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1. Landscape architect’s drawings and the landscape through time

1.1 A perfect imperfect landscape

Let us start with a drawing for Højstrup Parken, Odense by the Danish landscape architect C. Th. Sørensen, designed and built between 1948 and 1954. [1] [2] [Fig. 1.1; 1.2] It is the main plan drawing, 1:400, signed by Sørensen, but undated. Drawn by hand with fine black ink lines, it shows Sørensen’s design for the public space between a series of apartment blocks. Height lines reveal that this neighbourhood was built on a gentle slope. On the upper left of the drawing we see a detail of the construction of the hard surface. Close to the housing both graphically and with the word buske, hedges appear on the plan. The main part of the plan appears to be an open space of grass and large trees. Drawing conventions tell us to read such a plan as representing the projected situation, and to understand that the drawing indicates adult trees. The word træer on the street side indeed stands for tree. This drawing, however, shows the initial situation, consisting of 32 beds of oak whips. Sørensen described it in his 1975 Haver. Tanker og arbejder [Gardens. Thoughts and works], but it is also indicated by the word plantnings, Danish for plant beds, in the centre of the drawing. Sørensen described it in his 1975 Haver. Tanker og arbejder [Gardens. Thoughts and works], but it is also indicated by the word plantnings, Danish for plant beds, in the centre of the drawing. It is known that Sørensen often consciously started with small trees or even with acorns. [3] He was convinced that the necessary process of thinning over the years would result in the most beautiful and healthy oaks. In the case of Højstrup Parken, this realization process including the thinning is not documented in drawings or texts, as was done in other cases. [4] Here, Sørensen relied on the client’s gardener.

Højstrup Parken is a part of the city’s post-war extensions of Odense, Denmark. Now 60 years old, we find the park more or less as imagined. Today, Højstrup Parken for most people is probably barely recognisable as a piece of landscape architecture, but that

Fig. 1.1 Højstrup Parken seen from above in 1973.

[1] Following the list of projects in Andersson and Høyer (163) design and execution are dated as 1948-1952.

[2] For this piece of research I was kindly supported by Sonja Poll, daughter of C. Th. Sørensen; Thomas Norskov Kristensen, city archive of Arhus; Palle Løkke, historian at Arhus University; Frans Borgman Hansen, C. F. Møller Architects; Claus M. Smith, Samlingen af Arkitekturtegninger, National Art Library; Anders Busse Nielsen and Ellen Braae, Copenhagen University. See also Andersson and Høyer 2001: 160-163.


[4] In the archives, for several projects written notes and drawings can be found that address the later actions to be done. The role of the gardener in this was also mentioned by Sonja Poll, who worked for years in the office of her father, starting in 1953. (Interview from June 2012).
Fig. 1.2 Plan drawing for Højstrup Parken by C. Th. Sørensen, undated, design 1948-1952.
wouldn’t have bothered Sørensen. He appreciated plain design. Robust ingredients like oaks and grass, common to the Danish landscape, are recurrent motifs in his work. [5] Sørensen envisioned a _lund_, a grove of oaks on a meadow. [6] In order to one day reach this matured grove, hundreds of oak whips in round beds were planted - 20 to 30 per bed. These beds had to be thinned out over the following decades. An aerial photograph of 1973 shows us what the area looked like, almost 20 years after planting. The round beds are clearly visible. [7] [See Fig. 1.1] At that time each bed contained 5 to 8 trees. The idea of circular beds was going to be lost shortly after this, which was exactly what Sørensen wanted. [Fig. 1.3] The extensive planting of the beds with young trees was a solution for the early years, giving the trees the chance to grow well. Ultimately, the circles were of no importance for the design and in the end only 32 large trees should remain. [8]

