FOREWORD

Amongst the processes linked to the territorial expansion of the city —particularly to the development of great urban systems— we find the production of metropolitan landscapes, the characteristics of which cannot be understood in the light of the usual landscape categories nor the methods associated to their analysis. That is why remarkable efforts have been made over the last twenty years in order to develop a theoretical body for their understanding, parallel to the efforts carried on by the public administration in order to improve them.

Both their territorial reach and their being the background of most of the population's daily life entail an increasing prominence of metropolitan landscapes as objects of planning, design and management. Furthermore, this prominence is enhanced by the goals of the European Landscape Convention, which introduces the need to dedicate attention to common landscapes, and —in the case of Catalonia— the implementation of the policies stipulated by the *Llei del paisatge* (2005). The articles in this issue of *Papers* suggest a reinterpretation of metropolitan landscapes that can be understood as a challenge to achieve a better articulation of the territory and an improvement of the quality of both places and the lives of their dwellers.

In the first article, Carles Llop refers the most substantive elements and dynamics of metropolitan landscapes and claims the worth of the concepts and instruments unfolded by the territorial planning, and the principles of environmental sustainability, as means to deal with the current stage of the city. In accordance to this goal the author introduces the challenge of renewing territorial planning basing on a reinvention of the landscape.

In the second article, Francesc Muñoz expounds the way in which mobility, besides transforming the territory and the landscape, is determining the appearance of typologies of places and landscapes related to each type of mobility. In particular, the author analyses the rise of a new type of *low cost* geography and landscapes which are linked to the needs of this form of aerial mobility, and the breaking away of

the traditional bonds between individuals and places, to be substituted by a paradoxical *delocated* sense of place.

The third article, by Enric Batlle, deals with the leap of scale regarding the design of parks in metropolitan areas, as landscape plans that intend to respond to territorial functions which go beyond municipal boundaries. The author's discourse runs over a number of design strategies found to be adapted to the scale and characteristics of places —from municipal urban parks to metropolitan park systems— through what he calls value-added environments.

After describing the main features of the process of urbanization of Northern Italy during the second half of the 20th century, Fabio Renzi writes about one of the most innovative experiences of the Lombardia park system: the *Parco Agricolo Sud di Milano*, appeared in the 1990s as a supra-municipal answer to the urban pressure affecting one of the most developed areas of the country. Being based on heritage, ecological and social landscape values, the *Parco* has become a European reference in the field of metropolitan territories and landscapes management.

In the fifth article, Ramon Torra, Antoni Farrero and Víctor Ténez describe the ways in which the successive plans of the metropolitan area of Barcelona have interpreted the Llobregat River, and analyse several initiatives promoted by the *Mancomunitat de Municipis* that aim to create a new type of relation between the river and its territorial environment, according to what they call the *river city*. They deal, amongst others, with the means and projects focused on environment, landscape and social restoration of the last stretch of the riverside.

The last article of the issue is Jaume Busquets', which reflects on the importance of the appreciation of urban peripheries and the evolution of groves as a shaping factor of the entrances to the cities, introducing the project of landscape improvement of the access to the town of Granollers through the BP-5002 road. Based on urban-planning requirements and the understanding of the landscape values of the site, this plan is an example of intervention in peripheral areas, in which landscape improvement cannot be undertaken without regarding the citizens' wellbeing.

METROPOLITAN LANDSCAPES: POLYCENTRISM, EXPANSION, MULTI-PERIPHERIES AND MICRO-PERIPHERIES. From the cliché landscape to the kaleidoscope landscape

Carles Llop

1. *Quo vadis* city? *Quo vadis* territory? *Quo vadis* landscape?

The use of the territory has always followed an expansionist trend. Notwithstanding, up until the last century the city has demonstrated a controlled configuration. Now, the city and the territory are changing inexorably and, consequently, how they are interpreted. But, what we perceive as an "urban landscape" or a "territorial landscape" should not be seen from an apocalyptic or nostalgic point of view. We revise the state of the city and the territory to improve them in an attempt to construct quality landscapes, proving the Catalan aphorism "*el paisatge és l'ànima del territori*" (the landscape is the soul of the territory). After all, it is never too late to start and nothing is completely lost when it comes to city, territory and landscape quality.

There have been a number of seminars and papers read, not forgetting resulting published articles, that have concerned themselves with investigating new landscapes, particularly metropolitan landscapes.[1] In particular, I would like to underline those studies which have talked in detail about densely populated territorial areas where phenomena such as urban sprawl determine the characteristics of public concern that attempts to deal with environmental management from a renewed standpoint.

