

„WHAT LANDSCAPE WOULD YOU LIKE TO LIVE IN?” EXPECTATIONS OF YOUNG LANDSCAPE DESIGNERS IN POLAND

Tadeusz J. Chmielewski, Emilia Śliwczyńska

Department of Landscape Ecology and Nature Conservation, University of Life Sciences in Lublin,
Dobrzańskiego str. 37, 20-262 Lublin, tadeusz.chmielewski@up.lublin.pl

Summary. The adoption of the European Landscape Convention inspired researchers to undertake studies on the estimation of landscape character, social perception of changes taking place in landscape, and on the future of landscape physiognomy and social aspirations in this respect.

During the coming decades a special role in the shaping of landscape will be played by people who are now students of architecture, landscape architecture and landscape ecology. Therefore, knowledge on the outlooks and expectations of that group concerning landscape quality is of particular importance for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention. The objective of this paper was presentation of the results of the first study of this type conducted in Poland based on a new and original method.

Participants of the project were 120 students of architecture, landscape architecture and landscape ecology from 4 Polish state universities located in large cities in various regions of Poland. The students, after listening to a brief introductory presentation, wrote short (1–2 page) individual and personal essays on „What landscape would you like to live in?”.

The study permitted to acquire knowledge on the expectations of the young generation of architects and landscape architects concerning their preferred quality of various types of spatial systems. It also put in focus the role of the university curricula in the creation of attitudes towards the environment. The results obtained will be used in further studies on the standards of landscape quality in various regions and will contribute to the process of shaping the social attitudes towards the quality of the surrounding space.

Key words: European Landscape Convention, landscape quality objectives, social aspirations, landscape essay method

INTRODUCTION

The European Landscape Convention places an obligation on the countries that ratified it to identify and implement „landscape quality objectives” that will take into account the needs of sustainable development and of the protection of

the identity of landscape of the particular regions of Europe. The Convention defines the landscape quality objectives as „the formulation by the competent public authorities of the aspirations of the public with regards to the landscape features of their surroundings” [European... 2000]. The adoption of the Convention by the European countries inspired researchers to undertake studies on the estimation of landscape character [Fairclough and Macinnes 2003, Mucher *et al.* 2006], social participation in the process of shaping the landscape [Skogoe and Skov 2007], social perception of changes taking place in landscape [Nijnik *et al.* 2008, Nijnik and Macher 2008], estimation of landscape quality [Kaplan *et al.* 2006, Chmielewski and Sowińska 2008], and on the future of landscape physiognomy and social aspirations in this respect [Nohl 2001, Dramstad *et al.* 2006].

During the coming decades a special role in the shaping of landscape will be played by people who are now students of architecture, landscape architecture and landscape ecology. Acquisition of knowledge on the outlooks and aspirations of that group concerning landscape quality is of particular importance for the implementation of the objectives of the Convention. The objective of this paper is presentation of the results of the first study of this type conducted in Poland based on a new and original method.

METHODS

Participants of the project were 120 students of architecture, landscape architecture and landscape ecology from 4 Polish state universities located in large cities in various regions of Poland, and namely:

- Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW (the capital of Poland, central Poland),
- University of Life Sciences in Lublin (eastern Poland),
- Wrocław University of Technology (south-west Poland),
- Cracow University of Technology (south Poland).

Thirty students from each of the above universities participated in the study.

The method applied has been defined as the *landscape essay method*. The students, gathered in a seminar room, after listening to a brief introductory presentation (problem outline presentation by the moderator), wrote short (1–2 page), personal essays on „What landscape would you like to live in?” Then the contents of the essays were subjected to comparative analysis. Reading the students’ essays the authors of the project were trying to find answers to the following questions:

What are the students’ preferred or the most desired features of landscape concerning the following:

- a) the class of natural landscape (acc. to classification applied in physical geography [Richling and Ostaszewska 2005]: lowlands, uplands, mountains, river valleys and terrain depressions),
- b) forms of land cover (waters, peatlands, forests, grasslands, fields, village areas, urban areas, mosaic of forms, etc.),

- c) degree of anthropogenic transformation of landscape,
- d) choice of a specific (favourite) physical-geographic region,
- e) expected standard of living,
- f) most valued, worthy of conservation, features of „dream” landscape.

