European Planning Studies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ceps20>

Landscape as a Medium for Integration in Design Practice: The Case of Flanders, Belgium

Sylvie Van Damme ^a, Hans Leinfelder ^b & Pieter Uyttenhove ^c

^a School of Arts, University College Ghent, Ghent, Belgium

^b Spatial Planning Department, Flemish Government, Brussels, Belgium

^c Department of Architecture and Urban Planning, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

Published online: 26 Sep 2012.

To cite this article: Sylvie Van Damme, Hans Leinfelder & Pieter Uyttenhove (2013) Landscape as a Medium for Integration in Design Practice: The Case of Flanders, Belgium, *European Planning Studies*, 21:8, 1128-1152, DOI: [10.1080/09654313.2012.722938](https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722938)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722938>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms &

Landscape as a Medium for Integration in Design Practice: The Case of Flanders, Belgium

SYLVIE VAN DAMME*, HANS LEINFELDER** & PIETER UYTENHOVE†

*School of Arts, University College Ghent, Ghent, Belgium, **Spatial Planning Department, Flemish Government, Brussels, Belgium, †Department of Architecture and Urban Planning, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

(Received March 2011; accepted November 2011)

ABSTRACT *The twenty-first century has seen a remarkable revival of interest in landscape by disciplines of spatial design, such as landscape architecture, urban design and architecture. Inspired by the principles of the European Landscape Convention (ELC), several authors have suggested extending the concept of landscape into a metaphor for inclusive multiplicity and pluralism in design and planning. However, the implementation of the ELC is rather complex as it deliberately contains no methodological or practical guidelines. In this paper, we explore whether or not the holistic approach towards landscape in the spirit of the ELC actually affects Flemish design in practice. To this end, we study interviewees' perspectives on the use of landscape in design and their experiences with it by means of a qualitative interpretive research design with multiple triangulation of data collection methods. First, we present the perspectives of the study on landscape as a medium to facilitate integration in design projects, by discussing four separate topics where this is the case. Second, we conceptualize the integration of landscape in spatial design as an expertise which can be obtained by spatial designers, regardless of their disciplinary background through awareness-raising, training and education.*

Introduction

Landscape is increasingly a focal point of a range of disciplines and a field of interest for many (Antrop, 2004; Corner, 1999; Selman, 2006; Tress & Tress, 2001; Waldheim, 2006a). This paper focuses on the interest in landscape by disciplines of spatial design. By design, we mean “the search for forms that satisfy a program” (Lynch & Hack, 1984, p. 127), assuming that spatial design refers to the creation and manipulation

Correspondence Address: Sylvie Van Damme, School of Arts, University College Ghent, Jozef Kluyskensstraat 2, Ghent 9000, Belgium.. Email: sylvie.vandamme@hogent.be

of three-dimensional forms (Lynch & Hack, 1984; Steenbergen & Reh, 1996; Swaffield, 2002c). It refers to the creative process of giving form to physical phenomena at every scale as well as to the final product in the form of a specific plan and its realization (Leinfelder *et al.*, 2008). In contrast to planning, it is not an administrative, legal or policy-making activity, although planning and design are in practice closely linked and work in tandem (Lyle, 1985). In this paper, we regard landscape architecture, urban design and architecture as disciplines of spatial design.

A Growing Interest in Landscape by Design Disciplines

In 1968, Hackett (in Laurie, 1975) stated that landscape is the medium in which landscape architects work and which makes the essential difference between landscape architecture and other design professions. Today, however, this way of thinking may be outdated. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, landscape—urban and rural, big and small—is a field of interest for different design disciplines (Corner, 1999; Marot, 1999; Schafer & Reeser, 2002).

Traditionally, landscape architecture as a design discipline reconciles a thorough understanding of the existing landscape and its constituent parts with a strong, forward-looking vision of the future landscape. The use of landscape as a source of information and inspiration for design is a point of view which is customary in landscape architecture, and landscape design methodologies are based on this belief (Lagro, 2001; Provost *et al.*, 2004; Marot, in Steenbergen & Reh, 1996). Several authors (Geerts, 2005; Laurie, 1975; Provost *et al.*, 2004; Sijmons, 2002) discuss how design projects in landscape architecture have gradually broadened from garden and park design to large-scale and public projects such as landscape plans for wetlands, concepts for infrastructure, rehabilitation of town centres or the design of urban and rural areas. At the same time, the projects of urban planning and architecture have expanded from the design of urban spaces to more “green” design objects, such as the development of old industrial sites, trails in nature reserves and public gardens (see Figure 1). During the past decade, the growing interest in landscape led to the emergence of landscape urbanism, as “a disciplinary realignment in which landscape supplants architecture’s historical role as the basic building block of urban design” (Waldheim, 2006b, p. 37). Adherents of the movement call for landscape as the model of contemporary urbanism (Corner, 2006) and urban, economic and social order (Waldheim, 2010) and see landscape as “a lens through which the contemporary city is represented and the medium through which it is constructed” (Waldheim, 2006a, p. 15). As for architecture, the renewed interest in landscape has been indicated by Birksted (in Birksted, 1999). He argues for “a graduated and gradual axis where one end represents architecture as landscape and the other end represents landscape as architecture with a range of continuous variations between the two” (pp. 3–4). This is also illustrated in the Spring 2010 issue of *Oase*, a bilingual (Dutch/English) journal featuring architecture, urban design and landscape design. This issue was dedicated entirely to the relationship between the territory and its (architectural) design. One of the contributions in the issue is an adapted and translated version (Gregotti, 2010) of Gregotti’s article “The form of the territory” of 1965, where he pled to widen the territory or scope of architecture beyond the matrix of the historical city.

Figure 1. The cross-breeding between landscape architecture, architecture and urban design. On the right side of the diagram, design objects are indicated from top to bottom ranging from rather green design objects at the top to the more “mineral” design objects. Landscape architecture has gradually broadened its focus from garden and park to various larger projects in rural, suburban and urban areas. Meanwhile, architecture and urban design have shifted their focus from buildings and cities to the same design objects.

Towards a New Approach of Landscape in Design

In most European countries, cross-breeding between urban design, architecture and landscape architecture is intense (Giro, 2004; Kapper & Chenoweth, 2000; Preece, 1991) and there is evidence that professional practice is becoming increasingly diverse (Swaffield, 2002a). The increasing complexity of spatial problems is the main argument to involve a broader spectrum of disciplines and expert knowledge in projects investigating and solving these problems (Tress *et al.*, 2005b). More and more, experts join forces in multi-disciplinary teams to cope with the growing complexity of design projects. Experience shows that fragmented sectoral policies and top-down approaches are not the answer to control today’s extremely complex spatial claims and fast evolutions. There is a growing body of opinion (Antrop, 2003, 2005; Buijs *et al.*, 2006; Descamps, 2000; Naveh, 2001; Naveh & Lieberman, 1994; Tress *et al.*, 2005a; Van Eetvelde & Antrop, 2009b) that integrated projects offer specific opportunities to converge divergent spatial demands in order to create a better spatial quality. In practice, it is becoming increasingly common for separate design disciplines to work together on the same projects.

Several authors (Corner, 1999; Kaplan, 2009; Selman, 2006; Weller, 2008) state that landscape has sometimes been treated in a fragmented fashion or as a “sectoral” interest, with the result that it has been perceived as only an accessory to physical planning and

design or as a resource to be extensively exploited by various cultural interventions. Nowadays, it seems that multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary cooperation and the exchange of knowledge, experience, values and concerns all lead to new insights into the landscape concept. Reflections on a new approach of landscape in planning have been made by Selman (2006), arguing for “planning at the landscape scale”. In his study on cultural landscapes, he discovered “surprisingly convergent views about the importance of landscape as an organising framework for analysis of and purposeful intervention in the process of land use change” (p. 5), through which policy can be delivered and actions can be integrated. Similar views have been put forward by the adherents of landscape urbanism (Corner, 1999; Weller, 2008) focusing on urban design and architecture. Corner (1999, pp. 1–2), for example, calls for attention to the “yet-to-be-disclosed potentials of landscape ideas and practice”. He suggests that, rather than “the passive pastoralism of previous landscape formations”, landscape might serve as “a metaphor for inclusive multiplicity and pluralism, as in a kind of synthetic ‘overview’ that enables differences to play themselves out”. He pleads for landscape’s full efficacy to be extended to that of a synthetic and strategic art form, one that aligns diverse and competing forces into newly liberating and interactive alliances. These recommendations are in line with the principles of the European Landscape Convention (ELC).

