Urban Evolution in regeneration Hybrids
Vegetation suggestive of a wild garden enhances the natural escape of the High Line. From Black-eyed Susans, a typical native wild flower, to Oriental Bittersweet, a foreign species from East Asia, there are about 310 species growing at the High Line. At no other site in New York it is possible to see such a variety of vegetation. This planting palette is made of species originally grown on the building site. Contrary to the concerns of horticulturists, wild plants still growing well in the gaps between the new concrete piers. It is a strange but pleasant experience, this panoply of wild flowers. The magic created from the combination of these various elements has made this simple linear park one of the most beloved sites in New York.

Apart from the enjoyment to be had at the High Line, it is also responsible for a redefinition of spatial and programmatic forces operating the city. Just ten years ago, the abandoned structure was an emblem of blight, an impediment to development. In the 1980s, Robert Hammond and Joshua David, two young men who did not have any background on design field or urban planning, became interested in preserving the structure and started an organization called Friends of the High Line. The Friends commissioned a study of the potential impact of the High Line’s development on a prominent real estate firm, HR & A Advisors. The study showed that the High Line could actually spur, rather than hinder development, and add an estimated $250 million in incremental tax benefits to the city over a 20-year period. One of the most effective moves by Friend was having a photo exhibition revealing the hidden green world that might be steel slabs. Visitors are disconnected from the urban story on the street and alienated from their daily routine. Patrons of the High Line become spectators looking at a play running on the streets of New York. While watching the flow of cars on 10th Avenue, or reading a book on the sun deck, the serenity that one might never have thought possible in the middle of Manhattan becomes a reality. In order to get back to the hustle and bustle of New York, one must exit this enchanted garden.

At the artificial garden of the High Line, one gains a new perspective. The High Line becomes an architectural museum where one can discern the stories of how this great city developed. New landmark buildings designed by Jean Nouvel, Frank Gehry, Neil Denari, and Shigeru Ban are just some of the shining jewels between types of red brick industrial buildings. The architecture of New York is a portrait of the city.

Gardening is the sum of our collective physical and emotional response to a site. In this way, it is the sum total of how we relate to a place. The High Line is a work of art that reflects the many ideas and perspectives of those who have contributed to its creation. It is a public space that is shared by all who visit it. The High Line is not just a linear park, but a symbol of the possibilities that exist in urban design and urban planning.

In 2009, the High Line opened to the public. It is now an iconic symbol of the city’s commitment to sustainability and innovation. The High Line is a testament to the power of collaboration and community engagement. It is a space that welcomes and embraces people of all ages and backgrounds.

The High Line is a reminder that we can create meaningful and beautiful spaces that enhance the quality of life for all who live and work in our cities. It is a place that invites us to think differently about our relationship to the environment and to each other. The High Line is a reminder that we can continue to build on the rich history of New York City and create a future that is both sustainable and vibrant.

The High Line is a living example of how we can transform spaces that have been abandoned or neglected into vibrant, livable, and enjoyable places. It is a reminder that we can take what was once considered worthless and turn it into something that is valuable and cherished by all.

In conclusion, the High Line is not just a linear park, but a symbol of the possibilities that exist in urban design and urban planning. It is a space that welcomes and embraces people of all ages and backgrounds. The High Line is a testament to the power of collaboration and community engagement. It is a place that invites us to think differently about our relationship to the environment and to each other. The High Line is a reminder that we can continue to build on the rich history of New York City and create a future that is both sustainable and vibrant.
organization of the city. But, it is safe to say that it is an unprecedented project representing a new direction in public park design! Looking back into recent history, the design field has been witness to a new trend of public project design in the past two decades. The High Line is simply one milestone. Where did this new understanding of public design emerge from and how are they different from the parks of the past? In order to answer this question and more, we need to understand the new mode of contemporary urbanization.