American cities have already experienced the expansion of the city across the territory many years before us here in Catalonia, and many articles have been published on the phenomena of metropolisation, generating a substantial bibliography of explanations and definitions.[2] "Cities without Cities" is the title of the introductory conference to the seminar *The Future Metropolitan Landscape: Conference Reflections*, which focused on understanding contemporary regional metropolitan landscapes. This title has a bearing on our awareness of how the traditional city (more or less compact, but which can be measured and delimited) is losing its configuration in the face of the ever-increasing

constitution of an infinite city (spread out and dilating across the territory, not so easy to delimit, heterogeneous and multiform); a kind of city which some scholars have already qualified as a great mixed colloidal cities, curdled cities, or a variety of forms built over a territory ploughed up by infrastructures, spattered with construction and with fragmented geographic continuities.

Metropolitan territories not only have to put up with physical banalisation. More than anything else, this is a question of quality loss that has a clear impact on weakening social integrity and economic power. Degraded landscapes looked upon with displeasure, is how we citizens who live in them verbalise and feel them when we see extensions to "urbanalised" residential areas: the now abandoned agricultural areas, brownfields on the edges of infrastructures, the industrial areas in precarious conditions or the major *spaghetti* junctions at the intersections of principal metropolitan road networks. It is abandonment which degrades the territory and illustrates a belligerent and disappointing landscape where we feel the need to call for a renewed perception of space. To re-think and re-make the landscape of the metropolis is surely the only path to follow to rediscover this lost perception.

2. The landscape as a perception of the territory: multi-landscapes

We can attribute multiple meanings to the word "landscape" to the degree that it begins to generate certain confusion. But, what are the consequences of using the word "landscape" indiscriminately?

A sound reaction would be to try and establish a consensus concerning the meaning we associate with landscape and precise usage so that we can identify or give meaning to shared questions concerning our perception of territories. I have begun by deliberately employing the use of the two key words, but now propose changing their order: "territory" and "perception". "Territory" is the fundamental key to setting the boundaries of what I am talking about, and "perception" is the term which enriches the interpretation of what happens in the territory. Territory entails a tangible reality, and perception influences our judgement of it, hermeneutically and critically, when it is observed, analysed, and a given evaluation is made. Perception, cognition and emotion are the categories that are applied with one's view of the landscape.

Landscape is the fusion of what is seen and not seen of the territory; the texture as an expression of a profound structure and the history that has preceded it and determined a "semantic latency" (as suggested by Eugenio Turri) made up of the communities that have lived in the territory and have shaped it geographically

and socially. We have over-consecrated the contents of the "landscape" and we have lost the force and convincing nature of what "territory" is and what it means. Territory signified on the basis of environmental features, transformed by the ways in which it has been inhabited. Landscape needs to rediscover its condition of "land"! There is no sense behind nostalgia for the old landscapes which cannot be recovered, the pseudo-modern defence of —and fascination for— "none-places" or the landscapes of homogenising globalisation. If the territory has no soul then the epidermis dries up and withers.

3. Territories in a world of explosions - explosive landscapes in the territory

We could perhaps agree that the contemporary world bears the marks of explosions: demographic, urban, migration, mobility, economic and, finally, a social explosion which shatters traditional paradigms. It is interesting to observe how we set territories against the limits of certain thresholds to achieve the highest level of urban occupation (the metropolis) and the total absence of anthropisation (the desert). This extreme dualisation, becomes mistaken, attending to the progressive loss of definitive isolation in desert territories, parallel to the growing isolation experienced by humans in the atopy of some metropolitan places. Nature is becoming more and more urbanised and the city is rediscovering new forms of forest abandonment.

Urban explosions are causing an uncontrolled break up of physical space which becomes a broken mirror, a split space, a broken-mosaic, where the fragments still maintain the sense of a decomposed "whole". It offers a shattered landscape and a desolation in which it attempts to comprehend the integrity of the territory, because the sequences and links between the individual pieces no longer exist. This is the landscape of the ordinary periphery, now transformed into a multitude of incongruous and banal peripheries, polluted and noisy, sliced up by road networks and poorly connected, with little infrastructure and poorly infrastructured. The city sprouts with a wide range of plural processes of different shapes and forms. But we have to accept the "new forms of urbanity" even though the new forms of cities may appear inadmissible. We need to distinguish between 'city' and 'urbs' as suggested by Henri Lefebvre;[3] otherwise we cannot understand, and even less identify, the true reality of the contemporary city.

