Abstract

In the last years of urban planning and landscape design practice, new technologies have evolved and become significant per formative attitude that have transformed the ways in which we conceive and configure the space we live. The interaction between necessity, desire and nature born new cultural paradigm who suggests that technology and nature need not to be mutually exclusive but can help each other. This interaction became a crucial tool of comprehension for today’s complex world defined by gradients or intensities of values, with no physical boundaries. Nature arranged on different levels provides a natural extension of existing, but also a symbol should its artificiality.

To build environmental awareness of our living space requires the architect/urban planner/landscape architect to think about the relationship between building/place ecological and climatologically system that building/place works. This paper, in a broader sense, define the perspective of human responsibility on the relationship between nature and culture. Opposing nature against culture will never get sustainable solutions for environmental problems, so we need to look deep symbiosis and to different types of functional and flexible, permeable and responsive patterns that saves space and dilates, while saving energy, time, water, infrastructure, a mini-ecosystem. Leaving from this theoretical approach and life reality, the paper attempt to reveal the real pressure for the changes of usual technology to the new one that in the landscape education. Is this a result of a change attitude to the sustainable development and a attitude to envision an territorial tissue that could flexibly respond to all local input factors as well as accommodate desired (planned) goals through new landscape development? To do this we must abandon the viewpoint of the spectator, and to ask the question which is the interest of human beings for living within these new landscapes perspective making the territory fabric.
1. Introduction

Continuing urbanization process and various models of spatial development (especially in the twentieth century) extends the landscape problematic to the entire territory (as common landscape) which is under pressure and risk of different types of urbanization (Antrop, 2004). So, we face with a fragile relation between build and non-build areas, where the relationship of urban– rural space is leading to new relationships in rural areas under urban pressure (Antrop, 2008). The article debates from academic perspective continuous development of these models related to development policy making and tools for implementation. Both activities are ongoing processes that require a query to the dynamic of the increasingly high rate of change in society. The society is the most important and it is difficult to define the exact characteristics of the living society in nature. From this perspective, the article stress out the relation between nature- technology and culture, as features for becoming landscape, and tries to define principles in order to approach and assess landscape transformation from an integrative approach (natural- cultural- technological).

2. Nature as a model of technology

Our lives are becoming increasingly controlled by technology, so the direct connection to nature is disappearing into the background of everyday life. The smartest way is to take advantage of nature, learning from it. Our imagination is strongly moulded by countless shapes and natural structures that reflect both the building structure and the spatial development approach. This way of working can then be closely linked into the eco-systemic processes which underlie any sustainable design endeavour that aims to harmonise with nature (Stevenson, 2006). Similarities between building structure and plants, how to copy nature for decoration reasons, solving the discharges considering how they are building trees, the plants, the animals were beginning of this approach. Now we are facing with a much deeper discourse, thus, to study the existence of biological systems can develop new concepts for sustainable buildings as well as for city and landscape planning (Benko, 2010), but these ideas are still in a growing field. Examples of biological systems exist as metaphor of space for new sustainable concepts from the building to the territory and identify the biosphere limits through can still sustain the growth / development conventional from now to the future.

3. Nature – Culture symbioses

Over time, appeared two positions of the nature-culture relationship in human perception, and these relationships are based on a different approach to the environment. There are alternative models resulting from the adoption of circular economic and educational systems (Cohen, 2005).

This game of relationships nature/culture perception continuously produce a new structure of build environment, expressed through the landscape as an expression of new economic structures (characteristics of built space, ratio of agriculture/ industry / services, in which the last become dominant - travel, insurance, banking, specialized education, cultural services). Mentioned influences and changes are not limited to endogenous relations, are also present in relation to the territory with differences between regions sensitive to different territorial scales, landscape and infrastructure. In this relationship could occur dynamics under urbanization pressure on the land for housing, transport infrastructure, economic and tourist activities (Antrop, 2004). Ideally, land use planning could act as a tool to deal with the various, often conflicting, demands from human experience in territorial space.