The results of the above analysis of the contents of the essays were subjected to basic statistical analysis and compiled in Tables.

RESULTS

Style of expression and general variation of students' expectations

It was found that the manner of formulation (style) of the students' essays varied significantly with relation to the type university. Students from the life science and agriculture universities (Warszawa, Lublin) presented more often statements full of reflection, reference to man-nature and man-man relations. Students of the universities of technology (Wrocław, Cracow) wrote, as a rule, essays that were shorter and less emotional than those of students of the life science universities. The texts of the future architects and engineers contained more specific expected landscape features, frequently listed in an itemised manner. Students from the universities of technology more often expressed a preference for life in a large but nature-rich city, or in the neighbourhood of such a city, while students of the life science universities – for life in a village or in a small town. An important option selected in both groups was living in a city, with easy access to attractive rest and recreation areas in a low-urbanised, nature-rich landscape.

Whereas, the situation of a given university in an economically more prosperous (Warsaw, Wrocław, Cracow) or a poorer region of the country (Lublin) had a less pronounced effect on the landscape preferences of the students.

The illustrate the style and contents of the statements, given below are fragments of 8 selected essays which attracted the attention of the authors of the project (2 essays from each of the universities included in the project):

Since my birth I have always lived in a lowland landscape, in central Poland. The area is characterised by monotony of the landscape and by a high degree of urbanisation. Those elements cause that I feel overwhelmed and trapped here, deprived of the comfort of feeling large open spaces around me. Daily commuting to the university, in crowded trams and busses, more and more motivates me to escape from the place. Some people feel good in an anthropogenic landscape, but I know that I do not fit in that place. All this makes me think of my life and the place I live. My desire for freedom conflicts with the emotional attachment to me family and relatives who live in the city. The only solution would be to take my family with me, but not everybody shares my desires. Besides, we live in a world which constantly accelerates its rhythm, we are immersed in our work and more and more often have no time for the realization of our dreams. The place of work becomes our second home, and Warsaw is a place where it is easiest to find employment. One has to work to support a family. And so my house in the mountains will have to remain a dream, and my being in that beautiful landscape will be limited to holiday visits.

Maciej Kotwiński, SGGW Warsaw, landscape architecture

Years spent in Warsaw caused that I have come to like that city. It provides – like most large agglomerations – opportunities that can only be dreamt of in my home area. Evening walks and time spent in cafes in the Old Town, Sunday visits to the Zoo or concerts of world stars are attractions that I would never get to know there. Unlimited access to thousands of shops and supermarkets is now so obvious to me that I have nearly forgotten how great a change it was for me during the initial months of my living in Warsaw. If we add to that the incomparably greater cultural offer of large cities, the verdict seems to be obvious: of you want to live your life to the full, to be an active member of the society, a big agglomeration is the ideal place to live...

Until recently I was also of such an opinion. Now, however, I am no longer so sure. In a large city I will never have that feeling of quiet and internal peace that I achieve when I am in my home parts (...). I can live in my cottage in my village and at the same time, thanks to internet links, be transported to New York, make virtual visit to museums, art galleries... So today, if I am to answer the question: what landscape would I like to live in? I will reply with another question: and why should I have to make a choice? After all, sitting in my village garden I can be at the same time at any place in the world.

Joanna Józefczak, SGGW Warsaw, landscape architecture

My vision of a landscape that I would like to live in is inseparably bound with my memories and the feeling of happiness following from contact with nature, with the joy I felt when deer came close to my window. For me the important thing is the atmosphere of a landscape, its natural beauty which calms me down, gives me a feeling of safety. It does not matter if it will be the mountains, the sea or a flat lowland landscape. I know that I could not spend my life in an urban landscape. To me the city is associated with a dangerous concrete jungle, overwhelming and unfriendly. The smell of car fumes, the ever-present noise and the anonymity of people cause that I feel entrapped there. For me, this kind of landscape does not ensure the possibility of creating beautiful designs, relaxation, nor achieving inner calm. All that there is there is the incessant pursuit of profits...

