Part 1 - Overview, background and context

This outcome statement summarizes the main findings of the 6th LE:NOTRE Institute Landscape Forum on ‘Inclusive Landscapes’. The ideas presented here may support local and regional stakeholders in shaping more inclusive landscape development processes. The forum outcome statement may also inspire democratic landscape transformation in other metropolitan areas in Europe and beyond.

The 6th LE:NOTRE Institute Landscape Forum took place from May 16th -20th 2017 in Freising and included the participation of 145 landscape architecture and spatial planning practitioners, educators, students and researchers from 27 countries. The forum focused on landscape and inclusion. The working hypothesis was that “Inclusive Landscapes” are accessible for everyone, offering space for collaborative, socially inclusive processes, participation and social cohesion, thus contributing to equity and environmental justice. Further, the planning and design concept “Inclusive Landscapes” incorporates the knowledge and needs of everyone, balances interests of different stakeholders, in particular those who are left out of the planning processes, the unheard.

This landscape forum exemplified the concept of “Inclusive Landscapes” with the region of Munich North. This landscape is highly multifunctional, hybrid in its identity, and driven by the presence of a system of highways and the location of an international airport. Very valuable natural and cultural elements are embedded in this landscape, but they are difficult to perceive and disconnected. As the region of Munich is expected to grow, additional demands for urban development areas are challenging both the city of Munich and its adjacent municipalities. The territorial focus of the forum’s observations was on the administrative districts of Munich, Freising and Dachau, which encompass a diversity of municipal planning authorities, coming together in one landscape.

The forum was guided by the question of what an inclusive approach to landscape development might be like, and what strategies could be employed to promote democratic landscape change. These ideas have been derived from the observed landscape and are, therefore, to some extent specific to the local context. However, much of this can be upcaled to other urban regions in Europe and beyond. The working groups reflected on the landscape of Munich North from four perspectives: rural fringe, heritage and identities, sustainable tourism and recreation, and urban sprawl and periurban growth. Two cross-cutting themes — landscape democracy and landscape perception— added a transversal perspective to the work of each individual thematic group.
Part 2 - The key messages

These principles govern the final outcome statement for the landscape of Munich North under the aspect of inclusion. An elaboration of these messages and their planning and policy contexts follows in part 3.

1. **Inclusive goals**: The landscape of Munich’s North should be conceived as an integrative platform for collective goal setting for sustainable development.

2. **Inclusive identities**: Bringing people together in the landscape will strengthen their sense of belonging and identity, allowing the past and present, rural and urban landscapes to become a meaningful part of their lives.

3. **Inclusive knowledge**: The landscape can only be fully understood through the lens of the experiences and feelings of those who inhabit it.

4. **Democratic commitment**: Through engagement and participation, those living in the landscape will develop a strong sense of ownership, stewardship, and long term resilience. The landscape will serve as a forum for democratic life, connecting us with the landscape and with each other.

5. **Inclusive urban green infrastructure**: To improve socially inclusive landscapes we propose urban green infrastructure (UGI) as a planning approach to connect landscapes and people, to enhance accessibility of urban green spaces and to promote environmental justice.

6. **Inclusive foodscapes**: The development of edible landscapes contributes to landscape quality, economic sustainability and well-being of the residents.

7. **Inclusive heritage**: Bringing historical elements and new structures into a re-framed narrative will deepen the landscape awareness for both residents and visitors.

8. **Inclusion and nature**: The values of our natural capital – water, soil, air, flora, fauna and the aesthetics of nature – need to be understood by everyone and become the foundation of a holistic landscape concept.

9. **A multifunctional region**: Multifunctionality helps the landscape become more resilient and adaptable to change and uncertainty. Planning the multifunctional, inclusive landscape of the future will require negotiating long term goals and priorities with regional partners.