**Sporal**

At the beginning of the twentieth century, only sixteen cities in the world had populations larger than a million people, yet at the close of the century, more than five hundred cities had more than a million inhabitants.* Across the globe, cities are currently experiencing the ongoing process of dramatic evolution. The urban sprawl, meaning the horizontal expansion of urban areas with low density, defines the urbanization pattern of the North American context in the post-war era. The population density of American cities has significantly decreased without population growth. This means that European cities are experiencing fundamental reformation of urban structure rather than the gradual transformation triggered by population growth.

**City of Landscape**

In an environment where sprawl dominates the direction of urbanization, conventional mediums that have defined the city become useless. Architecture lost its power in deciding the forms of the city, and classical planning methods are no longer effective. In this situ-

ation, the landscape has emerged as a medium through which the contemporary city is con-

structed. In 1955, Victor Gruen tried to redefine American cities through the concept of landscape. He coined the term “cityscape,” which refers to the built environment of build-

ings, paved surfaces, and infrastructures. “Cityscape” which he proposed in contrast to landscape, is further subdivided into etchoscaping, transportation-scaping, suburb-scaping and subcity-scaping to describe the new structure of contemporary cities. Peter Rowe uses the term “Middle Landscape” to identify the territory lying between the traditional city center and green field suburbs. In order to make a meaningful public realm in this in-

dexed world, the cityscape could be divided into three layers: city, suburb, and green. The cityscape is further described as a combination of physical infrastructure, social arrangement, and cultural identity. The cityscape is a place for people to live, work, and play. The city is a place for people to live in, whereas the suburb is a place for people to live in. The green field is a place for people to live in and out.

The cityscape is further divided into three layers: city, suburb, and green. The cityscape is further described as a combination of physical infrastructure, social arrangement, and cultural identity. The cityscape is a place for people to live, work, and play. The city is a place for people to live in, whereas the suburb is a place for people to live in. The green field is a place for people to live in and out.

The cityscape is a place for people to live, work, and play. The city is a place for people to live in, whereas the suburb is a place for people to live in. The green field is a place for people to live in and out.
between landscape, he thinks that priority should be accorded to landscape rather than the "foremost building form." In his later formulation, Kenneth Frampton, who has argued for an architecture of resistance against Regionalism, found new potentials in landscape to construct meaningful cultural whole within the context of market production.15 Rem Koolhaas also declared that "architecture is no longer the primary element of urban order. Increasingly, urban order is given by a thin horizontal vegetative plane, increasingly landscape is the primary element of urban order."16

The concept of rebuilding the city through landscape is fundamentally different from conventional perspectives. Urban planning has tried to understand the city through a reductionist model. The model reduces the city into basic units of architectural blocks, in which main programs of the city, such as residential, commercial, and industrial lands, are allocated. However, the reductionist model that considers the city as a machine assembled with different individual components does not operate as expected in the new urban context emerging from historical expansion. Unplanned urban elements replaced original programs provided by the plan, and underdefined middle urban landscape was defined to prepare for the 1992 Olympics. Gradually urban infrastructures that used to be considered a secondary part of the city became a crucial element in the development. Ecological and hydrological functions became more important as a regional system operating mega-cities. The approach of rebuilding the city through landscape proposes a new phenomenological model that can handle more complicated problems that the reductionist model failed to solve.

The new concept of landscape is different from the notion of traditional landscape architecture. Old parks or open spaces had worked within the system based on a reductionist model. Not unlike other land uses in the city, open spaces were parts of the huge machine. Originally, the products of landscape architecture were invented to provide solutions for the urban problems that cities of the Industrial Revolution era were faced with. These solutions could not function properly in contemporary cities whose economic models were transferring to new industrial production systems. As a result, the structure of open spaces that were parts of the system also failed. Ander jargon pointed out that the outcome of the traditional approach using landscape as a scape from urban congestion and pollution was not the same as planned.17 The consequence of planning for the city as a machine assembles with different individual components does not operate as expected in the new urban context emerging from historical expansion. Unplanned urban elements replaced original programs provided by the plan, and underdefined middle urban landscape was defined to prepare for the 1992 Olympics. Gradually urban infrastructures that used to be considered a secondary part of the city became a crucial element in the development. Ecological and hydrological functions became more important as a regional system operating mega-cities. The approach of rebuilding the city through landscape proposes a new phenomenological model that can handle more complicated problems that the reductionist model failed to solve.

