geometry and Basic form

1. As we can see from the drawing - the development of the site plan of the Stowe House, this project went through many phases. For instance, from 1677 to 1683, the first design by Sir Richard Temple, we could clearly find out that the site plan was influenced by the French garden which we could see a clear axis and the house is in the center point of the plan.

2. Later, we could see that it emerged with some typical characteristics of English garden that the whole plan was ordering by means of a matrix changes into a linking of rational and formal compositional fragments, held together by natural geomorphology. The basic geometric plan of the garden totally integrated into the physical-geographic lines of the natural landscape.
The Spatial form

In this project, the house, the church and some construction are no longer the center of the composition, but one of the ornamental elements. The spaces of the garden and the surrounding landscape were seen in motion. For example, most of the constructions like temple and pavilion were became one of the natural elements in this landscape which you could have a rest and have visual contact with the other elements.
The Metaphorical form

Architectonic forms and art works, as part of a series of landscape elements which also included groves of tree, water courses, lake and bridges, were introduced into the pictural composition of the English landscape garden as ‘set pieces’. For example, the Temple of Venus and the Pebble Alcove, these garden elements formed a new visual and metaphorical dialectic in which mythic, classical, social natural motifs were included, including motifs from contemporary politics. All these elements like terrain the various natural formations of plants, trees, woods and natural water features replaced the formal bosquet and the formal water stair, and represented the natural morphology and the temporal order of nature.

The Form of the Program

The Stowe House is one of the Britain’s finest 18th century houses which accommodated the country life as an aristocratic alternative for life in the city which was different from the French garden, less formal manners. That also had its effect on the ordering of the country house. For instance, you could on foot through the garden, on horseback or by coach through the meadow of the estate and wilderness outside it.
Background

Project Name: Cap Gemini Campus
Location: Utrecht, NL
Architect: Frits Van Dongen, de Architekten Cie
Date of Commission: 1998
Date of Construction: 2001 - 2003
Gross Surface: 75,000 m²
Volume: 280,000 m³

Cap Gemini Campus

Cap Gemini, situated in the new Papendorp office park near Utrecht, is a campus-like complex. It consists of an undulating, raised park landscape, from which five free-standing towers rise skyward. There is parking space underneath. The eye-catcher is an enormous, spider-shaped Plaza, which is half-submerged below the lawn. This central plaza contains the main entrance and forms the link between the various office towers. An important guiding principle for the design was ‘sustainability through flexibility’. In future, the various buildings can also be rented out individually without requiring substantial alterations.
**Geometry and Basic Form**

1. This project located at a triangle-like existing polder.
2. There are five buildings which have different programs seems to be organized freely on the site.
3. The centerpiece is the new majestic landscape, which forms the connection between the five separate buildings.
The Spatial Form

1. This new landscape, which has an undulating shape, connects the five huge buildings and accommodates the individual entrances to them on an upper level.
2. The landscape, which covers the car park underneath and provides new parkland, separates the pedestrian route from the car route with different levels.
**The Metaphoric Structure**

The concave ceilings and flared columns which look like the root of a plant afford the new landscape the image of a naturally growing plant.
The Form of the Program

1. The reception (entrance hall) under the new landscape is the connection, as well as the access point of the five buildings.
2. The car parking places are also under the new landscape which offers individual accesses to the five buildings.
3. People can also go to the five buildings through the new undulating parkland which can be easily access from the street around.
Which elements of the Architecture are NOT approached with Landscape Methods

The five buildings comprise foyers, an auditorium, nine conference halls, meeting rooms and offices. Each individual function was characterized by the subtle material variations in the facades.
How is the concept of landscape understood by the architects of this project

This project, especially the new parkland, is a new landscape for this piece of land, which offers a better view of this area and the Amsterdam-Rhine Canal for the officers and the people live around.