10. **A long-term partnership for an inclusive landscape**: The ideas outlined here require a long-term process, and the trustful cooperation of regional and local actors operating well beyond the election periods. New processes of local governance should be initiated to allow locals to participate in shaping goals, visions and co-designed solutions.
Part 3 - Elaboration on the key messages

1. Inclusive goals: The landscape of Munich’s North should be conceived as an integrative platform for collective goal setting for sustainable development.

The landscape of Munich’s North is under pressure as constantly new spaces for housing, commerce, production and infrastructure need to be provided. This competes with spaces for agriculture, recreation, nature protection, heritage and identity. Even if the population growth rate is moderate compared to other metropolitan areas in the world, there is a need to accommodate the demands of an increasingly culturally and economically diverse society, of which the recently arrived refugees are only one of many groups. Municipalities are currently doing their best to solve these issues within their territorial scope. However, a landscape evolves its actual power only by linking potentials, structures and assets across administrative boundaries. Therefore, an inclusive landscape is in the first place a landscape that is perceived, recognized and valued by everyone who lives in it. The European Landscape Convention invites citizens and local governments to jointly formulate landscape quality objectives. “Landscape quality objectives are a way of shaping, in a reliable form and following a thorough process of public consultation and participation, the final goal which a society has set itself in terms of landscape improvement” (Catalan Landscape Observatory). We hope that actors in the North of Munich will start working jointly towards this aim. The challenge is to involve everyone equally in this process and to avoid a reconfirmation of opinion leaders which requires a careful process design. This approach does not exclude that some goals might be competing with each other. The deliberation of conflicting aims can become a necessary driver for change.

2. Inclusive identities: Bringing people together in the landscape will strengthen their sense of belonging and identity, allowing the past and present, rural and urban landscapes to become a meaningful part of their lives.

The landscape of Munich’s North has transformed rapidly from a rural environment shaped by agriculture, peatlands and hamlets and appreciated by hundreds of painters, into a peri-urban fabric of small villages and isolated public housing serving the metropolitan area. Locals with a long term relationship to the old villages and towns are no longer actively shaping the landscape as everyone is having a functionally urban life, even in a partly rural environment. New residents are constantly arriving from across Germany, Europe and beyond, lured by the job and success opportunities the region around Munich offers. Their relationship to this landscape is different because they did not see it changing. Their personal landscape biographies have started elsewhere. The new residents carry different expectations and patterns with them and need to link those to their new home, for example in the north of Munich. On top of that, the region needs to accommodate a substantial number of refugees who did not choose this place as their home, but somehow need to make sense of it now. Bringing people together in the landscape will link collective and individual landscape narratives to a new integrated identity. All of this will require inclusive methods for the co-creation of landscape knowledge, such as joint walks and events in the landscape. In doing so, the landscape in Munich’s North might also evolve its own identity which is distinct from the metropolitan centre.
3. **Inclusive knowledge**: The landscape can only be fully understood through the lens of the experiences and feelings of those who inhabit it.

More effort is needed to activate, translate, share and validate the landscape knowledge of local people, especially of groups that have historically been left out of landscape decision-making. A transdisciplinary approach is also called for on the part of knowledgeable stakeholders, who need to speak an inclusive language and use multiple methods to leverage tacit knowledge. There are tools that can help us reach out to residents. ICT-based approaches help in collectively mapping use and identity patterns. Other interactive approaches for knowledge creation include photovoice, workshops, walks, exhibitions and events in the landscapes as well as surveys and interviews. Good practice existing at the municipality level could be documented and shared with other communes located in the same landscape. All of this could come together on an interactive website bringing together the knowledge about the landscape of Munich North.

4. **Democratic commitment**: Through engagement and participation, locals will steward and plan their landscape in democratic ways, connect with the landscape and with each other.

Representative democracy reaches its limits when it comes to landscape-related decision-making affecting people’s everyday environment and identity. More deliberative and informal approaches are needed not only to reach consensus in the case of conflict but, most importantly, for setting common goals. Participation processes should be inclusive, focus on community, trust and partnership building. Furthermore, a participatory activity should not be judged by the number of participants, but by the quality of dialogue, the knowledge created, and the new partnerships made. More effort is needed to make sure that these processes reach out to those that have only little involvement in landscape-related decision making at present but will deal with our legacy in the future: the youth. Decision-makers are encouraged to use a methodical mix and also experimental forms of participation, with a focus on engagement with landscapes and related questions, in order to reach as many people as possible.

