

Project ID

115

Criterion 1: Interpretation of the overall topic ,inclusive landscapes‘

The proposal is highly inclusive for locals and visitors. In the whole, it is remarkably balanced and shows a remarkable understanding of the needs of different groups and stakeholders

Ranking Criterion 1:

4

Criterion 2: Connection to the landscape

The proposal recognizes most of the existing cultural, ecological, visual and functional values and incorporates them in the project.

Ranking Criterion 2:

4

Criterion 3: Creativity and Innovation

The project shows an adequate combination of creativity and a real connection to the site. It is respectful and at the same time imaginative.

Ranking Criterion 3:

3

Criterion 4: Concept and Method

The proposal is based in a clear perceptual (artistic) concept. That concept is accompanied by some parallel decisions that increase considerably the whole interest of the project. The development and argumentation of the project is highly remarkable

Ranking Criterion 4:

4

Criterion 5: Holistic Approach:

The proposal integrates the different dimensions of the landscape in the Munich´s Northern Fringe. Some productive aspects connected to the agricultural matrix or some ecological aspects could have been used more clearly

Ranking Criterion 5:

3

Criterion 6: Visual Quality

The visual and narrative quality of the proposal is very high, particularly in the first panel.

Ranking Criterion 6:

4

General comments:

Very good proposal. Perhaps the perceptual changes along the trails and the characters of the landscape could have been displayed more strongly. The location of the checkpoints was a little unclear. The thematic plans and the whole panel one are excellent and the proposal for the focus area is very promising

Project ID

115

Criterion 1: Interpretation of the overall topic ,inclusive landscapes‘

The overall topic is not included in the concept, but the approach leads to sustainability, identity and social coherence

Ranking Criterion 1:

3

Criterion 2: Connection to the landscape

Project linked to the site and context. The concept of the project is based on the features of the study area, on the main layers of the landscape – topography, hydrology, geomorphology, infrastructure, ecosystem. The aim of the intervention is to emphasize the identified characteristics, in a very creative cultural approach – the landscape through the eyes of a painter

Ranking Criterion 2:

4

Criterion 3: Creativity and Innovation

The creativity of the project lies in „translating“ of the landscape characteristics through a cultural point of view. The landscape is approached from an artistic perspective, aiming to establish a new local identity, based on the site s characteristics

Ranking Criterion 3:

4

Criterion 4: Concept and Method

The proposal is mostly based on the concept. The project is systematically approached, built and analytically argued based on the existing situation analysis. The concept and the intervention method are results based on the local and zonal observations and identifications

Ranking Criterion 4:

4

Criterion 5: Holistic Approach:

the project follows a multidisciplinary approach – sustainable tourism and culture – which covers nature revitalization, flood protection, education about the land, and local economy through small scale production

Ranking Criterion 5:

3

Criterion 6: Visual Quality

Sensitive representation, rich in information, supporting the concept which is based on a pictural / cultural vision

Ranking Criterion 6:

4

General comments:

The project is based on a cultural approach, in which the landscape is a cultural act. The solution proposed a series of frames – landscape frames – like paintings, the way of perception becomes the clue of the general composition. The project aims a general unity of the landscape, a unity generated by the diversity of pictural frames

Project ID

115

Criterion 1: Interpretation of the overall topic ,inclusive landscapes‘

Some aspects of inclusiveness a touched, but not very exhaustively.

Ranking Criterion 1:

2

Criterion 2: Connection to the landscape

This work very strongly works with the landscape, for my taste maybe a bit too romantic, but a counter-worldly approach could be the method of choice.

Ranking Criterion 2:

4

Criterion 3: Creativity and Innovation

Not too innovative as a concept, but thinking and working it through promises quite some innovation.

Ranking Criterion 3:

3

Criterion 4: Concept and Method

A simple approach that is however very consistent.