Landscape, Design and the European Landscape Convention

The ELC is the first international treaty to be exclusively concerned with all aspects of European landscape, facilitating European cooperation on matters regarding landscape. The convention was adopted on 20 October 2000 in Florence (Italy) and came into force on 1 March 2004 (Council of Europe Treaty Series No. 176). As it is open for signature by member states of the Council of Europe and for accession by the European Community and European non-member states, it has an important influence on the conceptualization of landscape throughout Europe. It defines landscape as “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors” (article 1). As such, the ELC “covers natural, rural, urban and peri-urban areas. It includes land, inland water and marine areas. It concerns landscapes that might be considered outstanding as well as everyday or degraded landscapes” (article 2). It also underlines that a landscape forms a whole, whose natural and cultural components are taken together, not separately (Council of Europe, 2000b). In the preamble (Council of Europe, 2000a), it is stressed that “the landscape is a key element of individual and social well-being and that its protection, management and planning entail rights and responsibilities for everyone”. It notes that landscape has an important public interest role in the cultural, ecological, environmental and social field, and that “landscape is not a question to be treated as a specialist field of public affairs” (Council of Europe, 2000b). The general and specific measures (Council of Europe, 2000a, 2000b, articles 5 and 6) mention the necessity to “systematically accommodate landscape into the country’s spatial and town-planning policies, its cultural, environmental, agricultural, social and economic policies, and any other policy sector, which may have direct or indirect impact on the landscape”. Hence landscape objectives should be taken into account in all relevant sectors of public life. This holistic approach (Sarlov-Herlin, 2004) towards landscape in the ELC undoubtedly offers interesting opportunities for spatial design disciplines. Moreover, the ELC reflects the idea that landscapes evolve through time, as a

result of being acted upon by natural forces and human beings (Council of Europe, 2000b). Although it does not give a separate definition of design, it is implicit in the definition of landscape planning, which is considered a “strong forward-looking action to enhance, restore or create landscapes” (article 1f). The Explanatory Report emphasizes that “in seeking the right balance between protection, management and planning of a landscape, the convention does not aim to preserve or ‘freeze’ the landscape at a particular point in its lengthy evolution” (Council of Europe, 2000b). It states that, as landscapes have always changed and will continue to change, the aim should be to manage future changes in a way that recognizes the great diversity and the quality of the landscapes that we inherit and that seeks to preserve, or even enhance, diversity and quality instead of allowing them to decline. Landscape planning in this respect is defined as “the formal process of study, design and construction by which new landscapes are created to meet the aspirations of the people concerned” (Council of Europe, 2000b).

From Theory to Practice

The implementation of the ELC is rather complex, because the definitions and suggested measures deliberately contain no indications for procedures and methods. Follow-up conferences and workshops are organized on a regular basis to discuss theoretical, methodological and practical guidelines for implementation. Furthermore, the Council of Europe Conference of Ministers Responsible for Spatial/Regional Planning (CEMAT) evaluates the implementation. In 2006, the European Network of Local and Regional Authorities for the Implementation of the ELC (RECEP-ENELC) was established to support the interested local and regional authorities in the scientific, technical, political and administrative aspects of their activities aimed at implementing the ELC’s principles within their territories. More recently, the networks Uniscape and Civiscape have been set up with similar aims. Member states and organizations also organize similar discussions at international, national and regional levels. However, these discussions and related research literature focus mainly on policy (e.g. Council of Europe, 2008; RECEP-ENELC, 2009; Roe *et al.*, 2008), and less on the consequences of the ambition of the ELC for spatial design practice (Van Damme & Antrop, 2010).

Holistic landscape conception is an important tradition in landscape research (Antrop, 2005; Naveh, 2000, 2001). According to Naveh (2000), holism refers to approaches of wholeness, connectedness and ordered complexity. As such, he refers to a paradigm shift “from parts to wholes”, from “dissection, fragmentation and analysis of wholes into smaller and smaller particles, towards integration, connectedness, synthesis and complementation” (p. 8), perceiving all parts in their full context. However, several authors report that there is an “applicability gap” between the development of theoretical models and their contribution to design practice. (Hohmann & Langhorst, 2005; Kapper & Chenoweth, 2000; Lagro, 1999; Lawson, 1980; Milburn & Brown, 2003; Milburn *et al.*, 2001). Hence, a contradiction might emerge between landscape “hailed” as a holistic planning tool and how the integration of landscape in spatial design operates in practice (Antonson, 2009; Macpherson, 2005). Likewise, Selman (2006) and Corner (1999) refer to the opportunities of landscape as “organising framework” or as a “metaphor for inclusive multiplicity and pluralism”, but they do not discuss its application in design practice.

The research aimed to assess if, and to what degree, landscape as an integrative concept affects design practice. First, the aim of this research was to explore whether spatial designers consider the integration of landscape to be valuable, irrespective of their background and the design project. Second, it sought to evaluate whether the approach of landscape in their design projects is actually integrative. This research aimed to establish if and how different categories of designers use landscape to connect “parts” in their designs or, in other words, if and how they use landscape as a medium to facilitate integration and synthesis in design projects.

This paper contributes to this exploration through the illustration of case study research in Flanders, Belgium. It presents interviewees’ perspectives on the use of landscape as a medium for integration in spatial design projects and their experiences with it. The following section lays out the choice for the case study of Flanders and the applied qualitative research methodology. The results of the research are then discussed and illustrated by means of excerpts from the interviews and secondary sources (SS). The discussion section considers the integration of landscape in spatial design in an evolving professional practice, and concludes with some general implications for future education and policy-making.

The Case of Flanders (Belgium)

Flanders, the northern part of Belgium, is one of the most densely populated regions in Europe. With 70% of the Flemish population residing in an urban–rural complex, it is a place of omnipresent network urbanity and fragmented multifunctional open spaces (Bomans *et al.*, 2010). The extreme urban–rural overlap and related multi-functionality make it a suitable model to research the use of landscape as a medium in the spirit of the ELC.

Landscape and Design in Flanders

The shift from a design practice predominantly focusing on private gardens and estates towards landscape did not progress at the same rate across Europe (Imbert, 2007a). This is one of the reasons why the integration of landscape in spatial design varies extensively, depending on the country (Sijmons, 2002). In Flanders, the development of landscape architecture as a professional practice made rather slow progress compared with the strong tradition in garden and park architecture. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, internationally renowned professionals like René Latinne, Jules Buyssens and René Péchère have developed strong practice in Belgian garden and park design, as a result of a local horticultural tradition. Today, Belgian garden and park design practice still flourishes, with names like the Wirtz family and Erik Dhondt embodying its international success. Imbert (2007a, 2007b) describes how international congresses and organizations in the twentieth century reflect the discussions about the identity of landscape architecture’s emergent professional body, its prerogatives regarding associated professions and its academic standing. In Belgium, these discussions were dominated by the “old guard of garden architects” (Imbert, 2007a, p. 15), such as Buyssens and Péchère, who represented an “attachment to horticulture and design as a decorative art”, often displayed by abundant floral arrangements (Imbert, 2007a, p. 9). An exception to this traditional movement was Jean Canneel-Claes. Influenced by Louis Van der

Swaelmen and his studies in garden art, urbanism and architecture at the Decorative Arts Institute of La Cambre, his design projects indicated a strong belief in the cause of modernism and architecture. According to Imbert (2007a), he represented the new practitioner, arguing for a design generalist who combines the skills of an architect and an urbanist and who is capable of shaping the environment from the scale of the garden to that of the city. However, this stance isolated him from “the old guard”, and his search for a modern theory and broader practice ultimately led him to seek international collaborators to further advance the cause of modernist landscape architecture. This debate was characteristic for the situation of Belgian landscape architecture in the first half of the twentieth century: while most of the European countries “leaped the garden fence” (Olwig, 2002), the private garden continued to serve as a ground for testing health and formal ideals in outdoor living in Belgium (Imbert, 2007a). As a result of this traditional preference for horticulture and garden and park design, the shift from private to public design objects, from garden to city planning, design of infrastructure and the cultural landscape advanced with difficulty. During this period, landscape architecture was strongly polarized, with a clear schism between the publicly present garden designer and the nearly absent landscape designer, who only played a limited role as a technical advisor in planning (Imbert, 2002).

This situation would last for decades. The building of infrastructure during the 1960s and 1970s, such as the construction of highways hardly took the landscape context into account (Jacobs, 1995) and the quality of public parks and gardens remained inadequate (Vandromme, 2005). The Belgian state reforms of the 1980s saw responsibility for spatial planning and policy devolved to regional governments. Consequently, the attention for landscape in design has developed differently throughout Flanders. Although research in landscape ecology had an established reputation in Flanders ever since the 1980s (Antrop, 2000) it did not have a strong relationship with creative three-dimensional design. Methods for landscape planning were defined (Allaert, 1979; Verhoeve & Antrop, 1980), but when applying these methods in practice, the emphasis was on the inventory and the assessment of landscape qualities in texts and maps. The objectives were mostly restricted to guidelines and recommendations for planning and spatial policy (e.g. Barbery, 1994; De Pelsmaeker *et al.*, 1988). Exceptions to this were the land consolidation plans, large-scale landscape plans for rural areas oriented towards agriculture, where inventory and assessment led to design and construction.