What is the (unique) architectural composition of these layers

The intervention of the central landscape is the most unique composition. Rather than using belowground spaces, the new landscape creates two layers which can not only provide a cover for the programs underneath, but also new parkland as well as a connection for the five buildings.
Geometry and Basic Form

1. Terrain: the landscape of the Stowe House was followed the natural geometry. It was a typical English garden that the whole plan was ordering by means of a matrix changes into a linking of rational and formal compositional fragments, held together by natural geomorphology. The basic geometric plan of the garden totally integrated into the physical-geographic lines of the natural landscape. On the other hand, the landscape of the Cap Gemini Office was created by designer that the site was originally located at a triangle-like existing polder and the centerpiece is the new majestic landscape which also forms a new layer for the site.

2. Architecture: As we analyzed above, the development of the site plan of the Stowe House went through many phases. At the early stage, this project was clearly influenced by the French garden which we could see a clear axis which made the house as the center point of the project. As to Cap Gemini office, we could see that there are five buildings organized freely on the site and connected by a new landscape which makes it hard to distinguish the primary and secondary of there five buildings.
The Spatial Form

In the Stowe House project, the surrounding man-made landscape was involved within the range of the plan by means of a pictural landscape composition. The house, the church and some construction are no longer the center of the composition, but one of the ornamental elements. The spaces of the garden and the surrounding landscape were seen in motion. For example, most of constructions like temple and pavilion were become one of the natural elements in this landscape which you could have a rest and have visual contact with the other elements.

As to Cap Gemini office, the new landscape was created to provide connection the five huge buildings which accommodated the individual entrances to them on an upper level and also a cover for the parking underneath.
The Form of the Program

The Stowe House accommodated the country life as an aristocratic alternative for life in the city which was different from the French garden, less formal manners. For instance, you could on foot through the garden, on horseback or by coach through the meadow of the estate and wilderness outside it. All these mean that in this project to provide a new or different life was the main point of the design. But on contrary, the new landscape of Cap Gemini office project can not only provide new parkland for this piece of land, which offers a better view of this area and the Amsterdam-Rhine Canal for the officer and the people live around but also a new layer to be the upper level connection and cover for the parking underneath.
Background

Project Name: TU/Delft Library
Location: Delft, NL
Architect: Mecanoo architecten b.v.
Date of Commission: 1993 - 1995
Date of Construction: 1996 - 1998

TU/Delft Library

MECANOO is the name of the architectural group joined in 1984. They are always trying to create new architectural form and compose new spaces. Now they are renowned architectural group. Completed in 1998, Central Library of TU Delft is their representative architecture. This library is very particular in exterior appearance. And this outside form is still the basic volume of the interior spaces. The masterplan had been proceeded by the architect, Jacob Berend Bakema. The library is sited in front of the student union architecture designed by Bakema. MECANOO had created the new hill on the TU Delft university.
The Metaphoric Structure

1. The new landscape creates a new amenity for the whole campus: lawns with flowers and trees where students and professors meet informally on it.

2. The conical tower, which extends forty meters above grade and floodlit at night, acts as a beacon on the campus day and night.

Geometry and Basic Form

This library, which has a diamond-like shape, is sited in front of the student union (AULA) architecture designed by Bakema who also design the master plan of the site. I could assume that the library had used the context with the Bakema's architecture and had been created as a new hill on the TU Delft campus.
The Form of the Program

1. The new grass roof, which can be walked upon, is freely accessible for walking and lounging, creating a new atmosphere for the university. It is supported by slender steel columns in a huge hall enclosed with canted, fully glazed walls. The base of the slope to the west is marked by a broad flight of steps leading up to a recessed entrance.

2. Inside the huge conical tower, there are four levels of traditional study spaces connected by a helical stair. Within the conical tower, a central void provides daylight from a glazed roof to the internal reading spaces.

The Spatial Form

1. The vast lawn is lifted on one edge like a sheet of paper and shapes the roof of the new library. This new landscape, which looks like a hillside, creates a green roof and the interior space underneath.