5. **Inclusive urban green infrastructure**: To improve socially inclusive landscapes we propose urban green infrastructure (UGI) as a planning approach to connect landscapes and people, to enhance accessibility of urban green spaces and to promote environmental justice.

In shaping the green infrastructure for future life, it is important to plan and design green spaces that benefit people’s health, natural resources, wildlife, and the economy; yet, also benefit social cohesion by providing places where people can meet and interact. Inclusive landscapes and urban design solutions are needed to implement these concepts in practice. Essential, therefore, is to expand knowledge on the interaction between people and their environment and the influence of the spatial configuration of spaces on people’s activities as well as to balance the interests of different stakeholders. It is a matter of justice to give everyone equal opportunities to benefit from the positive effects of green and open spaces on human health. In order to successfully implement urban green infrastructure for connecting spaces and people, potential trade-offs and synergies should be carefully assessed, setting priorities and favouring disadvantaged social groups.
6. **Inclusive foodscapes**: The development of edible landscapes contributes to landscape quality, economic sustainability and well-being of the residents.

Foodscapes are understood as all those areas that contribute to food production such as arable land and farms, orchards, allotments and vegetable gardens in combination with the social capital they build. Food and its production may help us connect and find shared interests across cultures. Elements of a local food system in Munich’s North exist, but they are fragmented and poorly accessible. Food production could be re-envisioned as a partnership between consumer associations, foundations guiding the overall goals and corporate partnership of farmers. This would provide opportunities for jobs for disadvantaged groups like migrants and refugees. The connection between people and food should be strengthened to attract children to spend time outdoors, rather than in front of a computer screen. The landscape should give people the opportunity to grow their own food for their physical and mental well-being. Multifunctional, inclusive and organic farms can help to protect and develop green corridors consisting of nature reserves, nature development zones and landscape development areas. Therefore, the foodscape of Munich’s North should be well connected to the networks of recreation and nature protection to trigger mutual benefits.

7. **Inclusive heritage**: Bringing historical elements and new structures into a re-framed narrative will deepen the landscape awareness for both residents and visitors.

We need to understand the past in order to envision the future. The landscape of Munich’s North is layered with heritage sites that are currently difficult to perceive. The natural foundation of peatland and gravel landscapes has been overwritten by an agricultural landscape, later painted by the Dachau school of artists in the 19th century. The baroque canals of the Schleißheim castle provide a green-blue heritage network linking the unique castle garden to its environments. The Olympic rowing regatta, a symbol of German history, is a landmark in the landscape. And Dachau reminds us not only of totalitarianism and crime, but also about the emancipation of artists in the 19th century and the emergence of alternative living styles, which we associate with the Dachau art colony. Inclusive heritage means that all layers of history are taken into account and woven together. Furthermore, the communities need to be involved in the definition of their sacred spaces since heritage is a living concept which is constantly evolving. The rich and multifaceted heritage of Munich’s North has the potential to become a guiding element for sustainable landscape development. A new communication format could for example be a ‘Dachau documenta’ in which contemporary and past artistic approaches come together.
8. **Inclusion and nature:** The values of our natural capital – water, soil, air, flora, fauna and the aesthetics of nature – need to be understood by everyone and become the foundation of a holistic landscape concept.