Such landscape has no inner harmony, it does not ensure the balance that is necessary in human life. I wish that our towns and villages become green, that nature is no longer locked in concrete pots set in public spaces of cobble stones. Let us allow our increasingly rich towns and villages live in harmony with ever richer nature.

Justyna Szajda, University of Life Sciences in Lublin, landscape architecture

I would like to live in a rural or a suburban landscape, where anthropogenic transformations are not so great and where the nature reigns, such as:

- forests, but not those planted „with a ruler”, that look like poles driven into the ground along straight lines, but forests teeming with life, walking through which would never bore me, because there would always be the chance of seeing something new: a very rare plant, a wild animal passing, where I can listen to bird song, to the rustle of a stream, where I can gather berries or mushrooms;

- rivers, but not those embanked with concrete and crossed with sluices, but those whose banks are protected by trees and bushes, in which – rather than a beer can or an old rag – I can catch a pike or a trout, where, floating down in a canoe, I would not have to look at the monotony of a regulated river bed, but where I would have to put in some effort to follow the wild and meandering water course;

- mid-forest and mid-field pools, streams, bogs, meadows full of colourful flowers.

I would not like, in future, to be telling my children or grand children how we, me and Dad, used to bring home baskets of mushrooms or buckets of blackberries; what beautiful carpets of anemones or marigolds were there once; that once I saw a rare animal or plant, and that it used to be beautiful here... but I would like to be able to take those children for a walk so that they could see all that for themselves.

Natalia Ciosmak, University of Life Sciences in Lublin, landscape ecology

The landscape I would like to live in is the city. However, the city must be characterised by notable diversity. It should have its modern „City” as well as a historical part. It is important that there is also water there (like it is in Wrocław, with the numerous branches of river Odra). Water teeming with life (boats, canoes, restaurants on the water), surrounded both with good architecture and with greenery. In the city centre riverside greenery surrounds the boulevards and promenades from which one can enjoy the view of the river, take a rest and have a good meal. Whereas, green areas far from city centre should be semi-wild in character: parks with forest-type nature, or areas of „wild nature” with walking paths and lanes. Numerous well-designed parks and gardens should also be found in the city itself. Green areas in the city should form a system of patches and corridors, i.e. larger green areas should be connected with green belts into a coherent system. In the city there should also be a system of bicycle lanes and an efficient public transport system. I would also like that, apart from the green areas generally accessible to the public, every inhabitant of the city could have a small private green area of his own, that he could design to his liking. This is the kind of landscape I would like to live in.

Rafał Bułka, Wrocław University of Technology, landscape architecture

I would like to live in a modern and universal urban landscape. Why urban? Because I like to live in a city, I like the dynamics of its life, I can see in city life prospects for development and self-realization. Why modern? Because the city needs modern solutions which meet the requirements of modern people and are adapted to their life style. What does it mean that a landscape is to be universal? – it should provide such a broad offer of places of work, services and rest that everybody can find something for himself. A city is divided into zones with various dominant functions, developed with a specific group of users in mind (e.g. student campuses), but I believe that many public spaces can be developed so that they are addressed to a larger number of social groups. (...) In my opinion the city green areas should be adapted to the needs of inhabitants, and not treated as a „filler” of places left in gaps among the buildings and the transport systems. I dream of living in a space that we could – at least on small areas and for limited periods of time – compose ourselves, e.g. from mobile modules of park or housing settlement greenery.

Dorota Garlińska, Wrocław University of Technology, landscape architecture

I am deeply attached to the landscape of villages and small towns. I would like to live in a landscape that would be balanced, respecting historical values and the genius loci, clean and green, and of the highest quality. I remember my town from the times of my childhood. It was poor and in a poor state of repair, but it had its own charm. Nowadays, thanks to numerous factors, both the commune and its inhabitants have become richer, decisions began to be taken on the revitalisation of public spaces, numerous investment projects have been realized. But the history, the cultural heritage, the simplicity and the beauty have been forgotten. It is a shame to see such wasted potential, such destruction of cultural heritage, al. at enormous financial expenditure.