Traditionally, Flemish landscape research involved historical and regional geographers (Antrop, 2000) and evolved from regional geographical monographs to more applied research that focuses on the specific problems in each of the regions (Antrop, 2004). Gradually, more interdisciplinary studies involving geographers, historians, archaeologists, agronomists, foresters, ecologists and nature conservationists generalized landscape research and applications became oriented towards spatial and environmental planning (Antrop, 2004). Landscape typologies (Antrop, 1997; Van Eetvelde & Antrop, 2009a, 2009b) and assessments (Antrop, 2001; Hofkens & Roosens, 2001; Van de Genachte *et al.*, 2001; Van Eetvelde & Antrop, 2005) have been developed as a source of information for landscape management, spatial planning and heritage. There has been a growing interest for landscape protection and management in Flemish policy since 1995 (Van Damme & Antrop, 2010). Landscape research has contributed to the fact that landscape care is a point of attention in various recent policy documents on spatial planning, like the Spatial Structure Plans, and is taken into account in the elaboration of zoning plans

(Leinfelder, 2004). However, its relevance for spatial design is limited because of the large scale of the landscape typologies, the general focus on heritage and the absence of a vision on development (Leinfelder & Notteboom, 2006).

Since the beginning of 2000, there has been a remarkable recovery of landscape in Flemish theoretical reflection and education in spatial design. The policy document 2005–2010 of the Flemish Government Architect (Smets, 2006) designated landscape as a significant design challenge, and in the Research Report of the government institution responsible for heritage conservation, a separate chapter was devoted to landscape design (Leinfelder *et al.*, 2008). Research has been developed on landscape urbanism (De Meulder & Shannon, 2010), landscape development in degraded landscapes (Boonen & Peleman, 2004), recommendations have been formulated regarding research, policy-making and measures concerning heritage (Studiegroep Omgeving, 2004) and explorative research was conducted regarding urban fragmentation (Onderzoeksgroep Stedenbouw en Architectuur KUL, 2007). Some conferences have been devoted to the relationship between landscape and design and the number of publications regarding the subject is increasing. There is now specialized training in landscape development and landscape is also increasingly a focus in educational programmes in spatial planning, urban design, landscape architecture and architecture.

The number of design projects combining landscape and design has grown noticeably in recent years. Several government projects such as infrastructure, industrial estates, public spaces, nature development or recreational parks now choose to include landscape design. Smaller scale projects also show increased attention to landscape quality (Leinfelder & Notteboom, 2006). This growing attention is illustrated in the entry of landscape projects in the Flemish Yearbook of Urban Design and Spatial Planning (Borret *et al.*, 2006), the best practice books for the Day of the Public Space and the journal of the Flemish Organisation for Space and Planning.

In terms of design practice, Flanders is now making up the ground it lost in landscape design during the previous century. However, the number of large-scale projects is still small (Meirlaen, 2009; Antrop in Uyttenhove, 2006; Van Dooren, 2009) and the integration of landscape in design projects varies greatly, depending on the goodwill and the available expertise of the policy advisers and the designers involved (Van Damme & Antrop, 2010). Moreover, Flemish landscape architecture both as a profession and as a discipline is still struggling for full recognition. Indicative are the lack of a specialized Flemish master's degree in landscape architecture, the limited theoretical base of the profession (Geerts, 2005) and the lack of a powerful professional organization (Van Damme, 2011). In general, landscape design lacks the power to weigh on Flemish spatial policy and political decision-making and internationally it still has a rather restricted reputation (Pinte, 2006).

However, more and more parties are joining forces in multidisciplinary teams and cross-border partnerships to cope with the growing complexity of landscape design projects. Consequently, landscape architecture, architecture and urban design converge significantly, which is seen in the exchange of methods, concepts and design principles. This research wanted to find out if this convergence has actually led to the use of landscape as a medium for integration in design practice, regardless of the discipline. To this end, we study interviewees' perspectives on the use of landscape in design and their experiences with it by means of a qualitative interpretive research design with multiple triangulation of data collection methods.

A Qualitative Research Methodology

International academic reflection and research on landscape and design has been relatively immature and scarce (Sarlöv-Herlin, 2004; Sijmons, 2002; Turner, 1996), and is in Flanders almost non-existent. Qualitative research offers important advantages and possibilities regarding explorative research (Baarda *et al.*, 1996; Boeije, 2005; Patton, 2002; Van Ijzendoorn, 1989). Moreover, the ambition of the study was to capture a wide range of perspectives and vivid experiences with the integration of landscape in spatial design practice. It wanted to look for concepts and observations by various experts, preserving the richness and detail of their findings. Data collection and analysis procedures were designed in order to gain in-depth understanding, and embrace the context of the study so as to generate new ideas and concepts (Lamnek, 1989 in Buchecker *et al.*, 2003; Patton, 2002). Our qualitative research on landscape and design used a conventional interpretive research design with multiple triangulation of data collection methods (Mathison, 1988; Patton, 2002; Richards, 2005; Yin, 2003). In-depth interviews were taken from Flemish policy-makers, academics and practising designers who are familiar with the working field of landscape and design. These interviews were combined with SS, i.e. literature research and exploration of design practice in Flanders. This section describes the selection of the key informants (KIs) and the data-triangulation and analysis.

Selection of the KIs. The interviewees were KIs who are a rich source of information, or who are specifically enlightening in relation to the research questions (Patton, 2002). As experts, they are capable of making well-grounded judgements regarding the research subject. However, more than “regular” experts, KIs are able to provide more information and a deeper insight into what is going on around them, as a result of their personal skills or position in society (Marshall, 1996). According to Tremblay (in Burgess, 1989), being “natural observers”, they are interested in the behaviour of those around them. They observe the development of their culture and often speculate, or make inferences about both. All KIs are regarded as brilliant experts by those around them. Because of their extensive experience they have mostly acquired a certain status, which is commonly acknowledged in the field. They stand out for their clear vision, which they make explicit through the execution of a profession, the writing of articles or books, or the presentation of lectures. They are persons who are involved in policy-making regarding landscape and design, persons who teach or conduct research on the subject or persons who have a very distinct experience in landscape and design (see Figure 2). As indicated in Table 1, the interviewees have backgrounds in the field of spatial planning, architecture, garden architecture, landscape architecture, landscape science, ecology, urban design and heritage conservation.

Aiming for a profound understanding, the integration of landscape in spatial design in Flanders was approached from various angles. Therefore, the respondents were selected by means of conceptually driven sequential sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Four KIs were selected on the basis of literature research, a thorough exploration of the working field and discussions with persons involved. At the end of each interview, KIs were invited to suggest other KIs who could be approached to further the research. Their suggestions were ranked and evaluated. Progressive understanding of the research subject by means of the interviews led to the selection of additional KIs, who were similar or extremely different to the KIs previously selected. In this way, the final sample frame of 16

Figure 2. Selection of the KIs (situation at the moment of the in-depth interview). Academics: KIs engaged in education and/or research. Policy-makers: KIs who have an important influence on policy. Practising designers: KIs with active practical design experience.

interviewees was composed in the course of the data gathering (see Figure 2). The KIs were invited by phone or by e-mail to take part in the research. One of the suggested KIs declined to participate.

Data-triangulation. Triangulation is essential to enhance the quality and validity of qualitative research results (Patton, 2002; Richards, 2005). Data-triangulation (Denzin, 1970) involved in-depth expert interviews and SS, with the intention of discussing different aspects of the research questions.

It was assumed that the selected KIs possessed an important amount of tacit knowledge regarding the research subject. The transfer of this individual and contextual knowledge and experience, encompassing ideas, beliefs and opinions, is difficult. Semi-structured expert-interviews with open questions are suited to this aim. Allowing the interviewees to emphasize, specify and clarify their view on particular issues opens possibilities to reveal filtered or denied tacit knowledge (Ambrosini & Bowman, 2001). The KIs received an introductory letter with the research objectives, and a topic list with interview themes, offering them the opportunity to prepare for the interview. The use of an interview guide enabled the interviewer to frame the topics and keep participants on track. The interviews were conducted at locations convenient to the KIs, often at home or at their office. The interviews lasted between one-and-a-half and two-and-a-half hours. The semi-structured interviews started with questions to assess the training and experience of each respondent.

Table 1. Background of the KIs

KI No.	Background							
	Spatial planning	Landscape architecture	Heritage conservation	Ecology	Landscape science	Garden architecture	Architecture	Urban design
1		X						X
2			X		X			
3	X						X	X
4	X		X					X
5		X		X		X		
6	X			X	X			
7	X	X			X			
8		X				X		X
9			X		X			
10		X		X				X
11			X			X		
12		X	X					
13	X	X						
14							X	X
15	X						X	X
16		X	X			X		

Next, the interview focused on the way designers integrate landscape in their design projects. This was followed by questions relevant to the way landscape facilitates integration and synthesis in design projects. The informants were asked broad questions related to the topic areas and follow-up (probing) questions to encourage further detail. The interviewees were constantly urged to be as practical as possible by encouraging them to clarify and illustrate their ideas with tangible examples of projects. Each interview was tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The transcripts of the interviews were sent back to the interviewees for correction and approval.