2. There is a conical tower inserted in the middle of the new landscape, which can not only provides the totally open space, but also daylight. All the function and space are organized around it.
The Spatial Form

In terms of spatial form, we try to compare the influence on the organization and the feeling when people visit this two places brought by the Stowe house and the conical tower. As we analyzed above, the development of the site plan of the Stowe House landscape went through many phases. At the early stage, this project was clearly influenced by the French garden which we could see a clear axis which made the house as the center point of the project. Later, although the development of the plan emerged with some characteristics of England garden, but the Stowe house was still the main influence point that all the later developments were created around it. But because of the impact of the England garden, when you walk around this place, the most impressive feeling is the pictural landscape composition which we discussed above and the Stowe house is no longer the visual center. On the other hand, the conical tower of the TU/Delft library is the center point of not only the organization from outside, but also all the function and interior space are organized around it. And at the same time when you visit this place, the most attractive thing is the conical tower which becomes the visual center of the surrounding.

The Form of the Program

As we have analyzed above, both the landscape of Stowe House and TU/Delft library were aim to create a new or different life to people. In Stowe House the landscape accommodated the country life as an aristocratic alternative for life in the city which was different from the French garden, less formal manners. With the same purpose, the new landscape of TU/Delft library creates a new atmosphere for the whole campus: lawns with flowers and trees where students and professors meet informally on it.
**Geometry and Basic Form**

Both the two projects provide a dynamic new landscape for the environment. Both of the new landscapes can be easily access from the street around and provides new layers for the programs underneath. Both the entrances of these two projects have the similar feeling that can attract the people to get closer.
The Spatial Form

As to Cap Gemini office, we can see there are five buildings organized freely on the site and connected by a new landscape which makes it hard to distinguish the primary and secondary of these five buildings, looks like the English garden. On the other hand, even though the design of the TU/Delft library doesn't have the axis like the French garden to make the center point for the whole organization of the plan and the feeling of the visual center, but with the influence of the conical tower, it still has the similar effect that the conical tower is the center point of not only the organization from outside, but also all the function and interior space are organized around it. And at the same time when you visit this place, the most attractive thing is the conical tower which becomes the visual center of the surrounding.
The Form of the Program

Similarity: Both the two projects create a new landscape and the space underneath. Cap Gemini office project could provide new parkland for this piece of land which offers a better view of this area and the Amsterdam-Rhine Canal for the officers and the people live around and also a new layer to be the cover for the parking underneath. The new landscape of the TU/Delft library also creates a new amenity for the whole campus and the total space for the library underneath.

Differentia: The new of landscape of the Cap Gemini office not only provide what we discussed above, but also a connection that connects the five huge buildings and accommodates the individual entrances to them on an upper level which also separates the pedestrian route from the car route with different levels. Another thing is the position of the architectonic form in these two projects. In the project of Cap Gemini office, the reason to create the new landscape is to provide two different levels of connections for the five separated buildings. But on contrary, the conical tower exists not only as the visual center to the new landscape, but also provides daylight for the space underneath this new landscape.
A library without walls

It was very difficult for the new building to compete with the Aula because of its special architecture. The library avoids this conflict by not being a building but a landscape which is oriented to the south. The approach was to create a social space on the TU Campus and weld the two buildings together. The form of the library opens the view to the cemetery and creates a triangular entrance situation between the two buildings.

At the Shoemakerstraat the building step back from the street and leave the green buffer zone for the living area on the other side of the street.

The Mecanoo architects sketch the cone full with books and it should be a statement for the knowledge stored into the TU library.

Three sides of the building are made of full glass facades and create transparent working spaces for the offices which are situated at the east and south of the building.

The building provides approximately 1000 study spaces, 300 of them are equipped with computer terminals. In addition to the study areas within the cone, spaces are provided at ground and first floor levels adjacent to the glazed north facade. In contrast, most of the books are kept in temperature and humidity controlled storerooms in the basement.

They may be requested for retrieval by library staff and are delivered to the circulation desk by a glazed elevator.

80,000 of the most recent publications are available to the public. These are tangibly close at hand, displayed in a four-story, suspended steel-framed bookshelf silhouetted against an ultra-marine wall. Finally, thousands of current periodicals are on open display at ground level. In addition to serving the local needs of university students and staff, the library provides distance reference and information services for many companies and industries. Designated as the national library for technical and natural sciences, the facility is also connected electronically to major libraries around the world.