Continuous urbanisation and intensification of agriculture have greatly exploited the natural capital of Munich’s North. Every new settlement, every new road results in the loss of fertile soil that has developed over millennia to build up its capability for producing food. Landscape fragmentation caused by roads and settlements, as well as the loss of structuring elements along agricultural fields, and ongoing use of pesticides have caused immense damage to flora and fauna. Inclusive foodscapes might help in enhancing more organic farming. Linking those organic foodscapes to a wider green infrastructure network, which also includes nature protection areas, heritage sites and recreational areas, can result in a mutually reinforcing, diversified system offering great benefits to both people and nature. The restoration of the former peatlands should be considered not only with respect to biodiversity objectives but also because of their great potential for carbon storage which make them very effective in the context of climate change mitigation. It is important that everyone living in the landscape has the chance to learn about the value of our natural goods. There is also a need to involve people in nature protection activities which would also deepen their bonds to the landscape and to each other. Environmental education therefore needs to be inclusive and made available in various languages and educational formats.

9. **A multifunctional region:** Integrative processes can help to conceive and negotiate multifunctionality in a wider context.

Landscapes should serve different functions and uses, and provide a variety of experiences but at the same time they should not be overloaded. Other landscapes may be set aside for uses we can’t yet imagine. Therefore, it is important to conceive multifunctionality at a broader scale: which needs may be fulfilled by the landscapes surrounding our homes? Which qualities and functions are (easily) accessible in the neighbouring municipality and how can we link to those? Boundaries and limits should be designed to prevent exposing human beings to environmental risks. Their design should be flexible to adapt it to changing needs and culture.

10. **A long-term partnership for an inclusive landscape:** The ideas outlined here require a long-term process and trustful cooperation of regional and local actors beyond the range of election periods. The forum participants suggest a comprehensive regional process which could for example be triggered by a landscape-focused IBA (Internationale Bauaustellung), which would bring various stakeholders together for a certain period. This could ideally be linked to the new urban development area ‘Munich North’ around Feldmoching. An even more long-term perspective could be a ‘landscape park Munich North’, not in the sense of an overall designed park but as a well-connected, multifunctional system of sustainable mobility, foodscapes, nature conservation and heritage sites. An inclusive approach will allow the landscape of the region to be shaped and transformed through the engagement of its citizens, by initiating participatory processes that could help establish long term goals and help generate in residents a renewed sense of commitment and ownership of its destiny.
Background of the Landscape Forum and the LE:NOTRE Institute

The LE:NOTRE institute has been established under the auspices of ECLAS, the European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools, as an umbrella organisation for interdisciplinary collaboration between education, research and innovative practice in the landscape field.

The goal of the LE:NOTRE Institute is to develop and strengthen the links between landscape education, research and innovative practice, in the public, private and not for profit sectors.

It aims to achieve this by furthering and facilitating communication, collaboration and cross-fertilisation of ideas on an interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral basis, in order to promote the wider and deeper understanding of the cultural, environmental, social and economic role of the landscape for the benefit and well-being of society as a whole.

What makes the LE:NOTRE Landscape Forum different from other European landscape events is the focus on dialogue, debate and discourse. It provides a unique opportunity to interact creatively with colleagues from a range of landscape disciplines in informal workshop and field visit settings. The aim is to create stimulating environment to promote the generation of both new teaching ideas and projects, for research and for collaboration between theory and practice. To date, the forum has been organized six times: Antalya (2012), Rome (2013), Sarajevo (2014), Bucharest (2015), Pafos/Cyprus (2016), Freising (2017).

Landscape Forum Website: http://www.forum.ln-institute.org
LE:NOTRE Institute: http://www.le-notre.org
Outcome statement coordinating author: Ellen Fetzer
Contributors to the document: Stefanie Gruber, Werner Rolf, Deni Ruggeri, Richard Stiles, Maria Beatrice Andreucci, Stephan Pauleit, Martina van Lierop, Jeroen de Vries.

The outcome statement further includes ideas and comments collected from all forum participants via an online consultation.

For feedback on this document contact: office@ln-institute.org

Credits for images and sketches: Karl-Heinz Einberger, Ellen Fetzer, Stefanie Gruber, Werner Rolf, Ben Ter Mull, Jonas Württele, Jeroen de Vries, Maythe Garcia Velarde, Clara Garcia Mayor, Anna Szilágyi-Nagy.