SS refer to pre-existing documents useful in the scope of the research, but created—mostly by other people—without any specific intention regarding this research (Clifford & Valentine, 2003). In this study, two types of SS were involved. First, a broad literature research was supplemented with documents related to the research. Publications and policy documents written by the KIs, and publications about them were integrated in the research as much as possible. In addition, the experts themselves guided us to an important number of SS. They provided us with their lectures, presentations and internal working documents in order to make their ideas more clear. Furthermore, they referred to specific literature they found useful for or which helped to explain specific lines of thinking. These documents proved to be especially important so as to be able to put the KIs' statements into context during the interviews. Second, the exploration of design practice in Flanders was supplemented with various design projects, which according to the KIs were particularly interesting regarding the research subject. This proved to be very useful to clarify, exemplify and illustrate their ideas, aiming for a better understanding of their points of view.

Data analysis. The interview transcripts and the SS were researched by means of qualitative content analysis, i.e. systematic, theory-guided and rule-based analysis following rules of procedure, dividing the material into content analytical units (Mayring, 2003). In interpretive analysis, the goal is to generate a framework or structure for understanding data. Categories and subcategories for common themes, patterns and relationships were analysed. The data was coded by means of a successive process of open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Neuman, 2007). In the first step of the analysis, we screened the interviews and the SS line by line in order to identify notable statements concerning the use of landscape as a medium for integration in spatial design projects. Specific topics embedded in the data, following the research questions were categorized and carefully revised within the process of analysis. Words, categories and themes were not counted or quantified as the purpose of the qualitative analysis was to gain depth and breadth of meaning. Not only was the manifest content of the material important, but the latent content and formal aspects were also taken into consideration. The key feature of the analysis was the emphasis on understanding processes as they occur in their context. In order to achieve a comprehensive analysis of complex phenomena, research questions on “how” and “why” were better suited than “what” or “how much” (Hartley, 2004).

The entire analysis process was highly repetitious and reflective. Qualitative research requires the researcher to pay attention to the trustworthiness and internal validity of the study (Boeije, 2005; Nievaard in Maso & Smaling, 1990; 't Hart *et al.*, 2005). Procedures and techniques, as referred to by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Patton (2002), were included in the research design and analysis process to ensure the study's

credibility and internal validity. The researcher took extensive notes during the interviews and through data analysis, and verified the transcripts and basic interpretation by means of literature study and screening of Flemish landscape design practice. Data management and analysis were supported by the software programme QSR International's NVIVO 8-software, a computer programme for qualitative data analysis which allowed the vast amount of data to be processed and analysed more efficiently.

Results: Landscape as a Medium for Integration

The qualitative analysis of interviews and SS provided insights into how the landscape can facilitate integration and synthesis in design projects. The following quotes are representative of the emergent themes across the interviews with the KIs and the SS. They were chosen to demonstrate most of the interviewees' experiences across each particular theme.

Regardless of their background, all KIs stressed that an interest in landscape is important and that it is becoming more prevalent in Flemish design practice: "In my opinion, landscape is probably the most suitable way to frame today's projects". (KI3) However, they agree that the integration of landscape in Flemish design practice varies greatly, depending on the project. During the interviews, they gave various examples of so-called good and bad projects, referring to projects in which, in their opinion, landscape was either fully integrated or had not been integrated in an appropriate way. When we asked the KIs to clarify what distinguishes the "good" projects from the others, they suggest that in "good" projects, the local landscape serves as a kind of medium for spatial design in the project area: "A design that intrinsically takes into account landscape, the framework of integration is landscape" (KI7). They indicate that the integration of landscape in a design should "really" start "from the landscape", "from landscape concepts, landscape principles, landscape objectives". According to them, this kind of approach offers the possibility "to work in an integrated way and experiment, think and design almost free of assignments" (KI4).

When we asked the KIs to make suggestions for a kind of "best practice" translation, they stressed that this approach requires the attention for the landscape to be safeguarded in the design process, from the beginning of the project through its management and to the completion of the project. They talk about "opportunities", "respect", "landscape reflex", "connection with landscape reality" and "landscape quality" to indicate that the designers, as experts, have to conduct a personal and creative assessment to integrate landscape in their design in a qualitative way. For all of them, the surplus value of landscape for design lies in its synthesizing and integrating capacities to facilitate this translation. Their findings led us to distinguish four ways in which landscape can play a role as a medium for integration in design.

Structuring capacity of landscape. The structuring capacity of landscape refers to the added value landscape offers to spatial design because landscape structures can join and connect various elements in space and in a way set them in order:

In fact, it is the story of: what elements are in it, and where is the coherence between those elements, and as a designer to play with this in a manner of speaking ... to do something with it that generates a later logical time layer for which there are social needs. (KI2)

Some of the KIs argue for a more active application of the structuring potentials of the landscape concept. In their opinion, landscape development can “offer a way out of spatial fragmentation or ecological questions and the need for regional identity” (SS). Arguing for more spatial coherence and structure in Flanders, they suggest “Perhaps, we have to see landscape as the beginning, as something which gives structure instead of something that no longer has structure” (SS). According to them, successive, individual interventions rarely yield large structures. They argue for “interventions planned together in one direction”, as this “can give rise to an important part of landscape structure”. In contrast to the rather cautious approach of other KIs, this group of KIs decisively urges for a deliberate and active transformation of space, by means of landscape’s structuring capacities.

The KIs conceive landscape as the result of the interaction of multiple factors and actors concerning a particular place and refer to landscape as a “complex relational system” and the “expression of complex processes” (KI6). To this end, all KIs stressed the importance of analysis of the local landscape. According to one KI,

it starts with the ability to describe, to analyse the landscape. To look at the landscape with a spatial eye. And I am always convinced: if you design properly as a designer, then you use that context, always. If you didn’t do something with the landscape for a long time, then this was because in fact you couldn’t describe a landscape, you didn’t see things, etcetera. The moment you analyse it, it returns to your design. (KI15)

Their statements indicate that they all are aware of the basic principles of landscape ecology on landscape patterns and processes.

However, they have differing opinions about the extent of knowledge needed for landscape design. KIs with a background in landscape research argue that an in-depth knowledge is indispensable, because this is the only way it is possible to assess the potential values, in order to decide which of them will be fully integrated in the design. KIs who are more design-oriented qualify this and state that basic knowledge or even sometimes a feeling for the place can often be sufficient. According to them, there are more than enough sources of information on the local landscape identity, and designers have to select from this available information what they find useful for their designs. All KIs agree that full knowledge of the local landscape does not guarantee a qualitative landscape design. Specifically, they point to the often laborious translation of those aspects of the local landscape that deserve particular attention in a spatial design.

Landscape articulating mindscape. Landscape articulating mindscape refers to the potential of the landscape concept for design to introduce the mental or social construction for the identity of place:

High-quality landscape is landscape which we can identify with, which inspires us. Landscapes can express aspects of our personality and therefore initiate and facilitate a desired behaviour. This supposes an intensive dialogue between people and their surroundings, continuously bringing meaning and relevance to these surroundings. (KI1)

In this sense, the KIs seem particularly interested in the possibilities of the landscape concept towards the integration of more subjective values, such as multisensory perceptions, experiences, stories, memories, feelings and imagination. They relate aspects of recognition, familiarity and social involvement to the place lived in and experienced by inhabitants, users and other parties involved, to characteristic features of the territory and their interaction. “It has something to do with certain values which are socially acknowledged, but which aren’t directly part of one or another spatial plan. However, we want to incorporate, conserve, continue them, even though a place is organised for something” (KI6). More generally, the KIs indicate that “through a better landscape, they want to make sure that the place is also a place in someone’s mind” (KI4).

In this respect, the KIs draw specific attention to the visual and three-dimensional aspects of the landscape because of their effect on the use and the perception of a place:

I often regret the fact that spatial policy lacks the ability to envisage what a certain development will entail three-dimensionally, also in a landscape context in the end, what it will look like and what it means for the assessment of it. (KI13)

However, not all of the KIs ascribe three-dimensional aspects to landscape in itself, but regard it as inextricably linked to design: “So, I expect ... a good designer makes a designer-analysis. And visual-esthetical aspects are part of design” (KI15).