So, it makes no sense to panegyrise the city left to the devices of the chaotic flexibility, non-regulations or uncontrolled, nor does it make sense to praise the periphery as a new type of modern space. What is needed here is to be aware of the phenomena which characterise the

metropolis to be able to understand the challenges posed by its possible transformation:

— Extension of the forms of the city over the territory with the resulting dispersal of functions.

— Spread of residential areas which are increasingly located further from the metropolitan centres.

— Polarisation of central functions over the metropolitan access junctions.

— Major internal transformations of the consolidated city.

— Lloss of centrality.

— Increase of the peri-urban perimeters.

— Infrastructure congestion.

— Problematic use of certain types of land.

4. Multi-peripheries and micro-peripheries: the effects of dispersed limits in the use of the territory

The city has turned its back on its atavistic relationship with the territory, generating a multiplicity of heterogeneous forms, often fragmented and jumbled up. The real city is a huge "nebulous urban construct",[4] that we need to know how to decipher, comprehend and act on accordingly. The new lexicon we are searching for to understand the phenomenon of urban reality, are devices for planning and managing urban processes.

Mobility conditions and determines the shape of the territory, and the metropolis is its ultimate stage. The spread of people over the territory determines the scale of the metropolis. It does not exist without the movement and flows of materials, goods, information and people. The "product" and the "construct" of this mobility are the urbanisation of the territory and the most visible expression of the depths and surfaces of what the metropolis is; its real landscape, in the kinetic perception and in the changes and transformation that it accumulates.

The prolonged use of the territory that has progressively shaped urban life, has spread the city over a vast geographical area, giving rise to a highly anthropised territorial geography, and a system of cities that are increasingly more urbanised and closer.

The spread of the city, the over-occupation and the fragmentation ways of occupying the territory have increased the contact perimeters between the countryside and the city, between countryside and countryside, and between city and city, in the multiple situations that cause contemporary urban realities: commercial strips, infrastructure

landscapes, brownfields, wastedlands, major areas occupied by industry, transport and mobility hubs, marginal landscapes, marginalised landscapes, and so on.

5. Recomposing the territory, reinventing it: generating new landscapes

The territory is a permanent archive. It provides clear proof of the biophysical substratum, it expresses environmental dynamics, and it bears witness to social actions. It is the history and geography of the space production. From a holistic perspective of "territory" as a contemporary expression which includes memories of the past and the vindication of an improved future, we understand that it is possible to intervene modifying territory pathologies. The most appropriate strategies involve re-composing it, but also reinventing it.

Recomposing is the order of the day. Re-mix, re-make, re-configure, re-consider"[5] are formulations applicable to social behaviour and, consequently, to the recomposing of our territories from a standpoint of commitment to ecology, to arrive at an environmental agreement between the contemporary city and the permanent territory.

The city is expanding and the territory welcomes it. This has been and still is the binomial on which territorial transformations are based.

The new paradigm for the contemporary city project would have to establish itself over technical, political and social accords which we have been constructing in territorial governance in recent years, in plans for urban and territorial development, and in citizen proposals. Through all these platforms and agents, we have been putting together a collection of efficient and conceptually solid principles when it comes to planning, projecting and managing this phase of the city which has befallen us. Here, I am mainly talking about the case for Catalonia —alas we are not accompanied along this path by other autonomous communities in the Spanish peninsula. These are to confront:

— Spread, concentration.

— Low population density, work on new population densities that are rationally higher.

— Territorial fragmentation, more rationally compact models.

— Hyper-specialisation, mixture and mixed uses.

— social segregation, the project of social space as an motivating agent for cohesion and solidarity.

— Reticulating polarisation of the capital centres linked by networks to metropolitan medium-sized cities, making good of the network theory principle: autonomy of the parts and being mutually complementary.

Reinventing landscapes means generating renewed ways of relating to the territory, using it and managing it. On the subject of metropolitan landscapes, Bernardo Secchi says, "Watercourses once engineered for transport can be set free or reconnected to wetlands. Industrial areas can be transformed into porous sites, and the infrastructure of rail lines can become an opportunity to enhance mobility and make the city truly accessible to all without relying on private transportation." These are images that do not belong to the pre-existing territory, but rather to the virtual imagination of new scenery. Reinvention is based on new imaginary conceived in the virtual world, reflecting on the possibilities of changes, on the basis of a spatiality that does not correspond to the real view, but rather the evocation of reflexive thought, and the cybernetic world, in a still non-formal a *priori* that will become possible though the landscape project.