Ranking Criterion 4:

4

Criterion 5: Holistic Approach:

1. Are many aspects considered in the project: 2
2. Is the whole project more than an addition of elements? 3
3. Does the project explicitly relate to issues of other disciplines? 3

Ranking Criterion 5:

3

Criterion 6: Visual Quality

To me, the visual Quality is high and logical in itself. 4

Ranking Criterion 6:

4

General comments:

I am very fond of the fact that this project does not try to cover everything. This is the reason for the relatively low ranking with regard to inclusiveness. All inclusive in my opinion leads to not concentrating on and thinking in depth about once project, but to remain in too shallow water.

Project ID

115

Criterion 1: Interpretation of the overall topic ,inclusive landscapes‘

Supersoft tourism and usability! This approach doesn't really change the landscape and searches its qualities for a very specific use. Although I highly appreciate the ambition, I cannot see a bigger usability for larger parts of the society. Is that inclusive? Demands and influences by towns, settlements, agriculture and infrastructure have not been touched upon.

Ranking Criterion 1:

2

Criterion 2: Connection to the landscape

The connection to landscape context is high, but rather based on a very optimistic interpretation of the dynamics of the northern fringe of Munich.

Ranking Criterion 2:

3

Criterion 3: Creativity and Innovation

I would say that the innovation and creativity lies in the interpretation of the landscape as an artistic object. Difficult to say whether that position could be shared by others.

Ranking Criterion 3:

2

Criterion 4: Concept and Method

It has a clear concept, which' methodology and arguments are consistent, but not fully convincing in the context of the brief.

Ranking Criterion 4:

3

Criterion 5: Holistic Approach:

No, the result is not holistic and doesn't want to, really. Whether there is an interdisciplinary approach is not important.

Ranking Criterion 5:

2

Criterion 6: Visual Quality

Yes, Yes, Yes. I am just missing to be convinced about the strategy in such a context by drawings and/or photos.

Ranking Criterion 6:

4

General comments:

The project doesn't really change anything, it interprets. Is that sufficient?

Project ID

115

Criterion 1: Interpretation of the overall topic ,inclusive landscapes‘

YES, well analysed and presented.

Ranking Criterion 1:

4

Criterion 2: Connection to the landscape

yes, territorial analysis present, and landscape issues analysed.

Ranking Criterion 2:

3

Criterion 3: Creativity and Innovation

yes, some fresh ideas here!

Ranking Criterion 3:

4

Criterion 4: Concept and Method

yes, follows a line, and structures actions around it.

Ranking Criterion 4:

4

Criterion 5: Holistic Approach:

yes, though a bit on the art side, missing a bit of landscape productivity other than that.

Ranking Criterion 5:

2

Criterion 6: Visual Quality

yes, well defined, good drawings

Ranking Criterion 6:

4

General comments:

Good proposal, though rests a bit on the cultural side missing other landscape issues.

Project ID

115

Criterion 1: Interpretation of the overall topic ,inclusive landscapes‘

-

Ranking Criterion 1:

4

Criterion 2: Connection to the landscape

-

Ranking Criterion 2:

4

Criterion 3: Creativity and Innovation

-

Ranking Criterion 3:

3

Criterion 4: Concept and Method

-

Ranking Criterion 4:

3

Criterion 5: Holistic Approach:

-

Ranking Criterion 5:

2

Criterion 6: Visual Quality

-

Ranking Criterion 6:

4

General comments:

Project 115

Positionality

Empowering groups of people who have critical differences (tourists & locals) is at the heart of the project, it draws on local community issues and is acutely aware of plurality (within its own sphere of activity).

Score 1-4: 4

What was done to include people?

It seeks to develop meaning as well as action in landscape, primarily through the development of a hiking track and engagement materials on that, but an important secondary measure is maintaining local ownership of identity (not sure how though).

Score 1-4: 3

Who was included?

Diverse local people (poster 3), with a variety of activity groups, and their historical identity (poster 2).

Score 1-4: 4

How was interaction with local people handled?

The project centres on sustainable heritage and promoting that through landscape while supporting local identity. Human perceptions are also key (poster 1).

Score 1-4: 4

Was there learning from the community?

Based on local knowledges and seeks to support them, and local are part of the ongoing learning mission (poster 1).

Score 1-4: 4