Staff offices are planned at the perimeter of the building, rising to five stories at the southeast corner. The east wing is designed as a double loaded corridor with support facilities on the dark interior side and offices along the glazed outer edge. The offices look out through a slender canted colonnade to a row of mature trees along the street. The south wing is single loaded, with open circulation galleries and stairs expressed within the large central space of the library. The office wall along this corridor is a collage of transparent and several kinds of translucent glass, and the exterior window wall of the offices is fully glazed. The rich quality of dappled light admitted into the heart of the building through these many layers of glass helps to activate the vast interior space. Likewise a book shop and a coffee bar activate the library socially.
The general assembly hall
The faculty buildings along Mekelweg aren't communicating, they look straight ahead, just standing there being themselves.
The general assembly hall is a kind of building which wouldn't tolerate a building next to it. It looks like a space ship touched down in the campus area. The brutalist concrete structure reminded the architects of a frog:
"The frog needed grass."

The cone
The design approach for the cone was to create a contrast with the landscape: "like a tepee in the landscape". The pure structural form should be a symbol of the University of Technology.
Analyse Architecture with landscape Methods

Geometry and Basic Form
The basic form of the library consists on triangular shapes, differently to the assembly hall it creates green triangular areas facing the surrounding streets or properties. To show that the library belongs to the campus, the architects let fall back the outlines of the building and oriented it to the campus area. The main entrance is facing the back side of the assembly hall and is also made of triangular shapes which leading into the library. In middle of the library the architects planned a cone which is thrilled trough the green roof of the library.

The aula let people pass trough along it’s middle axes which is quite the mirror axes of the building. The Library breaks up the symmetry on the plot and creates a new outline for the TU campus.

Grove parking
The car park has been designed as a painting with recycled stones form the former car park and new black ones, separated by white lines. Flowering trees deck out this area.
The library got two different faces, the green hill and the glass facade facing the street. On the backside of the assembly hall, in the middle of this rectangular plot, huge steps shrinking to the small main entrance and leads you to the round info area. From there you are distributed to the different functions in the library: offices, bookshelf, study areas. In this huge space you will find a bookshelf which is four stories high and offices which are arranged along the east and south facade.
The Metaphoric Structure
The architects created a lawn for sun-bathing, a romantic hill in the campus where people can seat and lie around reading books or improve the social contacts between the people on the campus.
The facade which are facing the streets are more technical, the building shows its romantic side just to the campus. So the library main approach was to show that it belongs to the campus and it’s designed for the people there.

The Form of the Programme
University library of 15,000 m² with underground book archive, reading rooms, university publisher, offices, save for historical books and exhibitions, study spaces, book binder and bookshop.

After passing the main entrance you can choose to go to the library shop, the library or some closets.
In the library the info area, which is situated under the big cone in the middle, distributes to the bookshelf, study areas and the offices. The offices are arranged along the east and south facade and went up to 4 stories.
Which Elements of the Architecture are NOT approached with Landscape Methods
The cone should be the symbol for the knowledge stored into the library of TU Delft. Functional approaches were recommended for the offices so these were also not approached with landscape methods. That’s the same for the facades.

What is the (unique) architectural composition of these layers
The contrast of technic and landscape as main design approach and to show that the library is a very important part of the university. A place where people like to go and that on a very contrary situated plot.

How is the concept of the landscape understood by the architects of this project
The building should be part of the landscape - be the landscape.
Facts Mercator SportPlaza

Architect: Venhoeven CS, Amsterdam
Landscape Architect: OKRA Landschapsarchitecten, Utrecht
Client: Sportfondsen Nederland, Gemeente Amsterdam
Bruto surface: 7100 m²
Delivery: July 2006

Introduction Mercator SportPlaza

The mercator sportplaza is located in the west of Amsterdam, in a city area called the Baarsjes known as a multicultural Area. The building is designed as a society on it's own with functions mixed like a landscape.

The Mercator building is build at the end point of the Rembrandtpark, a park situated between the ring road and 19th century area called the Baarsjes.