One could write a lot about idealistic visions of landscapes of our dreams. Instead, I can briefly formulate a few postulates concerning the landscape I would not want to live in. I do not want a landscape:

- with no character, devoid of a unique charm of the place,
- homogenised, standardised, being a copy of other landscapes,
- scattered and disordered,
- with nouveau riche decoration and poor examples of pseudo-modern architecture, „showing off” and not composed into the context of the landscape.

Joanna Skowron, Cracow University of Technology, architecture

It is good to live next to a meadow, near a forest, to feel the nature and to derive from it the strength to live;

It is good to breathe fresh air, to admire the birds, to experience God in the mountains.

It is good to live in a city, to walk along old little streets, to feel the rush of life, to take advantage of the available entertainment, to have ice cream in a cafe.

It is good to have near to work, to nice neighbours, to feel safe.

I want to live in a town – garden, I want to go out from my home and go to school passing trees.

I want to do my shopping in a park, to have my breakfast on the grass in the centre of the city.

I want to see the sky from wherever I am!

Martyna Kumkiewicz, Cracow University of Technology, architecture

Preferred classes of natural landscape

A majority (65.8%) of the students did not indicate any specific class of natural landscape as especially preferred. The remaining ones most often chose landscapes of valleys and depressions and the sea shore and mountain landscapes. The most rarely indicated as preferred was the upland landscape (Tab. 1).

Table 1. Preferred classes of natural landscape

Class of natural landscape	Number of responses indicating a given class					% of total number of responses
	SGGW	ULS Lublin	UT Wrocław	UT Cracow	Total	
Sea shore	3	1	3	2	9	7.5
Lowland	3	1	0	0	4	3.3
Upland	0	0	0	1	1	0.9
Medium mountains	1	2	2	3	8	6.7
High mountains	1	2	2	2	7	5.8
Valleys and depressions	0	1	8	3	12	10.0
No data	22	23	15	19	79	65.8

Among the students from the, 10% each indicated the sea shore and the lowland landscapes as the preferred ones, and 3.3% each – the landscapes of medium and high mountains. Among the authors of essays from the University of Life Sciences in Lublin, 13.3% indicated the landscapes of medium and high mountains, and only single students – the remaining classes of landscape. Students from the Wrocław University of Technology had a particular preference for the landscape in which their city is situated, i.e. (more or less consciously) the valley and depression class of landscape (26.7%). Ranked second was the sea shore landscape (10%), and third – mountain landscapes (6.6%). Among the students of the Cracow University of Technology, 10% each expressed a preference for the landscape of medium and high mountains and for that of valleys and depressions, and 6.6% each – for the sea shore landscape and the landscape of high mountains.

Preferred forms of land cover

A majority of all the students (53.3%) indicated a preference for life in a built-up area. 32.5% of the authors of the essays indicated the mosaic rural landscape as the preferred one, with intertwined patches of fields, meadows, forests and housing, and 8.3% of the students specified a typically forest landscape as that of their dreams (Tab. 2).

Table 2. Preferred forms of land cover

Dominant forms of land cover	Number of responses indicating a given form					% of total number of responses
	SGGW	ULS Lublin	UT Wrocław	UT Cracow	Total	
Water	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest	6	2	0	2	10	8.3
Fields	0	2	0	4	6	5.0
Mosaic of various forms	14	17	4	4	39	32.5
Built-up area	10	9	26	19	64	53.3
No data	0	0	0	1	1	0.9

Students from the SGGW most frequently chose a landscape little transformed by man – a rural landscape, with a mosaic of fields, meadows, forests and housing (46.7%), and even a landscape close to the natural. As many as 20% of the students of the SGGW indicated a typically forest landscape as the preferred one. Life in an urban landscape was chosen by a third of that group of students.