Landscape reconciling spatial claims. Landscape reconciling spatial claims refers to the broad approach of landscape bringing together a diversity of interests in order to obtain better spatial quality. According to one KI:

Landscapes are the expression of a lot of influences and the consciousness of people who have been working on it, who design it and still live or work there. This means you have to seek contact with a broad range of interests and opinions, facts and emotions. It requires continuous cooperation and attuning various interests. (KI1)

Although they admit that it is not an easy way, and a long-lasting and often expensive process (KI11), they argue for an open dialogue between the different spatial claims, instead of a confronting or isolated designer’s attitude with a separation of functions (KI1).

A lot of them stress the importance of landscape as a place which has “originated out of use” (KI11). According to these KIs, traditional planning and design talks too much about “function, not functioning properly, new function, functionality, multifunctionality ... and hardly ever about use, user-friendly, mixed-use, other use or improper use”. They mention that “far too often, functions are imposed top-down. This often causes problems, as the actual use afterwards is different, often expressed in inadequate maintenance”. According to this KI, there is “a kind of detachment of the social world of people and the social world of designers” (KI11). They assert that landscape has the possibility of bridging this detachment, by bringing up specific expectations regarding the organization of a place by the stakeholders. They therefore suggest leaving the commonly used sectoral approach, which imposes separate functions top-down. Instead of “looking to the landscape with a biological, ecological, agricultural perspective” (KI6), they recommend spatial design with an integrated view, starting from mixed use where one function supports another, with landscape as a reconciler of spatial claims. According to one KI, “people find the quality of

their surroundings increasingly important. This means that you can have more and more dialogue with them when the landscape is your starting point, and not a function you have to locate somewhere”. (KI4)

One of the KIs stated:

With landscape—with the scale of a landscape—you have to try to bring together agriculture ... a bicycle path and a cemetery ... You can't separate this from spatial characteristics and structure ... And if you succeed in experiencing that space in its entirety, that I can do something else than only be farmer or cycle within that churchyard or ... accidentally pick a daisy ... everything: at that moment that is an intelligent design, the next level, a surplus value. (KI6)

In summary, it may be stated that most of the KIs assert that landscape can play an important role in spatial design as a sort of neutral medium which enables a dialogue with local stakeholders across various sectoral claims. Remarkably, however, the KIs with a background in architecture and urban design hardly mention this approach.

Landscape crossing disciplinary boundaries. Landscape crossing disciplinary boundaries refers to the fact that working with several disciplines that understand a place, and have a philosophy, a statement, an idea about it is crucial and even indispensable for the integration of landscape in spatial design:

I think that working on a landscape is no longer possible unless you're working in a team of geographers, historians, botanists and of course a landscape designer. You have to gather so much knowledge and give feedback to all of the domains time and again. (KI4)

According to the key informants, landscape can be integrated in all kind of projects in Flemish design practice. Their examples range from rural to urban, from small to big and from public to private and include projects by architects, urban designers, landscape architects and multidisciplinary offices. When pursuing the matter, the KIs all agree that the integration of landscape in design projects can and should not be exclusively related to a particular discipline, training or professional background, and that it is not only a matter of theoretical knowledge:

So of course, there has to be someone who knows the ropes to design with landscape ingredients. That can be an architect or an urban designer who has trained himself a bit. Somebody that has grown into that direction. But there has to be somebody. (KI15)

They mention experimenting, skill, practice, “métier”, learning through experience to indicate that the application of acquired knowledge is essential and suggest this requires a specific combination of knowledge, skill and innate talents. One KI graphically expressed:

A physiotherapist does more than just rubbing a bit, you know. Integrating landscape in a design means more than just drawing some trees. You have to learn to know the

body, to follow anatomy, to know where the muscles are, how a skeleton is constructed. And only if you know that, you can become a good physiotherapist. So, if you don't know which muscle you're working on, I suppose it won't work. And above that to know who you are working on, with which person is a surplus value. And that is the same with landscape and design: you have to get it, you have to live it through. And you can't do that with a course of landscape planning, so ... (KI10)

All KI argue that project teams should represent both research and design, and that an intensive "intertwining" between both of them is needed. However, they point out that this is not always easy. They mention the "seemingly difficult reconciliation between the design paradigm and the analytical paradigm" (KI7) to indicate that designers and researchers often have difficulties in understanding each other, as a result of which cooperation is hampered. Other KIs refer to the difference in approach of researcher and designers:

Of course, you can do a survey as thoroughly as possible, but sterile, with which nothing is done. As a designer, you secretly already have design ideas during that survey. Sometimes even before that survey. So, you should do that survey from the viewpoint of design, your design hypothesis should determine your way of surveying. (KI15)

One of the KIs asserts that integrating landscape in design implies another way of thinking:

... either you are working on a disciplinary point of view, or you are using space as a framework. The big problem of the structuring of our education has to do with the fact that we divide everything according to disciplines, and that every science claims its own territory, its own legacy, wants its own journals and as a result in fact isolates itself from the others. If someone should say: no, the object we are working on is important, you should have a totally different accumulation. I am now making a case to work on the object. (KI3)

The other KIs agree with this and stress that cooperation by which each sector independently formulates problems, the way they should be solved and the final solution, is insufficient. According to them, the area to be designed should itself give rise to interdisciplinary cooperation from the beginning of the design process (KI6).

However, they assert that such an integrated approach is not simple, and that it requires intensive and continuous consultation and dialogue between the team members during the entire course of the process. One KI reports how discussions between landscape architects, architects, urban designers and planners are normal and even important in this regard: "Let there be discussion, let there be some disagreement!" (KI1). According to some of them, there should ideally be a person who is responsible for the control of the process from the beginning to the end to safeguard the integration of landscape:

So, it is more than throwing together a number of disciplines and letting each of them do their discipline and then join or integrate this. No, it is about... the

person who joins it should make something more out of it . . . the sum is more than the parts. . . the holism . . . (KI10)

Discussion: The Integration of Landscape in Spatial Design as an Expertise

At the beginning of the interviews, the interviewer and interviewees often used the term “landscape architecture” when referring to the integration of landscape in spatial design. However, sometimes the KIs interpreted “landscape architecture” in various ways. Some of the KIs associated landscape architecture with garden architecture, while others explicitly turned their back on this interpretation, stating that landscape architecture had nothing to do with this. Other KIs limited the range of landscape architecture to “green” projects. The different use of concepts caused resentment amongst some KIs, and gave way to oversimplified judgements about education or disciplines.

This has undoubtedly to some extent been prompted by the long-lasting dominance of garden and park design, the converging trajectories of other disciplines and the uncertain position of Flemish landscape architecture as a profession and as a discipline. Internationally, however, similar findings have been mentioned. Drake (2010, p. 51), for example, mentions that “even a century after the founding of the American Society of Landscape Architects the public often conflates landscape architecture with the work of gardeners and horticulturists”. Discussions about the name “landscape architecture” (Filor, 1994; Laurie, 1975; Thompson, 2000; Turner, 1990), its identity (Girof, 2004; Kaplan, 2009; Preece, 1991; Thompson, 2000; Swaffield, 2002a, 2002b) and its perceived value in society (Kapper & Chenoweth, 2000) have continuously characterized landscape architecture’s theory ever since its origin. Although they have never really quit the scene, these discussions recur today in the light of the growing interest in landscape by all kinds of spatial design disciplines. The concept of landscape urbanism has particularly caused discussion in the world of landscape architecture, focusing on differences or similarities between both disciplines and their identities (Andersson, 2010; De Meulder & Shannon, 2010; Drake, 2010; Palmboom, 2010).

The findings of this study shine new light on these discussions. They suggest that Flemish landscape architecture, urban design and architecture all look upon a landscape approach as a lever for upgrading integration in design projects. Hence, we suggest seeing the integration of landscape in spatial design as an expertise which can be obtained by spatial designers, regardless of their disciplinary background (see Figure 3). We understand expertise as being the combination of knowledge, skills, experience and talent that distinguishes a certain person or a group of persons on a certain field, and by which someone is acknowledged as an expert by the persons in this field. Although expertise can be fostered by a specialized training, this is not a precondition.

This view is in sync with the reality of convergence and multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary cooperation in integrated projects in spatial design practice. Moreover, it meets with the desire for cross-disciplinary attention for landscape in the spirit of the ELC. Considering the integration of landscape in spatial design as an expertise should not lead to the conflation or loss of individual design disciplines like landscape architecture, urban design and architecture. Precisely the differences between them and their stratification are essential in order to come to grips with today’s complex design tasks (Descamps, 2000; Palmboom, 2010). This acceptance and confrontation of divergent ways of thinking offers a specific and important surplus value for multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary cooperation.

Figure 3. Transdisciplinary approach of landscape design. The research findings suggest a shift from the traditional disciplinary point of view to a more integrated approach of the integration of landscape in design as an expertise, with the local landscape as a framework for integration.

The fact that all of the design disciplines involved make use of landscape in their designs should be seen as a benefit. During the study, considering the integration of landscape in spatial design as an area of expertise proved to have the important advantage that it was debated free of prejudice, and on a conceptual level across the various disciplines and educations. This resulted in more balanced judgements and constructive discussions.