6. A new structure to rethink the efficiency of the metropolis: the territorial-mosaic-city

The renewed territorial project, thus passes through remixing and reinventing, which take shape by expressing the fragments and adapting the different forms of the city in a new system of physical and functional organisation. The "territorial-mosaic-city" is both a morphological and environmental structure at the same time, seen in terms of the ecological mutual adaptation and the co-evolution of urban and natural ecosystems in interaction, based on a mosaic articulated in urban pieces and the biophysical matrix of the territory, environmentally balanced, comprising:

— Consolidated urban structures.

— High quality rurban tessera on metropolitan perimeters and interstices, as new city spaces.

— New Attractors fitted out in the contact between the major territorial empty spaces and the urban tesserae.

The conceptualisation of this model brings with it a series of operative objectives:

— The favouring of osmosis and dissolving of frontiers through planning permeable and exchange spaces.

— The task of re-classifying boundaries.

— The articulation of the pieces that make up the mosaic by means of efficient mobility management and an ever more precise plan for road network grids.

— The regeneration and articulation of empty spaces of the metropolis. An active empty space is the "non-city", comprising the group of spaces of the territory's biophysical matrix, full of rivers and all their components, of water drainage and the most capillary water supply network, crop growing fields, orchards and forest spaces.

7. The kaleidoscope landscape

The relationship between the city and its surroundings has generated a wide array of confused feelings and a collection of imaginaries or multiple landscapes which praise or criticise the different territorial situations. Often we have found model orphans to manage territorial planning. I believe that we now have to talk from the perspective of the wealth of disciplinary diversity, a forum of visions and polyhedral opinions (even dialectically opposed) because we are living in times of uncertainty. We are living through the tension between the most pernicious liberalism and the demand for a new territorial culture, or "for the territory" which, when all said and done, this is what constitutes the true ecosystem in which we live incorporating the people that live in it.

We need to talk from the perspective of the planner, the project manager, of those who, if I may be allowed to say, is building the city, intervening in the subtle equilibrium of the blurred frontier between the natural and the built, who are aware of what Joseph Rykwert reminds us: Planners today... still have to learn an important lesson from their predecessors [...] that "model" the city may offer has to be strong enough to survive whatever inevitable disorder [...] and has to give structure to the urban experience.[6]

We will have to explore to the full the possibilities of the landscape without a nostalgic yearning for the past and with a deeply rooted enthusiasm for managing the city project which is our fate to live in, giving thought to the construction of the "new" space in this road to the infinite city.

So, we have to reinterpret the possibilities of the landscape as a tool. In the metropolis, landscaping has to create a social contract to: improve the quality of life (environmental, cultural and aesthetic) in places that are useful for the community; provide efficient mobility; create habitability, for the sake of health in an appropriate environment. A new beauty, a new aesthetics, a new feeling for the possibilities of the metropolitan inhabitant to generate comfort and equity.

Our use of the landscape has to be a "tool for social mediation" for "managing transformations". When planning territorial transformations one realises how "new landscapes" open up.

Landscape planning is thus a tool, cultural mediation to generate a critical view of the abuse of the territory and to pose new paradigms of use. Recycling the territorial abuse of the metropolitan peripheries means generating a 'landscape factory" which, in addition to new forms and space, arouses new ethical attitudes in the citizens who inhabit them. As proposed by Gaston Bachelard: "…it is dreamed before contemplated, before becoming a conscious spectacle; all landscapes are an oneiric experience. One only contemplates with aesthetic passion those landscapes that were previously seen in dreams. We have to recognise the prelude of natural beauty in human dreams[7]… If we look at the metropolis in this way, we shall leave behind the cliché that limits and we will be able to glimpse at the possibilities of the kaleidoscope landscape.

1   *The Future Metropolitan Landscape: Conference Reflections*, a collection of reflections resulting from the exhibition at the York Museum of Modern Art "Groundswells" (Febrer 2005).
2   Llop Torné, Carles, Adrià Calvo and Mara Marincioni: "Formes de ciutat al segle XX" in *L'explosió de la ciutat / The explosion of the city, Barcelona*: COAC i Fòrum Universal de les Cultures Barcelona 2004, pp. 346-352. ISBN: 84-96185-18-4, 2004; and "Mocions i lògiques d'intervenció en el projecte territorial renovat en les regions urbanes" in the same publication, pp. 346-379.
3   Lefebvre, H., *Espacio y política*, Editorial Península, Barcelona, 1972.
4   *In the last one hundred years, the urban revolution*, based on the concentration of major cities, has given rise to multiple denominations from a diverse to the traditional city, nuclear. See my article: I Timeline "Nuevas formas de ciudad en los siglos XX-XXI".
5   REBAR, group of creators, designers and activists (San Francisco, EE.UU.) http://www.rebargroup.org/
6   Joseph Rykwert. *La idea de ciudad: antropología de la forma urbana en Roma, Italia, y el mundo antiguo.* Ediciones Sígueme, 2002 (republished from the first edition, 1976).
7   Bachelard, Gaston, *El agua y los sueños: ensayo sobre la imaginación de la materia*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, México, 1978.