To an even higher degree (56.6%) the mosaic rural landscape was preferred by the students from the University of Life Sciences in Lublin. However, 30% of the authors expressed a wish to live in an urban landscape, rich in green areas. The remaining students (13.4%) indicated a preference for the typical agricultural or the forest landscape.

As many as 86.7% students of the Wrocław University of Technology would like to live in an urban landscape, in which houses and interspaces with areas of greenery and recreation. The remaining students (13.3%) opted for the mosaic rural landscape.

At the Cracow University of Technology 63.3% of the students preferred the landscape of a large city, 13.3% indicated the rural landscape, an identical number – small towns set in a mosaic of fields, meadows and patches of forest, 7% indicated the forest landscape, and one person did not express any preference concerning the forms of land cover.

Preferred region

In their majority, the authors of the essays were not strongly attached to any specific favourite region of Poland or the world. Nearly 60% of the students indicated that they could live in any region, provided it fulfilled certain criteria of landscape quality. A fairly small group, 15% of the students, indicated a definite preference for their home parts, and 11.7% – for the region in which they live at present. A relatively small percentage (4.1%) declared a wish to live abroad (Tab. 3).

Among the authors of the essays from the particular universities, return to their home regions was most often declared by students from Warsaw (30%) and Lublin (16.7%). At the same time, none of the students indicated those cities as the favourite place they would choose to live. Whereas, as many as 30% of the students from Wrocław perceive that city as a very good place for their future lives.

Table 3. Regions preferred as a place to live

Preferred region	Number of responses indicating a given region					% of total number of responses
	SGGW	ULS Lublin	UT Wrocław	UT Cracow	Total	
Home parts	9	5	1	3	18	15.0
Region in which I am now	1	0	10	3	14	11.7
Another Region in Poland (which?)	5 mountains, the coast, Wrocław, Suwałki region, Bieszczady	1 Bieszczady	1 Bieszczady	3 Łódź, Tenczyn, mountains	10	8.3
Abroad – EU (where?)	1 Portugal	2 Slovakia, Swiss Alps	0	2 South France, Mediterranean	5	4.1
Abroad – the world (where?)	0	0	2 New York, Crete	0	2	1.7
Any, if it meets specific criteria	14	22	16	19	71	59.2

Highest ranked landscape features

In the 120 student essays the authors included a total of 16 landscape features which they considered to be the most important for landscape quality. Among those the highest ranking were the following: high nature values (56.7% of responses), functionality and spatial order (55.8%), high share of green areas (54.2%), picturesqueness (48.3%) and harmonious blending of land use forms with natural elements of the landscape (40.0%) (Tab. 4).

Students of the SGGW emphasised high value of landscapes in which there is a balance between nature and man: on the one hand – harmonious blending of housing and infrastructure in the landscape (40%), high comfort of development (36.7%), culture values (30.0%), and on the other – high share of green areas (46.7%), peaceful and soothing atmosphere (43.3%), picturesqueness (33.3%), expansive space (30.0%) and nature values (30.0%).

A majority of the students from the University of Life Sciences in Lublin emphasised the importance of the natural (83.3%) and the aesthetic (73.3%) values of landscape, and of the significance of their proper management: harmonious blending of anthropogenic elements in the landscape (63.3%), avoidance of pollutions (36.7%). Also important were the cultural values (46.6%), the *genius loci* (46.6%), peaceful atmosphere (53.3%), and in the case of urban space – spatial order (56.6%) and high share of green areas (33.3%).

At the Wrocław University of Technology the greatest percentage – 86.6% – of the students pointed to the necessity of increasing the share of green areas in