It is a radical solution: It is a transformation from one design for the first few years, towards a very different one, which we encounter today. And yet they must be understood as one and the same design. Sørensen suggested 32 trees as the end goal, but his biographers interpret it as an on-going process - a ‘beautiful, slow play’: ‘The trees grow. The thinning out will continue. One day there will only be a few, enormous trees left. Like the oak tree in Thomas Havning’s drawing, the one that hung over Sørensen’s bed. By then 400 to 500 years will have passed.’ [9] Even if the approach could be seen as radical, Sørensen himself, with a background in nursery gardening, considered this common practice. He took a rather pragmatic stance towards the project. Revisiting Højstrup Parken in 1975 he counted some 5 trees per circle. [10] That was far away from the end goal of one tree per circle, but he was quite satisfied, and observed that it might even be better than the original idea of leaving only 32 trees. [11] Of some 800 oak whips planted initially in Højstrup Parken, the large majority was taken out, the latest ones being mature themselves. Today we find 29 trees, which is 3 less than the 32 oaks as envisioned by Sørensen, raising challenging questions about the park’s management. [12] Perhaps in the end the biographers are right, assuming that in the far future only a few enormous trees will remain. [Fig. 1.4]
Fig. 1.4 Højstrup Parken in 2012.
To begin with a drawing underlines the observation that motivated this research: the complex relation between a landscape on paper and a landscape in reality as a consequence of time at work. To understand landscape, and more particularly designed landscape and its drawings, time is crucial. One of the most obvious manifestations of time in landscape is the growth of trees, in this case oak. [Fig. 1.5] Even if the growth of a tree is a matter of course, in the context of landscape architecture this fact forces us to notice that the ideation and the realisation of landscape via design drawings are not as unambiguous as one would think. Højstrup Parken did mature and is well documented. It illustrates a profound ambiguity in landscape architecture: drawings are both essential and limited in their operational capacity towards the complex character of landscape. It is through the imperfectness that the example of Højstrup Parken is instructive. It reveals how we ascribe values to the controlled space of ideas on paper while, referring to Donald Schönb, the reality of the landscape evolving in time is messy. That is what comes under scrutiny in this research. [13]

1.2 A complex relation and a problem of today
Drawing, time and landscape architecture are the key words here. The complex relation between a drawing and the realized landscape over time is by no means a problem that is specific to Sørensen’s work. It is a problem that concerns today’s landscape architecture practice just as much, and perhaps even more so. The capacity of landscape architecture to deal with time in its drawings is under scrutiny. This means to set out on a walk in areas that were so far, at least from the perspective of landscape architecture, only incidentally explored. However, if we broaden the scope towards disciplines such as architecture, cartography or graphic design, we find theoretical starting points for studying the drawing as a medium, and investigating ways in which time becomes manifest in both drawing and writing. For landscape architecture, there is a gap in the literature on the topic of time being present in drawings. To bridge that gap, drawing(s), time and landscape architecture should be connected. Is it, in abstract terms, possible to evoke aspects of time in drawings? And are there other ways of displaying aspects of time in landscape architecture drawings, so far not developed, by expanding on ideas as found in literature, applying techniques as used in adjacent disciplines, or creating autonomous inventions?

Fig. 1.5 Arhus University in 2012. View from the north with amphitheatre.

Fig. 1.6ab  Two photographs from the Rijsterborghpark in Deventer. Situation in 1890, a few years after completion, and in 2010.
Studies of drawings in landscape architecture and more specifically the aspect of time in such drawings are rare, but recent literature confirms the need to expand on this topic. One of the most recent publications on the topic is *Drawing and Reinventing Landscape* by Diana Balmori (2014). Connecting representation to landscape architecture and time, Balmori delivers a concise summary of the problem. As she puts it, ‘it is curious that for a discipline in which everything is in constant change, there is so little in landscape representation that reflects time’. [14] ‘Constant change’ must be understood as one of the manifestations of time at work. A few years earlier, in 2009, Cesar Torres wrote an article in the Australian landscape architecture magazine *Kerb*. The title ‘Crisis in Landscape Representation’ leaves little to the imagination. Torres took the 1992 essay ‘Representation and Landscape’ by James Corner as his point of departure; an essential piece that will be referred to many times in the research at hand. In this essay Corner contributes to the theory on representation in landscape architecture, and as he considers the aspect of time crucial for landscape, this essay is fundamental to any study on the area of landscape architecture, time and representation. Torres in his article observes a growth of ‘flexible operations that address fluidity, non-linearity, open-endedness and indeterminacy’. In terms of representation, this asks that ‘the in-between and the unexpected’ are taken into account. [15] Corner declared the need for this in 1992, but, as Torres puts it, ‘few responses to Corner’s call have been advanced within the landscape discourse’, implicitly asking to finally do so. Corner’s essay barely speaks about professional practice. He approaches the topic in theoretical terms. It is exactly for that reason that his essay is fundamental. Lived landscape is a rich phenomenon, and in Corner’s eyes it is unique in three aspects: its spatiality, its temporality, and its materiality. We have to understand temporality as one of the many words addressing time, and thus time in Corner’s essay is seen as one of the three unique qualities of landscape. He links this to representation: these three unique qualities ‘evade reproduction in other art forms and pose the greatest difficulty for landscape architectural drawing’. [16] Thus, Corner too poses the representation of time in landscape architecture drawing as a problem, and we can observe an increase in attention paid to this issue in the period 1992-2014. As both practitioner and researcher, I posit that the issue of ‘drawing time’ in landscape architecture deserves our attention. It is both a timeless and a timely issue. Timeless, as it explores the position of drawing in landscape architecture in the context of the centuries-long development of architectural drawing, revealing a gap in the disciplinary theory when it comes to the role of time. And timely, as it seems to fit perfectly in the current development of the discipline, in which aspects of time are of growing importance.