In 1997, the University of Illinois at Chicago held a symposium and exhibition on Landscape Urbanism, Charles Waldheim, organizer of the event, addressed the potential of Landscape Urbanism with the example of several European and North American projects in the exhibition. He defined Landscape Urbanism as an interstitial design discipline operating in the spaces between buildings and infrastructural systems and natural ecologies.18 The symposium and exhibition attracted enormous attention from both professionals and academics. After the event, Waldheim further developed the concept of Landscape Urbanism with young professionals and landscape architects who had similar visions. In 2000, the Architectural Design of Urban Spaces was published with the title "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living." The book was written by the authors of the symposium and exhibition in Chicago, "Landscape Urbanism: Creating cities with architecture and nature, and the future of dense urban living."
Landscape Urbanism has established a solid theoretical foundation. Drawing from other theories that cultivate a more concrete framework as time goes by, Landscape Urbanism keeps expanding its scope to various areas. From the last twelve years, Landscape Urbanism has gained great populariy, emerging as the most influential landscape theory. The discourse of Landscape Urbanism has two theoretical layers: First, Landscape Urbanism suggests new urban planning approaches, and second, Landscape Urbanism suggests new urban planning approaches.

Nerida Gelmi, Brussels

The architectural root of Landscape Urbanism establishes a theoretical foundation to criticize the traditional urban theories more focused on architectural typologies, and its ecological root provides a fresh framework and vision that can replace conventional planning methodologies. Landscape Urbanism focuses more on the operational system of the city in a larger scale rather than detailed spatial grammar.

Secondly, Landscape Urbanism tries to propose a practical design theory in order to understand Landscape Urbanism more easily we need to be reminded that it is not urban planning or sociology who drives this theory, but landscape architects and architects. The ultimate goal of Landscape Urbanism was not about remaining current urban policies or verifying the pattern of contemporary urbanization scientifically. Because Landscape Urbanism is a discourse within the urban design and geographic context, they have several important characteristics in common. Through the process of solving similar problems caused by global urbanization, parallel design strategies were developed and applied to different urban contexts.