However, the KIs also indicate that the integration of landscape in Flemish spatial design practice varies and largely depends on the goodwill and the expertise of the designers and policy-makers involved. This implies that the integrative approach described by the KIs is not necessarily taken into account in all spatial design projects. The statements of the KIs reveal that even in the projects where the integration of landscape is considered as “good”, the disciplinary background of the users and the context in and the purpose by which it is used to some extent affects their interpretation of the landscape concept. Several authors (Antrop, 2005; Cosgrove, 1998; Kuçan, 2007; Meinig, 1979; Selman, 2006; Sijmons, 2002) agree that the concept of landscape has complex and multiple meanings based on a construct of ideas. As such, the contributions to the concept of landscape by different disciplines is remarkable: each of these disciplines reads and tells landscape through its own tunnel vision of perception, value, tool and action, as each of them works in a specific context and with a particular background, their narrowness of knowledge, experience, values and concerns (Kaplan, 2009; Selman, 2006; Spirn, 1998; Tress & Tress, 2001). Hence, they all construct their own traditional applications and concepts of the term and thus reach new insight into landscapes alongside their professional practice.

The findings of the study suggest that landscape has indeed evolved from a sectoral or fragmented approach which considers only specific aspects of the landscape system such

as heritage or visual quality, into a medium which can integrate spatial dimensions with mindscape, varying spatial claims and various disciplines involved. For designers, this shifting interpretation of the landscape concept offers important advantages as it enables them to interpret the landscape concept freely and creatively depending on the specific design projects. However, the study findings suggest that, at the same time, this broad and shifting interpretation constitutes its weak point. Because the landscape concept is so open to interpretation, possible wrong use or even abuse is not inconceivable. Hence, we run the risk of landscape being used as an opportunistic alibi to legitimize design proposals.

The attention given to awareness-raising, training and education regarding landscape matters in the ELC (Council of Europe, 2000a, article 6) and in the guidelines for implementation of the ELC (Council of Europe, 2008) makes it likely that the Council of Europe expected shortcomings regarding the interpretation of the landscape concept. In particular, the Council encourages the development of specialized training courses “aimed at training designers, managers, engineers and technicians specialising in landscape protection, management and planning” or provided “for elected representatives, the technical staff of public authorities of all levels and sectors, professionals in the private and public sectors whose activities affect the landscape and the associations concerned” (II.2.3C). A lot still needs to be done in the training of designers regarding the landscape concept. Seemingly, they still “retreat to the ‘safety’ and familiarity of their own disciplines when faced with problems of extreme complexity” (Groffman & Likens, 1994 in Descamps, 2000). In addition, Antrop (2005) and Tress *et al.* (2005a) argue that the lack of a common language and a good communication can hinder integrated projects. Especially when pursuing more integration of landscape into other areas of policy—as the ELC advocates—and taking into account the reality of convergence and multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary cooperation in integrated projects in spatial design practice, it is likely that more cross-disciplinary discussion regarding the integration of landscape in design will be necessary (Jones, 1991 in Arler, 2000; Tress & Tress, 2001). Besides disciplinary knowledge regarding landscape research, integrated landscape design projects require additional expertise in the integration of landscape in spatial design. The findings in this research indicate that it is particularly important for designers and researchers to be attuned and communicate effectively with each other. An integrated approach requires designers to be open to the ideas of the researchers. On the other hand, researchers should be sufficiently compliant to adhere to the way of thinking of the designers. The “seemingly difficult reconciliation between the design paradigm and the analytical paradigm”, as mentioned in the research by one of the KIs has been described by several authors (Ahern, 2005; Hobbs, 1997; Nassauer & Corry, 2004; Opdam *et al.*, 2002) indicating that integration of landscape research and design is of crucial importance, though not simple. Therefore, it is essential that awareness-raising, training and education focus on creating harmony between users, clients, researchers and designers so as to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to integrate landscape as a holistic concept in design.

Conclusion

At present, 30 countries have ratified the ELC. Belgium signed the ELC in 2000, which came into force on 1 February 2005. The implementation of the Convention is a matter

of regional authority and therefore differs in Flanders, Wallonia and the Brussels Capital region. Various discussions deal with the way in which the ELC can be implemented theoretically, methodologically and practically. This research applies to these discussions. It aimed to explore the integration of landscape in spatial design practice in Flanders by means of a conventional qualitative interpretive research design with multiple triangulation of data collection methods.

In spatial design, the reputation of landscape is becoming increasingly established throughout several European countries, firmly rooted through institutions, education, organizations and legitimization. The results of this research indicate that a landscape approach also affects spatial design projects in Flanders. The KIs ascribe to the local landscape a key role in design as a medium for integration with a surplus value regarding four particular topics: its structuring capacities, its capacities as mindscape, its capacities as reconciler of spatial claims and its capacities to cross-disciplinary boundaries. Its use creates opportunities for more connectedness, synthesis and complementation in design projects. This approach matches the principles of the ELC and the views on the integration of landscape in planning and design by Selman (2006) and Corner (1999). Moreover, the inherent flexibility of the landscape concept offers important opportunities, as designers can use it in a creative and personal way in design projects. When applied properly, this might lead to an improvement of the quality of design projects, offering an added value regarding “traditional” design.

However, it is clear that to ensure the credibility of landscape design and to embed it in the modern professional field, Flanders needs more than a flourishing design practice. Its professionalism requires expertise in the use of landscape as a medium for integration in spatial design, likely fostered by cross-disciplinary awareness-raising, training and education.

References

- Ahern, J. (2005) Theories, methods and strategies for sustainable landscape planning, in: B. Tress, G. Tress, G. Fry & P. Opdam (Eds) *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, pp. 119–131 (Wageningen: Frontis).
- Allaert, G. (1979) *Planologische benadering van het landschap: methodologie en toepassing. Verhandeling voorgedragen tot het behalen van de graad van doctor in de stedenbouw, ruimtelijke ordening en ontwikkeling* (Gent: HISROO) (in Dutch).
- Ambrosini, V. & Bowman, C. (2001) Tacit knowledge: Some suggestions for operationalization, *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(6), pp. 811–829.
- Andersson, T. (2010) Landscape urbanism versus landscape design, *Topos*, 71, pp. 80–83.
- Antonson, H. (2009) Bridging the gap between research and planning practice concerning landscape in Swedish infrastructural planning, *Land Use Policy*, 26, pp. 169–177.
- Antrop, M. (1997) The concept of traditional landscapes as a base for landscape evaluation and planning: The example of Flanders Region, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 38(1–2), pp. 105–117.
- Antrop, M. (2000) Geography and landscape science, *Belgeo*, 1–2–3–4 (Special Issue), pp. 9–35.
- Antrop, M. (2001) De landschapsatlas: Methode, in: E. Hofkens & I. Roosens (Eds) *Nieuwe impulsen voor de landschapszorg. De landschapsatlas, baken voor een verruimd beleid*, pp. 21–43 (Brussels: Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap, Afdeling Monumenten en Landschappen) (in Dutch).
- Antrop, M. (2003) Continuity and change in landscapes, in: Ü. Mander & M. Antrop (Eds) *Multifunctional Landscapes, Vol. 3: Continuity and Change*, pp. 1–14 (Southampton: WIT Press).
- Antrop, M. (2004) Landscape change and the urbanization process in Europe, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 67(1–4), pp. 9–26.