The goal of the architect was to make a building that fits in to the park denying there is a building in the park.
Geometry and the basic form

The basic form of the sportplaza is a clustering of volumes with different functions all linked by the roof. The starting point of the design was that the building became a part of the park. On the site of the park the roof is floating in a fragmented way into the park so it becomes part of it. The fragmentation of the roof gives the building the impression it grabs into the park. In a way you can see the roof as a part of the natural geomorphology of the park. Underneath the roof the fragmented program is held together by the roof. The basic form of the building is not a direct consequence of the form of the program but more related to the form of the surrounding park landscape.

The Spatial form

Like the basic form the Spatial form of the building consists of the roof landscape with underneath a composition of linked spaces. The linked spaces can be divided in closed spaces, open spaces and the outside. The relation between those spaces gives the building its spatial form, so it’s like the English landscape like a motion “movement” from one space into the other from inside to outside the building. This way every space has its own character where the visual relations from one space into the other becomes very important into the design. The Spatial form of the building consists of open elements like the pools and the entrance and closed elements like the fitness the dressing rooms and the party room.
The Metaphorical structure
The building becomes a part of its surrounding just by pulling the landscape on top of the functions. Underneath this landscape there arises a new world, Venhoeven used the metaphor cave or "grotto". The continuity of the park on top of this "grotto" is formed by a roof with a diversity of vegetation an let the building disappears as a collection bumps in the landscape. The new world under the landscape consists of open and closed volumes al linked together by the roof. This stresses out by the materialisation of the building against the materialisation of the volumes inside. The new world lays half a meter below the ground. The white plaster on the volumes makes a contrasted with the vegetation roof on top of the building, all to point out you enter a new world under the ground like a "grotto" in the landscape.

The form of the program
The form of the program is not a direct consequence of the outside shape of the building. Venhoeven tried to organise the program underneath a landscape roof in a way you go from one place into another and have a constantly changing experience of space and visual relations. A part of the program takes place in closed volumes placed under the landscape roof, dividing the more open spaces from each other. The organization of the program comes from the task to realize visual relations between the spaces and to the outside. The program is divided in the swimming and sport area and the restaurant and the party room and are connected by the enter. The swimming area is more orientated to the park landscape while the restaurant is orientated to the "city" street.
In the way of going from one room into the other and have constantly a new spatial experience like the various zones in the English garden.
Which elements of the architecture are NOT approached with landscape methods?
The way the architect divided the fast food restaurant from the other functions, the form is the same but the landscape roof is replaced by a metal facade and there are also no physical and visual relations. So you can say the restaurant is divided from the main building but still makes part of it by keeping the same form.

What is the (unique) architectural composition of these layers?
The organization of the program in open and closed spaces connected with the idea of walking from one space into another “like in an English garden” all combined with an overlaying roof landscape that comes out of the park the building makes part of. As if you are walking through a grotto underneath a park landscape.

How is the concept of landscape understood by the architect of this project?
In one way the architects try to make the building become part of the park by pulling the exciting landscape on top of the program. In a second way by organizing the program in a spatial way, so you walk from one space into the other and making visual relations between this spaces.
Comparison
The TU Library as well as the Mercator sportplaza both have the same starting point of trying to put the existing landscape on top of the program. But the way they interpreted the spatial form and the form of the program is from a landscape point of view different.

Geometry and the Basic form
The main approach to make a landscape on top of the programs has in the projects the same task. In the case of the library the architect lifted up the landscape to give the campus a green hill and block the road from the campus area and to fit the connection between living area and the campus. In the case of the sport plaza there is also the goal to divide the park and the main road. Both projects used the existing landscape to soften the border between “park” and main street (living area). That’s why the basic form of the to projects is different.

The Spatial form
The Spatial form under the landscape roof is interpreted in both projects on a different way. The library consist of a huge space beneath the roof with a round info area in the middle where you get distributed to different functions. In case of the Sportplaza you get distributed from the entrance hall in to the other functions. You go from open trough closed spaces in to other open spaces all connected by the roof.
The Methaforical structure
The architects of Mecanoo wanted to design a romantic hill inside the campus where people can sit and lie around, reading books and improve social contacts between the people on the campus. A technical, representative facade facing the street shows the importance of the building to the people which are not belonging the campus. In case of the sportplaza the pulled over the landscape on top of the program creating a new world underneath like a "grotto". The way the architects organized the program comes from that metaphor going from one space to the other.