The structural transformation of cities caused by the shift of economical production paradigm generated a vast area of wasted urban landscape. Through multifunctional public projects, contemporary cities found new potential in abandoned spatial remnants. Square of Hes-Chaon is a small urban square located at one of the revitalized former industrial sectors of Montréal. The square is a part of a network of public spaces organized along the main axis that links the old into the new. The designer discovers new identity of the place by interpreting various historical contexts of the site into contemporary lens. Reusing the abandoned waste materials, the designer re-creates the way the landscape is used in the past. The end result is a landscape that is re-created and transformed into a place that is unique and functional.
Industrial reclamation project in Norway, was originally the Olsøk International Airport. The new park located at the center of a new community some 10 kilometers from downtown Oslo is more a green network connecting adjacent urban fabrics rather than an endwise park with a well-defined boundary. The seven green arms stretching out to residential areas and office campus integrate different parts of the city through diverse park programs. Comparing to Nanjing Park that was a devolutionary project, however, it is a good example of an Infrastructure space regeneration project. Because of the tangled freeway system interfering with access to the site and serious flooding problems, the 2km portion of Bufflo Bayou was regarded as a neglected drainage channel for a long time despite its attractive location at the western end of the downtown Houston. SARA Group transformed the abandoned space into a successful urban park by introducing a series of stairs and ramps to connect people to the water and various other programs to activate the park. The success of Bufflo Bayou is not only attributed to reconnecting connectivity. From new flood control strategies integrated to detailed design of lighting features and guarding, the integrated design strategy made regeneration project possible. Boston Central Artery in Boston provides an excellent example of et cetera level to reconfigure the neglected urban spaces. This project, better known by its nickname, Big Dig, provides a 6-lane new park in the middle of the public and an infrastructure in the new city highway system underground. With the elimination of the barrier separating the central downtown area and harbor district, Boston gains new potential for future development. Recent public projects reorganized the spatial networks of the city. They work more like networks connecting diverse urban programs rather than a vessel contains fixed programs. These new species refuse predetermined forms or programs, and continuously change their positions in a larger urban context. Diversity and an unpredictable flow of change are the main variables in deciding the direction of the evolution of cities. The flexible and light networks trigger a new mode of transformation in between heavy structures. This is the most effective of reconnecting diverse functions and spaces of a contemporary city whose conceptual boundary does not exist anymore. Ronds De L’Ilot Promenade is a hybrid park with a highway system. Ronda De L’Ilot that reconnects the inner city with coastal area separated by a highway is a large-scale urban connector. The park was an intermediary medium link greater fabrics of the city. Nansen Park, the largest urban space located in the city, is a grid-like park network that connects parks, trees, squares, and inter changes to the old ring road in the city. The park project itself is a design strategy to work in the city. This is a spatial hybrid in which a building and a park infrastructure are integrated. The park has complicated problems. It needs to overcome a huge elevation change and connect the coastal zone to the city across wide roads and railroads. Furthermore, the site that was a former refinery was seriously contaminated by a large amount of waste. This contaminated soil was removed together with the underground water, and the site was then redeveloped as a residential area.}

 Ecuador: Cotopaxi

 In 1979, the government of Ecuador started the first major rehabilitation of the Cotopaxi National Park. The project, financed by the Japanese government, aimed to protect the park and the surrounding area from further degradation. The project involved the construction of a new road, the development of ecotourism infrastructure, and the creation of a new national park. The new road was built through a very steep and narrow valley, which required extensive engineering work to ensure the safety of the road and its surroundings. The road was completed in 1981 and has since been used for ecotourism purposes.

 In the 1980s, the government of Ecuador began to promote ecotourism as a way to generate income for the local communities and protect the environment. The Cotopaxi National Park was one of the areas where this strategy was implemented. The park was designated as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO in 1982, which also helped to promote ecotourism and protect the park.

 In the 1990s, the government of Ecuador began to focus on the development of sustainable tourism. This involved the creation of new ecotourism facilities, the promotion of responsible tourism practices, and the training of local communities in ecotourism. This helped to ensure that the benefits of ecotourism were shared fairly and that the local communities benefitted from the new tourism opportunities.

 In the 2000s, the government of Ecuador continued to focus on the development of ecotourism. This involved the creation of new facilities, the promotion of responsible tourism practices, and the training of local communities in ecotourism. This helped to ensure that the benefits of ecotourism were shared fairly and that the local communities benefitted from the new tourism opportunities.

 In the 2010s, the government of Ecuador continued to focus on the development of ecotourism. This involved the creation of new facilities, the promotion of responsible tourism practices, and the training of local communities in ecotourism. This helped to ensure that the benefits of ecotourism were shared fairly and that the local communities benefitted from the new tourism opportunities.

 In the 2020s, the government of Ecuador continued to focus on the development of ecotourism. This involved the creation of new facilities, the promotion of responsible tourism practices, and the training of local communities in ecotourism. This helped to ensure that the benefits of ecotourism were shared fairly and that the local communities benefitted from the new tourism opportunities.
In the 21st century, the world is experiencing a rapid urbanization process, driven by the need to accommodate the growing population and the economic development. The urban landscape is undergoing significant changes, influenced by technology, economics, and social factors. This transformation is not limited to major cities but is evident in smaller towns and rural areas as well.*