1.3 Where landscape architecture, time and representation meet

‘Nature shall join you; time shall make it grow’, wrote Alexander Pope in the fourth of his *Moral Essays* (1731). [17] This deceivingly simple line puts forward a crucial idea on the nature of landscape and landscape architecture. Any design by a landscape architect will be helped by the forces of nature, and in due time even the smallest twig will mature to a robust tree. But it must also be understood the other way around: To arrive at the desired mature landscape we have to wait, and we cannot do it without the forces

---

Fig. 1.7a-c Plan, visualization, and photograph of the new estate De Wilddobbe in Grolloo, Drenthe. Evaluating the realization together with the owner. Designed 2008, completed 2009. Design by Strootman Landschapsarchitecten, Amsterdam.
Fig. 1.8 Drawing by Buys & Van der Vliet, 1977, to compare a two-year-old tree and one of five years old, to answer a client's question.

Fig. 1.9 Working drawing by Hubert de Boer for the entrance to De Schohorst, Lelystad, 1979.
of nature. ‘Time shall make it grow’ is illustrated by two photos of the same park. [Fig. 1.6ab] The first was taken some years after the construction, and the other quite recently. It is the latter that shows the park as a park generally is expected to perform, but it is the first photo that depicts the reality of any young park. How do drawings, or landscape architectural design in general, deal with this? Tim Ingold, in an essay titled ‘The temporality of landscape’, takes a tree in a Brueghel painting to discuss aspects of time: ‘At one extreme, represented by the solid trunk, it presides immobile over the passage of human generations; at the other, represented by the frondescent shoots, it resonates with the life-cycles of insects, the seasonal migrations of birds, and the regular round of human agricultural activities.’ [18] Even if relating to a much broader context than that landscape architecture drawing, this points to a crucial aspect that is at stake in this research: How to represent the aspect of time in drawings? And are we capable of reading and understanding time in drawings, or in landscape itself? To what extent we are aware of processes of growth is in an ironic way commented on in the Asterix and Obelix comic book Le Domaine des Dieux. [19] The druid provides Asterix with enchanted acorns. Once thrown in earth, a mature oak materializes immediately. The baffled Asterix cannot believe his eyes; Obelix however, is not impressed. It is an oak as every oak, and why would he know how quickly an oak grows?

**Thinking about landscape architecture and time**
When it comes to the role of time in landscape architecture, in different periods in the past we find very relevant sources, such as gardening handbooks from the 17th century onwards. The 1683 *The Scots Gardn’r* by John Reid is a rich example. This handbook speaks in an implicit but instructive way about time, presenting an approach towards landscape in which processes of growth and change are carefully addressed. [20] Mark Laird, studying the role of flowers and shrubs in *The Flowering of the Landscape Garden. English Pleasure Grounds 1720-1800* reveals that time, here understood as the presence of seasons, became to be appreciated explicitly in this period. Authors, such as Clemens Wimmer in an overview of writings on gardening, confirm that an interest in aspects of time certainly was not continuously present. [21] Treatises from Dezaillier d’Argenville, in French, 1709, or Hirschfeld, in German, 1782, put forward aspects of time as very relevant, and new. [22] Departing from the idea that a beautiful garden should follow the principles as found in nature, several aspects of time become important for design, leading Hirschfeld to spend paragraphs on gardens ‘according to the seasons’ and gardens ‘according to the times of the day’. On one hand he recommends enhancing the strengths of these specific moments in time, on the other hand ‘to alleviate the discomforts’, referring to harsh midday conditions. [23] We can trace the evolution of such ideas in literature to reveal that in some periods they were very present, and in other periods they are less present, or even suppressed.