Table 4. Highest ranked landscape features

Landscape feature	Number of responses indicating special value of a given feature					% of total number of responses
	SGGW	ULS Lublin	UT Wrocław	UT Cracow	Total	
Diversified relief	7	4	6	7	24	20.0
Picturesqueness	10	22	10	16	58	48.3
Nature values	9	25	15	19	68	56.7
High comfort of development	11	5	21	9	46	38.3
Culture values	9	14	3	12	38	31.7
Unique climate	12	14	1	11	38	31.7
Functionality and spatial order	14	17	21	15	67	55.8
large share of green areas (urban space)	14	10	26	15	65	54.2
Harmonious blending into the landscape	12	19	5	12	48	40.0
Peaceful, soothing atmosphere	13	16	9	13	51	42.5
open space giving feeling of freedom	9	6	1	5	21	17.5
Diversity, dynamics of composition	6	5	5	2	18	15.0
Good climatic conditions	2	0	3	1	6	5.0
Safety-oriented land use/development	2	0	0	4	6	5.0
Distinct division into natural and developed zones	4	5	6	6	21	17.5
Lack of destructive elements and environmental pollution	6	11	1	6	24	20.0

the urban landscape – public, semi-private and private alike. Solutions indicated by the authors as attractive included, among other things, thematic gardens, roof gardens, and also combinations of greenery and water, characteristic e.g. of Wrocław (30%).

Other highly ranked features of the urban landscape (70%) included the functionality and spatial order, and high comfort of management and development (e.g. an efficient public transport system, availability of services, attractive rest and recreation facilities). 50% of the students emphasised the important role of nature values and the necessity of their conservation through the creation of urban networks of ecological patches and corridors. One third of the students

from the Wrocław University of Technology indicated the great role of landscape picturesqueness and the resultant soothing atmosphere.

The remaining features of landscape were mentioned in less than 20% of the responses.

A significant part of the students from the Cracow University of Technology would choose living in a suburban or a rural landscape. They pointed to the characteristic values of such a landscape: natural diversity (63.3%), picturesqueness (53.3%), peaceful atmosphere (43.3%) and harmonious incorporation of anthropogenic elements into natural forms of the landscape (40%).

In the case of the urban landscape, apart from spatial order (50%), high share of green areas (50%) and high comfort of development (30%) the students indicated a great role of cultural values (40%) and unique *genius loci* (36.7%).

In contrast to the other universities, in the case of the Cracow University of Technology many students raised the issues of pollution in the urban space (20%) and of safety (13%), which may indicate the existence of local problems in this respect.

Expected standard of living

A majority of all the students (52.5%) indicated a preference for a high standard of living. However, a relatively numerous group (23.3%) opted for a moderate standard, and even for simple living conditions, provided that would be related with beauty of the surrounding nature and with the harmony of an agricultural – forest landscape (Tab. 5).

Table 5. Living standard preferred by the students

Preferred standard of life	Number of responses indicating a given standard					% of total number of responses
	SGGW	ULS Lublin	UT Wrocław	UT Kraków	Total	
Moderate simple life in communion with nature	10	10	1	7	28	23.3
High	15	7	26	15	63	52.5
No data	5	13	3	8	29	24.2

CONCLUSIONS

The differences in the preferences of the students can be attributed both to the location of the universities and to the profile of a given university and faculty.

Students of architecture (Wrocław and Cracow Universities of Technology) decidedly preferred a typically urban landscape, describing the aspects of such a landscape from the perspective of a designer – architect and urban engineer. Those students also indicated Wrocław and, though to a lesser degree, also Cracow, as the preferred places to live, which indicates high attractiveness of those

historical cities, full of monuments of architecture, that also offer a variety of high quality services. Those are also cities where one can clearly feel the existence of a unique *genius loci*.

The essays of students from the life science universities, faculties of landscape architecture and landscape ecology, were different in character. Those student had a distinct preference for the rural, or even the semi-natural landscape, due to its aesthetic and natural values – even at the cost of a lowering of the living standard. Among the features that enhanced that standard the students from the SGGW and the ULS included rather the peace and quiet of nature than easy access to the technological achievements of civilisation.

The differences in the opinions of the students may also result from the location of the universities – the Lublin Region (where most of the students of the ULS come from) is a typically agricultural region, with a low level of urbanisation, while Warsaw is a city which, though dynamically developing, is a city full of contrasts, spatial chaos and acute competition, and thus – for many people – a city that is little friendly to the inhabitants.