The Form of the Programme
Because the library is forming a huge space beneath the green roof, the Mecanoo architects decided to put offices along the east and south facade. The office structure on the east side is hidden behind the huge bookshelf and is connected through bridges with the cone where you have space to study the books.

The sportplaza consist of open and more closed functions. The organization of this program comes from the goal to walk from one space in to the other and create visual connections from the different spaces.
The gardens were designed by Henry Hoare II and laid out between 1741 and 1780 in a classical 18th-century design set around a large lake, achieved by damming a small stream. The inspiration behind their creation were the painters Claude Lorrain, Poussin and, in particular, Gaspar Dughet, who painted Utopian-type views of Italian landscapes. It is similar in style to the landscape gardens at Stowe.

Included in the garden are a number of temples designed to show off the Hoare family’s education and wealth. On one hill overlooking the gardens there stands an obelisk and King Alfred’s Tower (a 50-metre-tall, brick folly designed by Henry Flitcroft in 1772); on another hill the temple of Apollo provides a vantage point to survey the magnificent rhododendrons, water, cascades and temples. Amongst the woodland surrounding the site there are also two Iron Age hill forts: Whitesheet Hill and Park Hill Camp. The gardens are home to a large collection of trees and shrubs from around the world.

In 1722-1785 during the 18th century the landscape around the new Stourhead House was changing:

adding of new architectonic elements: obelisk, walkways, bridges, temple,...
creating: different garden areas, redesigned driveway, new view axes, redesign of the lakes, new or redesigned walkways

The english gardens are based on the circular walk. The walkways with the immediate surroundings were creating the garden landscape inbetween agricultural landscape or woods. The most important example is Stourhead in southwestern of England. The circular walk is devided into scenes with different architectural objects and views which are mostly related to the lake in the middle of the circular walk.

The Stourhead landscape consists of two extremely different areas:

- the chalky, arable land of Salisbury Plain with its sparse vegetation
- the scarplands intersected by the river Stour.

In 1718 Stourton House was pulled down, 1720 they started to build up the new Stourhead house in the Palladian style. The design as a cube shaped block was similar to the central part of Villa Emo in Italy. 1792 the house was enlarged by two side wings and in 1838 a portico with a flight of step was added, according to the original plan of it’s architect Campbell.

King Alfred’s tower is the end of a formal drive at the highest point along the ledge which is directed to the northwestern part of the Stourhead grounds and on the borders of Somerset, Wiltshire and Dorset county. The tower consists on a triangular shape and is directed to each of the three counties.
Mekelweg becomes Mekelparc
A promenade links the faculty buildings with each other. The arrival of tram line 19, connecting Leidschendam with the Technical University via Delft Central Station, makes it possible to organise the campus as a car-free zone. The Mekel Park is 800 metres long and 80 metres wide. It is a park for pedestrians, cyclists and skaters. Trams and busses bring students, staff and visitors to the three stops on the Esplanade, which are designed in the same style as the promenade. The Esplanade links the various faculty buildings and their characteristic forecourts with each other and symbolises the interdisciplinary quality of the university. The granite edge of the Esplanade has been designed as a bench no less than one kilometre long. The Esplanade will be given a suitable name: the Nieuwe Delft, referring to the Oude Delft in the historic city centre of Delft, where originally the building of the TU Delft was located. The Esplanade is traversed by a playful grid of footpaths reminiscent of Mikado sticks that have been thrown down randomly. Existing trees have been saved or moved as much as possible and form a ribbon snaking through the park. With the Mekel Park the Technical University of Delft gains a campus of international allure, a meeting place for students and staff. Future alterations to the faculty buildings will increase the campus feeling since the entrances to the faculties and the shops, restaurants and cafés with terraces will be adjacent to the Mekel Park.