**Representation and time**
As soon as a drawing is made, it represents a frozen moment in time, and most often that moment is unspecified. A design by the Dutch office of Strootman can be taken as an example. This office designed a new estate in the northern province of Drente. [Fig. 1.7a-c] We see a plan drawing, a visualization of the same

---

[18] Ingold 1993: 168. The mentioned painting is *De oogstena* [*The harvesters*], 1565, by Pieter Breughel de Oude.
[20] See for example Reid 1683, further discussed in Chapter 3.
Fig. 1.10 Typical working drawing in art installation 1/20/1 by Tom Frantzen. Photograph, De Overslag, Eindhoven, 1998.
plan, as is standardly done today (or, in this case, in 2011), and a photograph a year after the design was realized. The photograph is interesting in more ways than one, as the drawing is part of the photographed scene. Plan drawing and visualization ‘promise’ what we expect from a lush estate. The photo shows the reality, and it will obviously take quite some time to arrive at what we generally consider a ‘finished’ estate landscape. Different fields of expertise have contributed to the development of landscape architecture over time. Drawing experience from cartographers, engineers and painters influenced landscape architectural representation, but it is mainly architecture that shaped a tradition of drawing. In architecture, however, the relation between a drawing and that what is built is more direct and unambiguous, even if in architecture time obviously also plays its part. Perhaps because of this amalgam of traditions we are today confronted with an unsolved tension. Landscape grows and changes. That very specificity of landscape is not anticipated in the adopted system of representation. Landscape architect Bob van der Vliet felt it necessary to inform architects that a tree as projected and as planted differs from its later mature state. [24] That may seem evident, but the seeming simplicity of the drawing is deceiving. If we look at this rather ordinary drawing by landscape architect Hubert de Boer, showing an arrangement of trees, do we know what year it is for? [Fig. 1.9] Generally, such a question is not asked, and most certainly it is not answered by the drawing itself. But the question is relevant. We could read this drawing as being very explicit on the aspect of time. We see trees of a certain dimension. Does that imply they are planted at that size? If so, what size will they reach in due time? Or does it mean that young trees are planted (the dot in the middle) and that they are expected to reach a mature state (the circle) in some years? Certainly, this one drawing is part of a project, and in that context there may be no doubt about what the drawing communicates. But is that indeed the case? In the architectural tradition this drawing is a plan. As a type of representation, the plan presupposes certain conventions that facilitate its reading without additional explanation. ‘Notational systems’, as Goodman calls them, function if their reading is not hindered by ambiguity. [25] Drawings are the intermediaries between a landscape architectural design and the making of a landscape. Different types of drawings, such as plans, sections, and visualizations are made to test ideas in the early stages of design, to communicate the ripened proposals and to prepare for construction. Both the words drawing and representation are often used in this context. In practice, these meanings are rather close, and they often overlap. Neil Levine understands representations rather straightforwardly as ‘the two- and three-dimensional means employed by architects to convey their ideas on paper, in models, or in digital form’. [26] In philosophical terms however, the word representation is rather complex, implying that an image stands for something else. In terms of (landscape) architecture it is even more complex; in this domain drawings stand for something not yet there. In an art project, architect Tom Frantzen played beautifully with the philosophical difficulty of representation and reality. Frantzen drew a 1:1-drawing of a stairs and mounted that drawing on the existing stairs. [Fig. 1.10] The effect was striking: Most visitors did not dare to take the stairs! The relation between drawings and reality in that sense is not only difficult in technical terms, but also in rhetoric - implicitly or explicitly the artist takes a stance on this.