- Antrop, M. (2005) From holistic landscape synthesis to transdisciplinary landscape management, in: B. Tress, G. Tress, G. Fry & P. Opdam (Eds) *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, pp. 27–50 (Wageningen: Frontis).
- Arler, F. (2000) Aspects of landscape or nature quality, *Landscape Ecology*, 15(3), pp. 291–302.
- Baarda, D. B. *et al.* (1996) *Basisboek Open Interviewen*, 165 pp. (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff) (in Dutch).
- Barbery, S. (1994) Bovengemeentelijke landschapsplanning, *Groenkontakt*, 20(5), pp. 21–25, (in Dutch).
- Birksted, J. (Ed.) (1999) *Relating Architecture to Landscape*, 294 pp. (London: E and FN Spon).
- Boeije, H. (2005) *Analysen in kwalitatief onderzoek—denken en doen*, 179 pp. (Amsterdam: Boom Onderwijs) (in Dutch).
- Bomans, K., Steenberghen, T., Dewaelheyns, V., Leinfelder, H. & Gulinck, H. (2010) Underrated transformations in the open space—the case of an urbanized and multifunctional area, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 94(3–4), pp. 196–205.
- Boonen, K. & Peleman, D. (2004) *Nieuwe landschappen in Vlaanderen: landschapsontwikkeling in Vlaanderen*, 47 pp. (Brussels: AROHM—Monumenten en landschappen) (in Dutch).
- Borret, K., Devoldere, S., Schreurs, J., Vanhaverbeke, F. & Wouters, E. (2006) *Jaarboek stedenbouw en ruimtelijke planning 2002–2005*, 166 pp. (Brugge: Die Keure) (in Dutch).
- Buchecker, M., Hunziker, M. & Kienast, F. (2003) Participatory landscape development: Overcoming social barriers to public involvement, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 64(1–2), pp. 29–46.
- Buijs, A. E., Pedrolí, B. & Luginbühl, Y. (2006) From hiking through farmland to farming in a leisure landscape: Changing social perceptions of the European landscape, *Landscape Ecology*, 21(3), pp. 375–389.
- Burgess, R. G. (1989) *Field Research: A Sourcebook and Manual*, 450 pp. (London New York: Routledge).
- Clifford, N. & Valentine, G. (2003) *Key Methods in Geography*, 572 pp. (London: Sage).
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, J. (2008) *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 379 pp. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Corner, J. (1999) Recovering landscape as a critical cultural practice, in: J. Corner (Ed.) *Recovering Landscape: Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture*, pp. 1–28 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press).
- Corner, J. (2006) Terra Fluxus, in: C. Waldheim (Ed.) *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*, pp. 21–33 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press).
- Cosgrove, D. (1998) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*, 332 pp. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Council of Europe (2000a) *European Landscape Convention* (Florence: Secretary General established by the General Directorate of Education, Culture, Sport and Youth, and Environment).
- Council of Europe (2000b) *European Landscape Convention—Explanatory Report* (Florence: Secretary General established by the General Directorate of Education, Culture, Sport and Youth, and Environment).
- Council of Europe (2008) Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)3 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the guidelines for the implementation of the European Landscape Convention, adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 6 February 2008 at the 1017th meeting of the Ministers' Deputies.
- De Meulder, B. & Shannon, K. (2010) Traditions of landscape urbanism, *Topos*, 71, pp. 69–73.
- Denzin, N. (1970) *The Research Act in Sociology: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, 368 pp. (London: Butterworths).
- De Pelsmaeker, M., Himpe, K., Verboven, J. & Waelput, D. (1988) Landschapsplanning over de vallei van de Driesbeek (Merelbeke-Oosterzele, Oost-Vlaanderen), in: Vereniging Voor Groenvoorziening, (Ed.) *Ruimte voor Groen, Vijfde Vlaams Wetenschappelijk Congres over Groenvoorziening—Deel II*, pp. 192–213 (Gent: Vereniging voor Groenvoorziening v.z.w.) (in Dutch).
- Déscamps, H. (2000) Demanding more of landscape research (and researchers), *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 47(3–4), pp. 105–109.
- Drake, S. (2010) Term—definition—identity—regenerating landscape architecture in the era of landscape urbanism, *Topos*, 71, pp. 50–57.
- Filor, S. W. (1994) The nature of landscape design and design process, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 30(3), pp. 121–129.
- Geerts, P. (2005) Tuin- en landschapsarchitectuur op een keerpunt, *Garden Style*, 27, pp. 50–53 (in Dutch).
- Giro, C. (2004) Entwicklungen der Landschaftsarchitektur in Europa, *Topos*, 49, pp. 40–48.
- Gregotti, V. (2010) De vorm van het territorium, translation of 'La forme du territoire' in L'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui, n° 218 of 1981, *Oase*, 80, pp. 7–22 (in Dutch).
- Hartley, J. (2004) Case studies in organizational research, in: C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds) *Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research, a Practical Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*, pp. 323–333 (London: Sage).

- Hobbs, R. (1997) Future landscapes and the future of landscape ecology, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 37(1), pp. 1–9.
- Hofkens, E. & Roosens, I. (2001) *Nieuwe impulsen voor de landschapszorg. De landschapsatlas, baken voor een verruimd beleid*, 192 pp. (Brussels: Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap, Afdeling Monumenten en Landschappen) (in Dutch).
- Hohmann, H. & Langhorst, J. (2005) Landscape architecture: A terminal case?, *Landscape Architecture*, 95(4), pp. 26–34.
- Imbert, D. (2002) Counting trees and flowers: The reconstructed landscapes of Belgium and France, in: M. Treib (Ed.) *The Architecture of Landscape 1940–1960*, pp. 82–119 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- Imbert, D. (2007a) Landscape architects of the world, unite! Professional organizations, practice, and politics—1935–1948, *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 2(1), pp. 6–19.
- Imbert, D. (2007b) The AIAJM: A manifesto for landscape modernity, *Landscape Journal*, 26(2), pp. 219–235.
- Jacobs, S. (1995) Landschap zonder plek. Pleidooi voor een landschapsarchitectuur in België, in: K. Vandermarliere (Ed.) *Het landschap: vier internationale landschapsontwerpers: Hargreaves associates, Desvigne and Dalnoky, West 8 landscape architects, Lapeña y Torres*, pp. 125–138 (Antwerpen: DeSingel) (in Dutch).
- Kaplan, A. (2009) Landscape architecture's commitment to landscape concept: A missing link?, *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 4(1), pp. 56–66.
- Kapper, T. & Chenoweth, R. (2000) Landscape architecture and societal values: Evidence from literature, *Landscape Journal*, 19(1–2), pp. 149–155.
- Kuçan, A. (2007) Constructing landscape conceptions, *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 2(1), pp. 30–41.
- Lagro, J. A. (1999) Research capacity: a matter of semantics?, *Landscape Journal*, 18(2), pp. 179–186.
- Lagro, J. A. (2001) *Site Analysis—Linking Program and Concept in Land Planning and Design*, 227 pp. (New York: John Wiley).
- Laurie, M. (1975) *An Introduction to Landscape Architecture*, 213 pp. (North Holland: Elsevier).
- Lawson, B. (1980) *How Designers Think*, 216 pp. (London: Architectural Press).
- Leinfelder, H. (2004) Verankering van erfgoed in het ruimtelijk beleid, *Ruimte en planning*, 24(2), pp. 13–32 (in Dutch).
- Leinfelder, H. & Notteboom, B. (2006) Landschapsbeleid in Vlaanderen: het lelijke eendje? in: K. Borret, S. Devoldere, J. Schreurs, F. Vanhaverbeke & E. Wouters (Eds) *Jaarboek stedenbouw en ruimtelijke planning 2002–2005*, pp. 34–36 (Brugge: Die Keure) (in Dutch).
- Leinfelder, H., Peleman, D., Van Damme, S., De Haan, A. & Heyn, M. (2008) Hoofdstuk 1.5: Landschapsontwerp, in: Vlaams Instituut voor Onroerend Erfgoed (Ed.), *Onderzoeksbalans Onroerend Erfgoed Vlaanderen, startversie* (Brussels: Vlaams Instituut voor Onroerend Erfgoed) (in Dutch). Available at www.onderzoeksbalans.be (accessed 17 February 2011).
- Lyle, J. T. (1985) *Design for Human Ecosystems*, 279 pp. (Washington, DC: Island Press).
- Lynch, K. & Hack, G. (1984) *Site Planning*, 499 pp. (Cambridge: MIT Press).
- Macpherson, H. (2005) Landscape's ocular-centrism—and beyond? in: B. Tress, G. Tress, G. Fry & P. Opdam (Eds) *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, pp. 95–104 (Wageningen: Frontis).
- Marot, S. (1999) The reclaiming of sites, in: J. Corner (Ed.) *Recovering Landscape: Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture*, pp. 171–186 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press).
- Marshall, M. (1996) The key informant technique, *Family Practice*, 13(1), pp. 92–97.
- Maso, I. & Smaling, A. (1990) *Objectiviteit in kwalitatief onderzoek*, 99 pp. (Meppel: Boom) (in Dutch).
- Mathison, S. (1988) Why triangulate?, *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), pp. 13–17.
- Mayring, P. (2003) *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse, Grundlagen und Techniken*, 8th ed., 135 pp. (Weinheim: Beltz).
- Meinig, D. (1979) *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, 255 pp. (New York: University Press).
- Meirlaen, L. A. (2009) Het Vlaams landschap roept om sterk ontwerp, *Ruimte*, 3, pp. 18–23 (in Dutch).
- Milburn, L.-A. S. & Brown, R. D. (2003) The relationship between research and design in landscape architecture, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 64(1–2), pp. 47–66.
- Milburn, L. A., Brown, R. D. & Paine, C. (2001) ... Research on research: Research attitudes and behaviors of landscape architecture faculty in North America, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 57(2), pp. 57–67.
- Miles, M. & Huberman, M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 337 pp. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Nassauer, J. I. & Corry, R. C. (2004) Using normative scenarios in landscape ecology, *Landscape Ecology*, 19(4), pp. 343–356.