Irrespective of the reasons and the character of the personal choices, a majority of the students presented specific ideas concerning the conservation and enhancement of the quality of landscape, or even the creation of their own dream landscape from scratch. In the case of the urban landscape, its attributes should include diversity of land use forms, dynamics of life, multi-cultural character, broad access to culture and entertainment, and on the other hand – spatial order, harmonious combination of tradition with modernity, unique *genius loci*, high share of green areas assuming diverse, attractive and modern forms of naturalistic gardens, thematic gardens, hanging gardens, or pocket gardens.

The students were also aware of the fact that, when designing an urban landscape, one should integrate the historical and the technological tissues with nature, and therefore the ideal urban landscape of their visions includes a well thought-out system of patches and ecological corridors and employs environment-friendly technologies.

The students of the Cracow University of Technology also chose an anthropogenic landscape, though with a somewhat different character. If they were to live in a large city, then rather in its peripheries, and best of all – a smaller or even a little town, the attributes of which are not ultramodern spatial solutions but the opposite – preservation of its *genius loci*, character of historical architecture, surrounded with a lot of greenery.

The modern nature of such a landscape is revealed in effective solutions concerning safety, the cleanliness of the environment and comprehensive satisfaction of the needs of the inhabitants.

The students of the SGGW emphasised the need for harmonious coexistence of man and nature, and the need of respect for the cultural heritage. They would willingly opt to live in a well cared-for village with a range of services, situated near a larger town or city, or in a quiet suburb, where every inhabitant has his own garden, and on a weekend can go to the centre of the city where, against the background of

carefully restored monuments of architecture there take place attractive cultural events. He can also go to a summer house in the mountains, or on the lakes.

For the students of the University of Life Sciences in Lublin the landscape of their dreams is the landscape of a Roztocze village – with their stripes of fields, old trees on the balks, roadside shrines, blue cottages under their thatch roofs. It is also the landscape of a small town, with numerous preserved monuments and the historic spatial layout, where peace and quiet reign, where all inhabitants know one another, and an afternoon walk can be taken in the nearby forest or meadow. It is also the mountains, a landscape of expansive spaces and majestic nature, offering the possibility of escape from civilisation.

The students of the University of Life Sciences emphasised also the necessity of conservation of the natural beauty of those landscapes and the need of man's humility towards the nature. Living in harmony with nature, for centuries people harmoniously blended into the landscape. Today in many places such a harmony appears to be an unattainable dream, and attempts at attenuation of the effects of aggressive human interventions into degraded landscape require enormous outlays of funds and labour. Therefore it is all the more worthwhile to devote special care to the preservation of those regions that have still retained outstanding values of harmony of the natural and cultural heritage

How far the students will be able to realize their ideas and plans? And how much will that depend on themselves? They should ask those questions of themselves as often as possible, for it is themselves who in several or more years will be the fundamental cadre of specialists shaping the landscape of Poland of 21st century.

The study permitted to acquire knowledge on the expectations of the young generation of architects and landscape architects concerning their preferred quality of various types of spatial systems. It also put in focus the role of the university curricula in the creation of their attitudes towards the environment. The results obtained, together with other similar studies but conducted with different methods, will be used in further studies on the standards of landscape quality in various regions and will contribute to the process of shaping the social attitudes towards the quality of the surrounding space.

Acknowledgements. The authors wish to express their cordial thanks to Prof. Alina Drapella-Hermansdorfer, DCs, Arch. Eng. (Wrocław University of Technology), Prof. Zbigniew Myczkowski, DCs, Arch. Eng. (Cracow University of Technology), and Prof. Barbara Szulczewska, DSc (SGGW) for their help in collecting the students' essays.

REFERENCES

- Chmielewski T.J., Sowińska B., 2008. Social expectations concerning landscape quality objectives for the Roztocze-Solska Forest region. *Teka Kom. Ochr. Kszt. Środ. Przyr.* – OL PAN, vol. V, 41–49.
- Dramstad W.E., Sundli Tveit M., Fjellstad W.J., Fry G.L.A., 2006. Relationships between visual landscape preferences and map-based indicators of landscape structure. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 78, 4, 465–474.