Fig. 1.11  Lawrence Halprin, Score for the Seminary South shopping center fountain, Forth Worth, 1961.
Time, representation and landscape

One of the first instances in which an interest in both the issues of time and representation is laid down in writings, is the work of Humphry Repton (1752-1818). [27] In his so-called Red Books he addresses issues of time in relation to the realisation of new designs, and the representation of time. He introduced ‘slides’ that show the situation before and after the intervention. Even if that may sound very basic for our current understanding, it was not done before, and therefore revolutionary - in his writings he also reflects on this drawing experiment. It can be considered a first attempt at defining a landscape architectural approach in which aspects of time are central, and at establishing a specific landscape architectural tradition of representation - in text and images. Capturing Music. The Story of Notation by Thomas Forrest Kelly describes how musicians in the Middle Ages figured out how to notate music on parchment. Kelly qualifies this as ‘an extraordinary conceptual leap’. [28] It meant music could be recorded, but also played back and conceptualized. One of the less obvious aspects of the progress in this domain is the ability to make and to print books, so that notations could be disseminated. However, the crucial aspect is the graphical ‘invention’ of a system that indeed captures music, and an agreement on how to understand such a notation. A section or a plan in architecture works similarly: It is founded on an agreement on how to understand the notation. When it comes to the aspect of time, landscape architecture still struggles with an effective notation. So far, it is not a generally accepted part of the representation of landscape. What then is the precise role of drawings in conceptualizing and making landscape? An important but isolated example that strictly focuses on the representation of time is given by the American landscape architect Lawrence Halprin (1916-2009). He explicitly addressed the issue of time and representation in his 1969 The RSVP Cycles. Creative Processes in the Human Environment. Inspired by his wife Ann Halprin, a choreographer, Halprin started to test the use of scores in landscape architectural representation. [29] [Fig. 1.11] Such a drawing type until then did not exist in landscape architecture. Halprin’s fascination with scores questions the system of types of representation: When it concerns the representation of time, does the system of plan, section, perspective come up to the mark? The assumption in this research is that the system does not, today, but that the system can be modified to do so.

Towards a landscape architecture tradition?

Due to its strong tie to the architectural tradition, gardening and landscape architecture were affected by the intellectual development of architecture and the arts, especially at the start of the twentieth century. From an art historical point of view Sigfried Giedion in Space, time & architecture marks the start of the twentieth century as a turning point, as Cubism broke with the tradition of Renaissance perspective. ‘Thus’, as Giedion puts it, ‘to the three dimensions of the Renaissance which have held good as constituent facts throughout so many centuries, there is added a fourth one – time.’ [30] Indeed Cubism, and Futurism even more so, engaged in ways in which to depict movement, as for example Giacomo Balla did in a painting titled Dynamism of a Dog on a Leash from 1912. [31] This evolution suggests a strong support for a landscape perspective on the issue of time in drawings. At the same time however, Giedion’s remark refers to the upcoming Modernism époque. How exactly landscape architecture relates to

[27] See Loudon 1840. The writings of Repton will be discussed in Chapter 3.
Fig. 1.12 The Biological Clock. Research project by Studio 1:1 in collaboration with DS, 2013.
Modernism is a debate in itself, but given that Modernism strived for pure and abstract form and that time in landscape implies uncertain, unpredictable and uncontrollable forces, the consideration of time was certainly not an obvious aspect in drawings of that period. In *Modern landscape architecture: A critical review* Marc Treib quotes the American landscape architect James Rose, who expressed this ambiguous feeling in an ironic statement: ‘A tree is a tree, and always will be a tree; therefore we can have no modern landscape design’. [32] Being the dominant frame for decades, the relation between the practice of landscape architecture and the issue of time became more complex. Especially when it comes to the representation of time, a standstill can be noted. But Modernism lost terrain, and that made way for several important publications that speak about issues of time in relation to landscape architecture. In 1972, Kevin Lynch with *What time is this place* went to the heart of the matter. One year later, a Dutch contribution was given by Louis le Roy in *Natuur uitschakelen. Natuur inschakelen* [Switch off nature. Switch on nature]. Time is essential in the approach of Le Roy: ‘It is precisely the factor of time that plays such an important role’. [33] The work of Le Roy fits in the expansion of theories in the field of ecology, a development very influential for landscape architecture. Alan Ruff in *Holland and the ecological landscapes* (1979) studied how this thinking affected Dutch design of cities and landscapes. In a recent dissertation on the development of ‘Naturgärten’ Anja Löbbecke traced how this ‘new ecology’, as she puts it, via several contributions, such as Ian McHarg’s *Design with Nature*, influenced garden and landscape design. [34] The perfect example in which this becomes manifest is the so-called *Plan Ooievaar* from 1985. [35] The influence of new ecological theories in landscape architecture materialize in this strategic plan, which, by means of its interventions, aims to invite the black stork to settle again in the Rhine valley. The drawings are not explicit on the issue of time, but, as happens more often, the combination with text is essential to convey ideas on how the plan should develop over time, and an interest in the growth process itself is encouraged - the dynamics of landscape are no longer a means but a goal in itself. The plan opened a door, and now this door is open, both thinking about and representing time seem to have found steady ground.