Comparison of the projects
Contrary to the design approach of Stourhead the architects try to bring the landscape into an urban context. In Stourhead the architects played with the location of architectural objects in the landscape - inside the campus of TU Delft Mecanoo tried to play with landscape elements to break the straight, rational planning of the campus area.

Stourhead Park follows the concept of circular walkways against the Mekelparc which is the link between all faculty buildings of TU Delft and where all connections, pedestrians, cyclists, cars and public transport come together. The routing through Mekelparc is similar to that in the English garden because the architects of Mecanoo played also with the routing, the axes of view and different scenes among the TU campus, like architects did it nearly 200 years before.

King Alfred’s tower in Stourhead marks an important point in the landscape where three borderlines come together. It’s location on the highest point in the landscape shows the importance as landmark. Also the building for electrical engineering in the middle of the campus complies its function as landmark and shows that something important is happening in the urban landscape of Delft.

The Aula looks like just landed inside the campus and is very dominant in front of the TU library. The building should catch the people under it’s huge concrete form and looks like an enormous porch. Also Stourhead House has got a porch but of course it’s not as big, the main entrance is reached by two staircases on each side and leading to the entrance. Instead the Aula has the main entrance oriented to the Mekelweg without a level change.

The Masterplan for the Mekeelpark shows that the architects are playing with different highs levels in form of hills, pedestrian areas which are linking the different green areas and TU buildings and the planting. On crossings the walkways opens up to bigger squares where people can sit or lie around. The concept of the English garden is to plan the routes passing through tighter green passages into bigger opened spaces and to open new view axes into the landscape.

Conclusion
After that comparison you can see that the design techniques of an old English garden are quite similar to those of nowadays. The need of green areas in cities is now very important and the Mecanoo architects are known for their use of former design methods. In Stourhead the architects placed architectural elements into the landscape - today it’s the other way round because the architects want to bring landscape into the city.
The Vondelpark

The Vondelpark is designed as an English landscape with the intention to give the visitor of the park the feeling they are walking in nature. This was improved by connecting the lakes in the park and soften the banks of the lakes.

The park is designed by Zocher and was opened in 1865. If you look to the layers of the park it consist on five layers:

- The Water
- The Green grove
- The green lawn
- The primary route
- The secondary route

In the design the visual relations are very important. The was situated on the edges of the park protecting it from its building surrounding and on the crossing of the primary route and secondary route.

This creates the intention of walking from one space in to the other. By curving the route the designers put in another natural element giving the park it’s quality of nature in the city.
Comparing Mercator SportPlaza vs. Vondelpark

Comparing a building with a park isn’t an easy thing to do because of the different scales of the projects. By using the Landscape layers I tried to compare the two projects. The Vondelpark is designed as an English garden walking in a natural environment in the middle of the city.

Elements such as open spaces like the lawn and the water are used for visual relations and closed elements like groves divided this “open” spaces from each other creating the feeling of walking from one open space true a closed space in to a new open space.

In the case of the Mercator Sportplaza there is in a programmatic way also chosen for this of organizing the program.

The organization of the program in open and closed spaces connected with the idea of walking from one space into another “like in an English garden”.

The interpretation of the borders of the park you can also see like soften the edges of the park to the hard shape of the city. In a way this is coming back in the basic form of the Mercator sportplaza The hard border to the road and soften it to the park side.
Architecture with Landscape Methods

**course:**

Villa Urbana  
Analysis - AR0063

**project 1: CODA Museum, Herman Hertzberger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>city</th>
<th>Apeldoorn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>latitude</td>
<td>52.215363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longitude</td>
<td>5.957175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal function</td>
<td>museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical comparison</td>
<td>Stourhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface size</td>
<td>9000 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footprint size</td>
<td>3400 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area size</td>
<td>3600 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client</td>
<td>municipality of Apeldoorn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**project 2: Basket Bar, NL Architects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>city</th>
<th>Utrecht</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>latitude</td>
<td>52.084843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longitude</td>
<td>5.171771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal function</td>
<td>grand café, basketbal field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical comparison</td>
<td>Boboli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface size</td>
<td>677 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footprint size</td>
<td>277 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area size</td>
<td>475 sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client</td>
<td>university of Utrecht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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