- European Landscape Convention, Florence, 20 October 2000; www.coe.int/europeanlandscape-convention (access date: 2010.08.14)
- Fairclough G., Macinnes L., 2003. Landscape Character Assessment. Guidance for England and Scotland. Topic Paper 5 – Understanding Historic Landscape Character. The Countryside Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage, pp. 84.
- Kaplan A., Taşkın T., Önenç A., 2006. Assessing the Visual Quality of Rural and Urban-fringed Landscapes surrounding Livestock Farms. *Biosystem Engineering*, 437–448.
- Nijnik M., Zahvoyska L., Nijnik A., Ode A., 2008. Public evaluation of landscape content and change: Several examples from Europe. *Land Use Policy*, 26, 77–86.
- Nijnik M., Mather A., 2008. Analyzing public preferences concerning woodland development in rural landscapes in Scotland. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 86, 267–275.
- Nohl W., 2001. Sustainable landscape use and aesthetic perception – preliminary reflection on future landscape aesthetic. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 54, 223–237.
- Mucher C.A., Wascher D.M., Klijn J.A., Koomen A.J.M., Jongman R.H.G., 2006. A new European Landscape Map as an integrative framework for landscape character assessment, in: Bunce R.G.H., Jongman R.H.G. (eds): *Landscape Ecology in the Mediterranean: Inside and Outside Approaches*. Proceedings of the European IALE Conference, 29 March–2 April 2005, Faro, Portugal, IALE Publication Series 3, pp. 233–243.
- Richling A., Ostaszewska K. (ed.), 2005. *Physical Geography of Poland* (in Polish). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, pp. 345.
- Skogoev K.I., Skov F., 2007. Fuzzy Cognitive Mapping – a model for public participation, in: Chmielewski T.J. (ed.) *Nature Conservation Management: From Idea to Practical Results*. European Commission 6th Framework Program: ALTER-Net. PWZN Print 6., Lublin, Łódź, Helsinki, Aarhus, pp. 178–192.

„W JAKIM KRAJOBRAZIE CHCIAŁBYŚ ŻYĆ?” OCZEKIWANIA MŁODYCH PROJEKTANTÓW PRZESTRZENI W POLSCE

Streszczenie. Przyjęcie Europejskiej konwencji krajobrazowej zainspirowało pracowników nauki do podjęcia badań nad oceną charakteru krajobrazu, społeczną oceną zmian zachodzących w krajobrazie oraz nad przyszłością fizjonomii krajobrazu i preferencjami społecznymi w tym zakresie.

Szczególną rolę w procesie kształtowania krajobrazu w ciągu kilku najbliższych dziesięcioleci odgrywać będą ludzie, którzy obecnie są studentami architektury, architektury krajobrazu oraz ekologii krajobrazu. Dlatego poznanie poglądów i oczekiwań tej grupy społecznej, dotyczących jakości krajobrazu, jest szczególnie ważne dla realizacji celów Konwencji. Celem tego artykułu jest przedstawienie wyników pierwszych takich badań zrealizowanych w Polsce nową, oryginalną metodą.

W projekcie wzięło udział 120 studentów architektury, architektury krajobrazu oraz ekologii krajobrazu 4 polskich uczelni państwowych, zlokalizowanych w dużych miastach różnych regionów Polski. Studenci, po wysłuchaniu krótkiego merytorycznego wprowadzenia, napisali krótkie (1–2 strony) osobiste eseje pt. „W jakim krajobrazie chciałbym żyć?”.

Przeprowadzone badania pozwoliły poznać oczekiwania młodego pokolenia architektów i architektów krajobrazu dotyczące jakości różnego typu systemów przestrzennych. Zwróciły także uwagę na rolę programów kształcenia studentów w kształtowaniu ich postaw wobec środowiska. Zebrane wyniki posłużą do dalszych prac nad standardami jakości krajobrazu różnych regionów oraz wspomogą proces kształtowania postaw społecznych wobec jakości otaczającej nas przestrzeni.

Słowa kluczowe: Europejska konwencja krajobrazowa, standardy jakości krajobrazu, oczekiwania społeczne, metoda esejów krajobrazowych