**Intervening in the landscape**

Introducing huge areas such as time, representation and landscape, this research risks being extremely broad. It could fit in what Umberto Eco refers to as ‘brief notes on the universe’. [36] But this is not a general study of time, or drawing, or landscape. Here, by examining these three aspects in the context of the making of landscape architecture designs the understanding of these aspects is restricted. Barbara Bender, working from an archaeological perspective, gives a beautiful example of a restricted understanding of landscape. She makes a strong link between landscape and time: ‘Landscape is time materialized. Or, better, landscape is time materializing: landscapes, like time, never stand still.’ [37] Bender bridges manifestations of time in landscape ranging from geology to anthropology, moving from the ‘granite landscape’ that speaks of evolutionary time to the ceremonial time of the church bell. In itself, however, landscape is taken into account in its broadest range when it comes to landscape architecture. John Dixon Hunt, in *Greater Perfections*, proposes a deceivingly simple definition for landscape architecture: ‘I would provisionally define

[33] Le Roy 1973: Italics in Dutch text by Le Roy: ‘Het is juist de factor tijd, die een belangrijke rol speelt’.
[34] See Löbbecke 2014.
[35] Plan Ooievaar was the winning entry of the 1985 Eo Wijers Foundation Nederland Rivierenland competition.
[36] Eco 1977: 14
Fig. 1.13 The office of karres + brands, Hilversum, 2015.
landscape architecture as exterior place-making; at that simplest level, place-making is to landscape architecture what building is to architecture.’ [38] Historically, the discipline struggled with its origins, with gardening being one, and in contrast the making of large-scale landscapes being the other, as reflected in the often-used collocation ‘garden- and landscape architecture’. In this research, both the garden and the large scale are essential. Both the Dutch polder and the private garden fall within this understanding of landscape architecture. In between these poles, we find common categories such as parks, squares and cemeteries but also the less common river dike, industrial zone, urban extension, and parking lot. Such categories are understood here as the physical outcome of a design; however, landscape architecture equally concerns studies that explore options and, especially in the Netherlands, such studies may investigate the distant future of extremely large landscapes. These instances all contain an element of time in the design process, its realisation and its further development. How have drawings help to manage this, or how have designers addressed this without help of drawings?

In this research, the words drawing and representation will be used many times, and often they stand for the same thing. I already mentioned Neil Levine, who spoke about representation as referring to the two- and three-dimensional means employed by architects to convey their ideas on paper, in models or in digital form. [39] The addition ‘on paper, in models or in digital form’ is often what confuses a conversation on drawing. The word drawing as used in common speech is related to something done by hand, on paper. In the context of this research it is best understood in a more abstract way. Lipstadt suggests that drawings by architects differ from other drawings in the sense that they are operative in the production of architecture. [40] It is against that background that the word drawing also includes models, mock-ups, installations, two-dimensional or three-dimensional works, on paper or digital, as long as they are produced to imagine, disseminate and build landscapes. Such drawings are by definition representations: they project something that is not there yet; they are a stand-in for the imagined landscape.

In Big Book of Time, the phenomenon of time is introduced to children by paraphrasing Augustine: I know what time is, but if one asks me, I don’t know what to say. [41] As a consequence of this tension between the evident and the unexplainable, the notion of time in relation to landscape is a catchall term embracing words such as change, growth, movement, dynamics, and process. One could demur that this is a rather imprecise way of speaking about time, but that is exactly what is observed here. The works of landscape architects refer to or speak about time in a very implicit way, and in rather diverse modes. The aim is not to frame landscape architecture within a well-defined perspective on time, but to collect thoughts, drawings and designs that express certain manifestations of time. Time, then, covers the growth of plants and trees, the use of public space over the seasons and the years, the development of forests, the realisation of urban extensions and other large landscape works over the decades, and strategic designerly thinking about the future of landscapes. [Fig. 1.12]

Landscape architecture could be understood as the (academic) discipline studying landscape and the design of landscape. Here, the focus is on landscape architecture as a professional practice.