A significant educational and practical instruments that have transformed the ways in which we conceive and configure space means design and simulation of different development and evolution scenarios have enabled the
emergence of new landscapes environmental parameters that are changing the ways in which we include disparate information within design process, but are also significantly altering the methodological approach (Hârnănescu, 2012a). New methods of space approach design flexible framework of integration of different components (Mohammed, 2010) that compose space and define its identity (activities, events, humans and social issues), starting from three key issues: the knowledge that informs design and decision making, the landscape performance targets to be achieved, the identity features of a certain landscape.

3.1. Nature against culture

The first generation of specialists (architects, environmentalists, planners, landscapers) came, with few exceptions, to the view that nature must be protected from destructive result of building, and chaotic growing development. In its extreme form, this point of view means: nature, anything that is not done or not touched by human hands and culture is everything which is touched by human hand and are seen as two separate, exclusive systems: nature can not be where the culture is. In this perception, the approach of human intervention is a losing battle in front of nature. We may be able to slow or take care of this process, but we will never stop it. In the best case we give in to nature. Views of nature pushing aside his return to beginnings of human influence on nature as much as possible, leaving consumer culture one step behind. One view that it needs to reduce consumption and ultimately savings prosperity. How noble and ethical is an issue to think on it. This vision hasn’t produced so intelligent solutions for environmental and clime problems, but is an open discussion. Nature and culture can not be considered similar systems. Besides mountainous stretches, desert and tropical forests everywhere on the solid ground of the planet we find this blend of natural and artificial. An example is the Netherlands, where, according to the strict definition of landscape, there is no nature there. In the first human perception is very difficult to perceive this country without nature. For a man, to make a new nature involves experimentation, sometimes accidentally, but is also means to develop plans to emphasize the nature and planning and developing landscape strategies to open a complex relationship based on re-use, re-furbishment and recycling - all in order to pave the way for sustainable development. This approach takes into account mutual benefit between man (who comes by culture) and nature (developed by its characteristic through time).

3.2. Nature and culture

Considering the nature and culture as mutually exclusive systems, in a sustainable environmental culture, human intervention in the landscape construction can be considered as real as nature and the natural environment in a more aggressive approach. This leads to a conclusion: our technology and architecture is equally guilty of the disappearance of nature and environmental pollution.

Thus, everything that is produced by experts, from one point of view or another, in human perception, produces suspicion and this issue requires to emphasizing a good position and an education which stops the natural separation of culture to develop new perceptions of landscape and fast urbanization.

4. Becoming landscape

We are here in front of a concept that balances between the physical, aesthetic and social space, which is defined as a designed space, lived space, perceived space (Lefebvre, 1947). After Lefebvre, the designed space is based on a series of representations of the space and conventions (scientists and planners). The landscape is a place of conflict, the place of a perpetual compromise (...) (Jackson 1984), which we can consider as a sum of these three spaces. “It is designed because it started from the structure of the collective identity. It is also perceived, over the customary practices (and through its vernacularism) and it is experienced as it is symbolized; it bears within itself the daily and power signs.”
So, increased urbanization is closely linked to increased territorial mobility (Antrop, 2004) generating new modes of transportation and new development patterns of the landscape. In this case, new landscape concept describes the combination of cultural and natural elements, both forms showing natural geographical and cultural elements from the people who live or have lived there.