- Naveh, Z. (2000) What is holistic landscape ecology? A conceptual introduction, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 50(1–3), pp. 7–26.
- Naveh, Z. (2001) Ten major premises for a holistic conception of multifunctional landscapes, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 57(3–4), pp. 269–284.
- Naveh, Z. & Lieberman, A. (1994) *Landscape Ecology: Theory and Application*, 360 pp. (New York: Springer).
- Neuman, W. L. (2007) *Basics of Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, 403 pp. (Boston, MA: Pearson Education).
- Onderzoeksgroep Stedenbouw en Architectuur (2007) *Het Vlaams Restgebied—ontdekking van het andere landschap*, 105 pp. (Leuven: KULeuven) (in Dutch).
- Olwig, K. (2002) *Landscape, Nature and the Body Politic: From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).
- Opdam, P., Foppen, R. & Vos, C. (2002) Bridging the gap between ecology and spatial planning in landscape ecology, *Landscape Ecology*, 16(8), pp. 767–779.
- Palmboom, F. (2010) Landscape urbanism: Conflation or coalition, *Topos*, 71, pp. 43–49.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, 700 pp. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Pinte, M. (2006) Is Vlaanderen het speelveld voor internationale landschapsarchitectuur geworden?, in: Belgische Vereniging van Tuinarchitecten en Landschapsarchitecten (Ed.) *Vademecum van de landschapsarchitectuur*, pp. 23–27 (Mechelen: Elma Multimedia) (in Dutch).
- Preece, R. A. (1991) *Designs on the Landscape*, 283 pp. (Exeter: SRP).
- Provost, A., Racine, M. & Baridon, M. (2004) *Paysages inventés/Invented Landscapes—Allain Provost, Paysagiste/Landscape Architect*, 287 pp. (Oostkamp: Stichting Kunstboek).
- RECEP-ENELC (2009) *The European Landscape Convention: A litmus test for the exercise of local and regional authorities' public responsibilities at national and international level*, 19 pp. (Florence: RECEP-ENELC).
- Richards, L. (2005) *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide*, 207 pp. (London: Sage).
- Roe, M., Jones, C. & Mell, I. (2008) *Research to Support the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention in England—Final Report—A Study for Natural England*, 267 pp. (Newcastle: Newcastle University).
- Sarlöv-Herlin, I. (2004) New challenges in the field of spatial planning: Landscapes, *Landscape Research*, 4, pp. 399–411.
- Schafer, A. & Reeser, A. (2002) Approaching Landscapes, *Praxis Journal of Writing and Building: Landscapes*, 4, pp. 4–5.
- Selman, P. (2006) *Planning at the Landscape Scale*, 213 pp. (London: Routledge).
- Sijmons, D. (2002) *Landkaartmos en andere beschouwingen over landschap*, 300 pp. (Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010) (in Dutch).
- Smets, M. (2006) *Beleidsnota Vlaams Bouwmeester 2005–2010: Pleidooi voor een dienstbare architectuur—Ruimtelijke kwaliteit voor een ambitieus maatschappelijk project*, 32 pp. (Brussels: Vlaams Bouwmeester) (in Dutch).
- Spirn, A.-W. (1998) *The Language of Landscape*, 334 pp. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Steenbergen, C. & Reh, W. (1996) *Architecture and Landscape*, 373 pp. (Bussum: Thoth).
- Studiegroep Omgeving (2004) *Aanbevelingen voor onderzoek—beleidsvisie en maatregelen omtrent onroerend erfgoed in het kader van de opmaak van gemeentelijke ruimtelijke structuurplannen voor stedelijke gebieden*, 107 pp. (Brussels: Vlaams Instituut voor Onroerend Erfgoed) (in Dutch).
- Swaffield, S. (2002a) The theoretical terrain of landscape architecture, in: S. Swaffield (Ed.) *Theory in Landscape Architecture: A Reader*, pp. 227–230 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- Swaffield, S. (2002b) Social change and the profession of landscape architecture in the twenty-first century, *Landscape Journal*, 21(1), pp. 183–189.
- Swaffield, S. (2002c) Introduction, in: S. Swaffield (Ed.) *Theory in Landscape Architecture: A Reader*, pp. 1–6 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- 't Hart, H., Boeije, H. & Hox, J. (2005) *Onderzoeksmethoden*, 384 pp. (Boom: Meppel) (in Dutch).
- Thompson, I. (2000) *Ecology, Community and Delight: Sources of Values in Landscape Architecture*, 201 pp. (London: E and FN Spon).
- Tress, B. & Tress, G. (2001) Capitalizing on multiplicity: A transdisciplinary systems approach to landscape research, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 57(3–4), pp. 143–157.
- Tress, G., Tress, B. & Fry, G. (2005a) Defining concepts and the process of knowledge production in integrative research, in: B. Tress, G. Tress, G. Fry & P. Opdam (Eds) *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, pp. 13–26 (Wageningen: Frontis).

- Tress, G., Tress, B., Fry, G. & Antrop, M. (2005b) Trends in landscape research and landscape planning: Implications for PhD students, in: B. Tress, G. Tress, G. Fry & P. Opdam (Eds) *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education and Application*, pp. 1–10 (Wageningen: Frontis).
- Turner, T. (1990) Was landscape architecture a good idea? *Landscape Design*, 191, pp. 28–29.
- Turner, T. (1996) *City as Landscape, a Post-Postmodern View of Design and Planning*, 248 pp. (Oxford: Alden Press).
- Uyttenhove, P. (Ed.) (2006) *Recollecting Landscapes: 1904–1980–2004 | Her-fotografie en transformatie*, 416 pp. (Ghent: A en S Books) (in Dutch).
- Van Damme, S. (2011) Landschapsontwerpers, verenigt u, in: G. Bouma, F. Filius, E. Vanempten & B. Waterhout (Eds) *Planning van de toekomst—bijdragen aan de Plandag 2011, Stichting Planologische Discussiedagen*, pp. 293–304 (Delft: Stichting Planologische Discussiedagen) (in Dutch).
- Van Damme, S. & Antrop, M. (2010) Expertise als sleutelfactor voor de integratie van landschap in ruimtelijk ontwerp in Vlaanderen—een onderzoek op basis van diepte-interviews met sleutelinformanten, *Ruimte en Maatschappij*, 2(1), pp. 23–51 (in Dutch).
- Van De Genachte, G., De Borgher, M., Leinfelder, H., Vloebergh, G., Tack, G. & Hofkens, E. (2001) De landschapsatlas – gebruiksmogelijkheden, in: E. Hofkens & I. Roosens (Eds) *Nieuwe impulsen voor de landschapszorg. De landschapsatlas, baken voor een verruimd beleid*, pp. 64–93 (Brussels: Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap, Afdeling Monumenten en Landschappen) (in Dutch).
- Van Dooren, N. (2009) Sprong naar het landschap: De (on)zekere opmars van het landschapsonderwerp in Vlaanderen, *Blauwe Kamer*, 5, pp. 40–47 (in Dutch).
- Vandromme, D. (2005) Kwaliteit, een trend?, *Groencontact*, 31(3), p. 44 (in Dutch).
- Van Eetvelde, V. & Antrop, M. (2005) The significance of landscape relic zones in relation to soil conditions, settlement pattern and territories in Flanders, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 70(1–2), pp. 127–141.
- Van Eetvelde, V. & Antrop, M. (2009a) A stepwise multi-scaled landscape typology and characterisation for trans-regional integration, applied on the federal state of Belgium, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 91(3), pp. 160–170.
- Van Eetvelde, V. & Antrop, M. (2009b) Indicators for assessing changing landscape character of cultural landscapes in Flanders (Belgium), *Land Use Policy*, 26(4), pp. 901–910.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. (1989) De navolgbaarheid van kwalitatief onderzoek: methodologische uitgangspunten, *Nederlands tijdschrift voor Opvoeding, Vorming en Onderwijs*, 5(2), pp. 97–106 (in Dutch).
- Verhoeve, A. & Antrop, M. (1980) Structuur en inhoud van een landschapsplan, in: Vereniging voor Groenvoorziening (Ed.) *Natuurbehoud en landschapszorg—derde Vlaams Wetenschappelijk Congres voor Groenvoorziening*, pp. 307–315 (Antwerpen: Universitaire Instelling Antwerpen) (in Dutch).
- Waldheim, C. (2006a) A reference manifesto, in: C. Waldheim (Ed.) *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*, pp. 13–19 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press).
- Waldheim, C. (2006b) Landscape as urbanism, in: C. Waldheim (Ed.) *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*, pp. 35–53 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press).
- Waldheim, C. (2010) On landscape, ecology and other modifiers to urbanism: Responses to the challenges of the contemporary metropolitan condition, *Topos*, 71, pp. 20–24.
- Weller, R. (2008) Landscape (sub)urbanism in theory and practice, *Landscape Journal*, 27(2), pp. 247–267.
- Yin, R. (2003) *Case Study Research—Design and Methods*, 181 pp. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).