[38] Hunt 2000: 1
[39] See Levine 2009. Ironically, Levine proposes this as one of the possible definitions of representation, followed by the comment that he will not use the word in that sense.
[40] Lipstadt in Blau and Kaufman 1989: 110. Lipstadt speaks about the concept of figuration, ‘according to which the psycho-social conditions governing the production of the object are used to differentiate representations by architects from other representations of architecture’.
[41] See Edmonds Wat is tijd? 1995 or Big Book of Time 1994. For Confessions see Augustine ca. 420/1995, translated by Outler: ‘For what is time? Who can easily and briefly explain it? Who can even comprehend it in thought or put the answer into words? Yet is it not true that in conversation we refer to nothing more familiarly or knowingly than time?’
Fig. 1.14 Working drawing for Mow Job as sent by fax. Design for SAIL 2000 on Nauerna dump. Paula Meijerink and Noël van Dooren, 2000.
The aspect of time and its presence in drawings is questioned against the background of professional practice and its culture, condensed in the office. Being a seemingly evident phenomenon, the office is crucial if we question representation, and especially if we are interested in its innovation. The office stands for a perspective on landscape architecture as a professional practice. [Fig. 1.13] Professional practice also is a cultural concept that changed over time. It implies an outer world of presentations, talks, neat drawings, expectations, names and fame. It also includes an inner world of sketches, ideas, workshops, in-between products, thrown-away drawings and files to be sent to the graphic designer. [Fig. 1.14] Landscape today is made in a complex environment of clients, users, society, public authorities, and designers. In such environments, landscape architects execute projects, starting with an assignment and ending in a final product. Even if that sounds obvious, this creates specific conditions for the making and reading of drawings. One of such conditions is that a drawing is generally part of a larger set of drawings and accompanied by text, as a service to the client and the public. In that sense this research takes an art historical approach. A section, as an example, is studied within the tradition of section drawing, more than as a part of a project for a park or a square. It is the office that became the dominant organizational unit in Dutch landscape architecture since around 1985. Dutch practice also is part of a larger international scene, but, at the same time, is known for its specific tradition. A remarkable aspect of Dutch practice is its surprising evolution in the years around 1985. It is because of this evolution that the research primarily focuses on contemporary Dutch practice.

1.4 About Time

In *About Time. Narrative, Fiction and the Philosophy of Time* Mark Currie, a professor of contemporary literature, plays with the double meaning of his title, distinguishing between tales that are about time, and tales of time: ‘Time is a universal feature of narrative, but it is the topic of only a few.’ [42] Rephrased: Time is a universal feature of landscape, but in landscape architectural drawings it is the topic of only a few. This dissertation is in the double sense ‘about time’. Historically, the garden and the park were the realms of landscape architectural design. Later engagement in city extensions and rural transformation changed the field of operation. In recent decades the field expanded even more. New challenges arose, such as transformation of former industrial sites, new approaches for food and energy production, or the changing climate. These new challenges require an intense engagement with issues of time. This is not exactly news: Dutch landscape architecture has been moving towards such an interpretation of the discipline for three decades already, and the more recent phenomenon of *landscape urbanism*, preceded by Corner’s essay ‘Representation and Landscape’, points in the same direction. [43] Yet, with regard to these challenges the representation of time must be taken into account, both in practical and in theoretical terms, and landscape architecture is behind when it comes to that. This research aims to fill in that gap. Such an undertaking will strongly contribute to the theory of landscape architecture in general and more specifically, it will contribute to the theory on representation in landscape architecture. Alongside that, it certainly enriches the debate on the future of landscape architecture, as it is believed here that a more explicit presence of aspects of time would strengthen the profile of landscape architecture as a discipline. As an undertaking, this


[43] Corner 1992; see Waldheim 2006 on landscape urbanism.
Fig. 15a-e Five growth stages of designed forest. Series of photographs of sprouting cress seeds. Annelies Bloemendaal, Academy of Architecture Amsterdam 2011.
research seems timely. The economic crisis we experienced in recent years not only delayed many initiatives already on course, but also stressed the need for flexibility in time. More than that, expectations with regard to sustainability seem to put a growing weight on the performance of landscape over time. If this is true, should we not see this appearing in landscape architecture thinking and in its drawings too? For such reasons, this study is relevant for researchers reflecting on landscape architecture, but also certainly for practitioners concerning their daily work. This is not to suggest that only a relatively small audience is addressed. Landscape architecture is a modest discipline, in numbers. As a discourse, however, the argument relates to much wider circles. Both the issues of drawing and of time are important for architecture and urbanism. Questions of how to represent time have been studied in the arts, in cartography, and in information design. This has influenced this study, and vice versa this study adds to the body of thinking in these areas.