By extrapolating these definitions to the practice, it has resulted that landscape is directly related to its present use, modern activities designated to valuate and promote cultural assets, in fact on long term development are modifying the structure of landscape and consuming its values. Landscape concept refers to individuals and groups of individuals who perceive and use the landscape in production and consumption for various purposes (Popa, 2012). From that point of view contemporary approach of landscape problematic is related to sustainable development. Landscape dynamic can be approached and studied as a result of temporal and spatial reorganization of the territory due to social and economic demand (Popa, 2012). Even perceived as a productive and build territory or a land resource for development, the common landscape, due to its features and historical presence and evolution, represents a large part of cultural landscape, attesting the becoming of a territory, as perceived and used by population throw time. It is also a resource acting as a market value for major economic activities, tourism and planning, an important part of human life quality, in addition, the landscape change in territory is highly rapid due the evolution of technologies, territorial planning, urbanization, transportation, infrastructure and tourism, aspects which require a new environmental approach. Due to the mixed evolution of urban development patterns, the landscape metamorphosis is unequal, as result of different temporary and spatial transformations. Sustainable management of landscape adjacent to urban centers, trough cooperation and common development policies, can provide the opportunity for the cities to re-establish territorial balance by preservation of land for productive, natural or recreational uses. In the perspective of development it is a clear relation between the influences indicators (ecological, land use and land cover, perceptive, historical, cultural and economical) who express the complexity of a productive land. Also, is being required a defined combination of them which are capable to quantify the development because like a common landscape is an identity value, allowing local people to position themselves in time and place, to relate their identity to culture and community.

Identifying the elements and their relations that give personality to the environment is the basis for valuing it (classification and hierarchy), but it could become also operational as a basis for decisions on development policies, based on specific methodologies related to the value system of the local population (Hârmănescu, Popa 2012). A proposed scheme of management and development of educational project should be enforced by preservation of local values and resources. In the same time, the success of a project depends on the recognition of collective interest and public consensus on development objectives. Ackermann (2011) used Bronfenbrenners’ concept of learning ecology to define a framework for the design of ecological educational setting, reminding the 4 layers (circle of influences) including a temporal dimension: the microsystem (close area, surrounding), the mesosystem (close relationships, neighborhood), the exosystem (cultural value, customs) and the chronosystem (transition over the time).

5. Conclusions

5.1. Territory vulnerability

The importance of the territory and of its analyze transformation are direct connected to the landscape through environmental sensibility and design approach, consequence of the environmental dangers and limited resources like society continuous problems (Chiesa, 2012). Thus, the territory regeneration is an edited process of continuous landscape evolution, in its formal and semantic relations between natural and human elements. The disturbing factors of the continuous evolution which are necessary in the territory description are the risk facts (Florescu, 2006). A territorial vulnerability research in order to improve the resistance of the territory is in fact a deep knowledge of the possibilities of landscape and a useful contribution to a respectful development of the
ecosystem based on contextual sensitivity, especially in transitions and processes on the texture level of obsolescence and re-uses planning. A right analyzing of these changes should be put on the risk factors challenge and to mitigate worsening cumulative effect of climate change, environmental damage and the depletion of natural resources of the territory.

5.2. Adaptive approach, a new challenge for the new landscape perception

The intention is to search for less destructive approaches which are now part of the nation's environmental development, by turning to nature and authentic cultural values, in the presence of special objectives (Hârnănescu, 2012b) and quantified by using specific sets of indicators that address its evolution (related to forecast and foresight processes described above). New landscape problematic can be approached and quantified by using industry-specific sets of indicators that address its evolution (related to forecast and foresight processes described above), this paper proposes a scheme of integration of these indicators and their ranking in terms of relevance to induced dynamic of landscape. Environment and landscape development are closely linked; the second one may be positive or negative consequences in relation to recovery and management activities. Management and sustainability of landscape in territory require to understand the impact of external environmental effects and to control socio-economic, development and use of media and also to maintain the quality indicators of landscape resources and spatial development markets. Also, dynamic approach of landscape and recent criticism to classical planning system have led to differentiation of the formulation of strategies and implementation tools by introducing forecasts based on environmental qualitative not only development quantitative indicators.

Studying environmental perception in education planning, architecture, landscape, territory, however, is based both on own theories and models and also others borrowing from related disciplines because the true territory for innovation in urban planning and is not a result of platonic solids, but rather in the design of operational strategies that deals with the multiply and overlapping forces of a highly complex and entirely uncertain “collective form” (Fumihiko 1964)
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