Otaniemi: Embracing Complexity

Actors







Country / City	Finland, Helsinki	 	
University / School	Aalto University - School of Arts, Design and Architecture	 	
Academic year	2019-2020		
Title of the project	Otaniemi: Embracing Complexity		
Authors	Allan Delesantro, Elka Lupunen, Kati Efraimsson		



Subsystems





TECHNICAL DOSSIER

Title of the project	Otaniemi: Emracing Complexity		
Authors	Allan Delesantro, Elka Lupunen, Kati Efraimsson		
Title of the course	Landscape Ecology in Planning: Otaniemi 2020>2050		
Academic year	2019-2020		
Teaching Staff	Prof. Juanjo Galan, Johan Kotze, Michail Galanakis		
Department/Section/Program of belonging			
	Department of Architecture, Master's Programme in Landscape Architecture		
University/School	Aalto University - School of Arts, Design and Architecture		

Written statement, short description of the project in English, no more than 250 words

This project is part of a course based in two initial assumptions or hypotheses: Firstly, because of its systemic and pattern: process methods, landscape ecology and urban ecology can activate new ways of thinking and working in other city-related disciplines. Secondly, landscape ecology and urban ecology can foster multi-disciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches to the city by recognizing it as a complex and evolving socio-ecological system. The project identifies the city as a system of heightened complexity, embodied in the intricate weavings of social, ecological and logical subsystems. These weavings are simplified in the language of "connections" - interactions between two entities over a long-time span that benefit one or both of these entities. Current systems of valuing (capitalism) focus on enlarging singular elements and following familiar patterns in order to minimize risk and achieve

"optimal" outcomes. This produces a winner-take-all status quo, in social, ecological or logical systems, in which homogeneity and simplification ensure something predictable and profitable (Swyngedouw & Heynen 2003; Kay & Schneider 1994). This system of valuing leads to non-resilience by overlooking the latent values embodied in the complex web of actors required to ensure resilience (Beilin & Wilkinson 2015; Kay & Schneider 1994).

In this project the authors propose an alternative system of valuing that can be used to plan for places and systems which are complex, diverse and as a result, resilient. For this purpose, the authors defined and tested in Otaniemi (Finland) a theoretical and methodological framework to understand, plan and design complex interactions in socio-ecological systems.

CLIMATE CHANGE AGAIN

11th International Biennial Landscape Barcelona

For further information Máster d'Arquitectura del Paisatge - DUOT - UPC

T: + 34 93 401 64 11 / +34 93 552 0842 Contact via email at: biennal.paisatge@upc.edu Máster d'Arquitectura del Paisatge - DUOT - UPC ETSAB - Escola Tècnica Superior d'Arquitectura de Barcelona Avenida Diagonal, 649 piso 5 08028 Barcelona-Spain Barcelona





September 2020 SCHOOL PRIZE

Measuring & Mapping Complexity



Hypotheses

Complexity

Connections are mutual interactions between actors.



Resilience

Complexity leads to resilience through redundant connections.



Complexity value of a patch

1. (actor connectivity score x patch size) 2. (typology connectivity score x perimeter) 3. (subsystem connectivity score x adjacencies)

Connectivity Scores & Spatial Modifiers

Actor Connections

Actor connections occur internal to each typology. We have identified connections in which one or both actors have a benefit. Fot the purpose of our value system we ignore negative connections, like parasitism, predation or herb ivory to focus on those connections which contribute the most to resilience

Actor Connectivity Scores

Actor connectivity scores are the sum off all connections found within a typology. A one-way connection receives a score of 0.1 points. A mutual connectios receives a score of 0.2 points.

Typology Connections

Typyology connections occur when one typology within a subsystem offers or receives a benefit from another system. These are different than actor connections because they are created and transmitted not by individual actors, but by the functioning of assembly as a whole unit.

Typology Connectivity Scores

Each pair of typologies receives a connectivity score based on the number of connections between them. Each connection is worth 1 point.

Subsystem Connections

Sybsystem connections occur when the functioning of an entire subsystem, consisting of all three typologies contributes a benefit it or service to another subsystem. These require translations between different realms of the material, social and cognitive and are thus often abstract.

Subsystem Connectivity Scores

Each pair of subsystems receives a connectivity score based on the number of connections between them. Each connection is worth 1 point.

Patch Size

In the mapping of complexity values, actor connectiity scores are weighed by the size of the patch in which they occur. This takes into account the importance of large and contininuous patches that allow all these actors to come into contact and thus actualize these connections. While these connections are still possible between fragmented patches, they are made more diff icult and fewer. Thus our scoring process generalizes that they are weaker because of this fragmenation.

Edge Effects

In the mapping of complexity values, typology connectivity scores are weighted by the length of the perimeter where the two typologies are in contact. This takes into account that direct contact allows the two typologies to participate in their connections more readily and promotes successful interactions of actors internal to those typologies.

Mosaics

In the mapping of complexity values, subsystem connectivity scores are weighted by the number of patches from other systems that the core patch comes in contact with. This takes into account the value of heterogeous patterns of land-use allowing more complexity and exchange of connections across systems.

A problem of valuing

Capitalist valuing leeds to reduced complex-













Envisioning New Connections





Complexity performance is weak throughout the campus areas. Parkland benefit from adjacency to large forests. Forest suffer greatly due to fragmentation. Wetlands and forest produce a strong combination.

Unified green		
campus		

Connectivity Score improvements

Garden plants Understory management Spawning grounds Water filtering

Wetland	
restoration	

Bees Psammophytes Ecology as a study Livestock

Complexity performance is strongest in the large campus core which combines university and research typologies and benefits from adjacency to forest ecotopes. Fragmentation and segregation of research and university patches on the edges of Otaniemi causes weak scores.



Connectivity Score improvements

Resident scholars Informal transit Nature-based learning Participatory research

University expansion

Entertainers Nightlife Co-working Crafts people

Complexity performance is strongest where all three logotopes interact since they have relatively equal typology connectivity scores. The high strength of STEM ativities is increased by their spatial concentrations.

Arts on Tech
campus

Connectivity Score improvements

Practice-based design methods

Agricultural science Cultivation knowledge Living Arts Partarticipatory-based design methods Diffuse production Food science



Residence hall

workshops

New Strategy for improving Complexity

Emergent Strategy: Learning fom the Landscape