Conversations with students
Perhaps the most important motive to pursue this study is to be found in my conversations with students. [44] Through these conversations I learned that already today students consciously choose to represent time in innovative ways. Consider this representation of the growth of a forest with help of sprouting cress seeds. [Fig. 1.15a-e] Over time, the drawing (indeed, I consider it a drawing) acquires a third dimension, until the small plants die. In the end, the dry remains again act as a two-dimensional drawing. It is therefore a rich example: the drawing not only represents change, but changes in itself. A second example shows how an unfinished and now decaying building complex could become landscape again, if the eroding powers of climate and nature are helped a bit. A triptych of drawings represents the argument. [Fig. 1.16a-c] The hand drawing throws light on the specific building parts where cracks enable seeds to sprout, on removed glass plates that allow water to come in and on small corners where animals find hiding places. This drawing rests on a firm awareness of the processes going on over time. The third example, a watercolour drawing in three parts, shows the initial state as an ordered pattern, and the evolution of that pattern to a rather spontaneous state. [Fig. 1.17] The different stages are presented as equal in their importance: There is not one intended final stage. Both in terms of theory of representation and theory of landscape design, that is an important statement. These three examples seem to underline that it is, in abstract terms, possible to display aspects of time in landscape architecture drawings. They are, however, isolated examples. They are coincidences, merely revealing the lack of a theoretical framework and the need for a collection of best practice in our time.

Aims and questions
Drawing is not only a means to communicate design ideas to the outer world, it also helps to explore, to generate and to test these ideas in design processes. The awareness of issues of time in landscape, the exploration of these issues while drawing (as a verb) and the communication of these issues to a larger audience via drawings (as a noun) is of vital importance for the discipline of landscape architecture, and hence the education of landscape architects should respond to this. The context of this research,

[44] I refer to my roles as tutor (since 2001) and as head of department (2004-2009) at the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture.
Fig. 1.16a–c  Second Nature. Making landscape out of a modern ruin. Situation after five years without intervention and with intervention, and explanatory drawing of processes at work. Final work, Hannah Schubert, Academy of Architecture Amsterdam 2014.
Fig. 1.17 *Green Warriors.* Drawing for a temporary public garden at three points in time. Marijne Beenhakker, Academy of Architecture Amsterdam 2010.
therefore, is professional practice, or more concrete, the landscape architecture office, and educational programs training new professionals. The aim of this research is to contribute to a coherent body of theory that supports the representation of time. An overview of thinking and writing in the last two centuries and an evaluation of current drawing practice will help to construct a tentative theory. A range of design experiments in which drawings are produced will show how such a theory could be applied in practice.

Two sets of questions guide this research. One set addresses landscape architecture in general: What exactly is the role of time in landscape architectural design, what is the nature of drawings in landscape architecture, and can aspects of time be conveyed via such drawings? The other set relates to today’s practice: Are aspects of time present in drawing in today’s landscape architecture practice, and in what way? And if they are not, then why not?

Structure of the argument
Chapter 2 elaborates on the methodological aspects of this research. Chapter 3 reports on the body of literature used to construct the argument, in three perspectives: ‘Time, Landscape and Intervention’, ‘Drawing, Drawings and the Design Process’ and ‘Profession, Practice and Project’. These titles deliberately state that the large issues of time, landscape and representation are not addressed individually, but in their mutual relationship. Linking these three issues, substantial in themselves, with words such as intervention, design process and project positions the argument within the field of the design disciplines and more particularly landscape architecture. Chapter 4 presents the data as derived from collected drawings and interviews. It also shows how this data informed ‘design experiments’ in which theory and practice expand towards a new understanding of representing time. Chapter 5 positions this in a wider perspective. A series of different lenses or frames enable us to understand the significance of individual drawings for the argument that is built up here, and to understand drawings as materialised thinking on the main topics time, representation and landscape design. In the concluding Chapter 6 our current position in time is addressed as meaningful, the outcome of this research is summarized and an overview of the many challenging questions it leaves open is given.