MOBILITY LANDSCAPES: FROM MULTIPLEX CENTRES TO *LOW-COST* AIRPORTS

Francesc Muñoz

Introduction

The morphology and evolution of the landscape, which always describe the relationships people establish with places, are matters that have habitually been explained as a result or function of how people inhabit the territory. So, the link between a given community and landscape has always been seen in the light of the activities and, consequently, territorial behaviour of a community, especially with reference to two major issues. First, the type of economy and the way in which it exploits the natural resources, or the assets of the territory.

Second, the type of settlement and housing construction from which we derive both the population structure and the functional and aesthetic characteristics of the constructed buildings. Accordingly, agrarian and industrial societies have given rise to characteristic landscapes seen as a synthesis of not only the economic or social nature of the inhabitants, but also their underlying historical and cultural foundations. Thus, a strong link has been established between our perception of landscape and a whole series of concepts associated with the idea of place, such as identity, vernacular or local character.

However, the sharp increase in urban development, particularly since the second half of the 20th century, and the present-day characteristic levels at a global scale, raise important questions about the key issues which not only explain the production of landscapes but also what they really mean in terms of what characterises, identifies and differentiates a given society. Many of the questions raised by the urban development of a territory cover dynamics such as the ever increasing importance of the spatial mobility of people, a process which is associated with the production of landscapes that are not only specifically related to managing mobility flows, but also to territorial support for this mobility.

In other words, it is not only the mobility of people which is a key consideration to be taken into account in order to understand how a territory functions, but also that we are witnessing the production of specific landscape typologies related to the manifestation of this mobility. As we are increasingly developing different dimensions to our lives in different places simultaneously, our experience of the landscape is not just related to where we live, but rather a whole series of territories with which we coexist when establishing our mobility itineraries. A wide range of places with specific mobility connotations emerge that are particularly important when it comes to defining concepts such as "living space" or a "feeling of belonging to a place". These landscapes not only stem from the infrastructure that actually copes with mobility —the motorways and airports—; they are also a result of a territorial model which is better explained from the perspective of mobility flows than the levels of population or building density.

Roundabouts, petrol station-shops, multi-screen cinemas or low-cost airports are clear examples of emerging landscapes that raise a key question. If mobility has now become the first order for inhabiting the territory, then it follows that landscapes associated with this mobility can also offer explanations (something which still has not been not sufficiently recognised) concerning the association between individual and place, between community and urbanised space mentioned in the opening paragraph. Perhaps they can explain even more than

the landscapes traditionally understood as being responsible for this function of endowing its inhabitants with a sense of their own place and shared history.

1. City and urban development: a history of the 20th century

During the course of the last two centuries, city and urban development has been a continuous process with one particularly important consequence: the city is no longer the exception in a territory where there is no urban development, and has become the most important characteristic feature of inhabited space. Although it is true that a territory may be subject to different degrees of urban development, it is no less the case that non-urbanised, agricultural or natural spaces (which were predominant in the past) have become environments that very often are confined or surrounded by urban stretches, infrastructures and buildings.

The spread of land development for urban purposes was a process which first began, and at a faster rate, in the cities in North Europe which became industrialised cities and had already entered into the dynamics of metropolitan development, particularly in the second half of the 20th century. These images of urban development became the archetypal process of the urban sprawl process with the now familiar features of low residential population density and specialised land use. For their own part, cities in the South of Europe, particularly Mediterranean cities, have preserved an image, that is no less archetypal: urban density, continued building construction density and mixed economic activities and land use. In contrast, the recent development of these compact cities illustrates an urban scenery which is clearly more complex, and which displays alternative urban forms to the compact city and dense population growth. The last thirty years have in fact witnessed a progressive dispersion of the population, activities and types of urban development in global terms throughout the urbanised world. Accordingly, a common metropolitan space has appeared in the majority of these cities characterised by its dispersed structure. This is a territory which combines different spaces, places and landscapes: some have undergone greater urban development, others are less built up, but all of them put to great use by the inhabitants and visitors whose numbers vary depending on the time of the year. Urban life, which in the 19th century was understood as any characteristic of the city and substantially different from life in the countryside, has thus ended up reaching out across the entire territory.

Dejan Sudjic described metropolitan space in similar terms in *The 100 mile city* (1991), in which the peripheries, centres, densely populated areas and the mobility spaces prove to be equally important