



Delft University of Technology

The Institutionalisation of a Creative Practice Changing Roles of Regional Design in Dutch National Planning

Balz, Verena; Zonneveld, Wil

DOI

[10.1007/978-3-030-23573-4_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23573-4_3)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Shaping Regional Futures

Citation (APA)

Balz, V., & Zonneveld, W. (2020). The Institutionalisation of a Creative Practice: Changing Roles of Regional Design in Dutch National Planning. In V. Lingua, & V. Balz (Eds.), *Shaping Regional Futures: Designing and Visioning in Governance Rescaling* (pp. 27-42). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23573-4_3

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

The Institutionalisation of a Creative Practice: Changing Roles of Regional Design in Dutch National Planning

3

Verena Balz and Wil Zonneveld

Abstract

This chapter discusses the organisational setting of regional design in the realms of spatial planning and territorial governance. As a starting point, it argues that rules on how imagined design solutions function in an abstract, simplified ‘planning world’ are an important regional design product. When focusing on these rules, regional design practice resembles discretionary action. As such, it aims to improve planning decisions by judging the implications of planning frameworks when applied to particular situations. This implies that the involvement of actors in design practice requires careful consideration. As in any form of legitimate rule-building, a critical distance between those who initiate practices and conduct design, and those who judge the quality and relevance of design outcomes is essential. On the basis of these considerations, the chapter investigates regional design practices that occurred between the 1980s and the 2010s in the context of Dutch national planning. It shows how they transformed from being a form of professional advocacy, criticising planning, into a practice that was pragmatically used to implement a national planning agenda. The chapter concludes by discussing this institutionalisation of a creative practice in the Netherlands, reflecting upon the implications of these outcomes for territorial governance in particular.

Keywords

Regional design • Spatial planning • Territorial governance • The Netherlands

3.1 Introduction

The ‘region’—especially the metropolitan region—has become a central focus of spatial planning in recent decades. There is a range of pressing societal problems that spatial planning seeks to deal with which do not occur locally but are instead found at higher levels of scale. Functional and socio-economic relations, embodied in transport and mobility patterns, traverse the boundaries of single administrations. Recently, due to the rising societal and political importance attributed to environmental sustainability and climate change, the accommodation of flows of water, energy and waste, for instance, has become encapsulated in planning agendas. These flows, as well as the spatial developments they cause, are quintessentially regional or even multi-scalar.

The regionalisation of spatial planning has several critical consequences. One important effect lies in what Hajer (2003, p. 182) calls a loss of ‘territorial synchrony’, that is, an increasing mismatch between autonomous spatial development processes that produce societal problems and the scales and scopes of territorial governing. The result is what Hajer identifies as an ‘institutional void’ (*idem*, p. 175): a lack not just of effective and efficient politico-administrative structures but also of institutions that hold the knowledge and deeper cultural understanding required for appropriate responses. What one might call

V. Balz (✉) · W. Zonneveld
Department of Urbanism, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands
e-mail: v.e.balz@tudelft.nl

W. Zonneveld
e-mail: W.A.M.Zonneveld@tudelft.nl

the ‘inertia’ of statutory planning further perpetuates the void. To find, promote, legitimise and formalise generally accepted, regional spatial planning rules and norms are a highly complex, often contentious and therefore time-consuming affairs. Since regions differ, such rules and norms are likely to lead to an unequal distribution of the costs and benefits of planning across areas, thus often rather accentuating mismatches between societal problems and governing structures than resolving them.

One coping strategy for the loss of territorial synchrony involves taking the geographical scope of spatial problems as the point of departure and letting this inform the creation of more provisional governing structures (De Vries and Zonneveld 2018). Such an approach (embodied for instance in the formation of non-statutory metropolitan regions) entails what Allmendinger and Haughton (2010) call ‘soft spaces’. These are malleable territories with a temporary spatial fix, established by informal and often voluntary networked governance arrangements. Addressing regionalisation in this way is not unproblematic, however. Such governance does not equate to representative democracy, giving rise to legitimacy issues. Another problem lies in accountability. Network governance is often shaped by overly pragmatic behaviour, hidden political agendas and a wish to sustain the status quo of power relations (Allmendinger and Haughton 2010). Soft space planning—with all its positive connotations concerning territorial synchrony—is a fragile construct that can easily be crushed between powerful and hegemonic interests. Just like any form of planning, it requires mechanisms that expose and justify action.

This chapter takes the position that regional design in the Netherlands (and possibly also elsewhere) has emerged as an approach that seeks territorial synchrony—an alignment between the geographical scope of spatial problems and comprehensive territorial governing—through addressing the above-mentioned deficiencies of soft space planning. It does so by exploring matches and mismatches between imagined solutions to particular problems, on the one hand, and planning frameworks that are employed by governing actors on the other. Whilst planning strives to establish generally applicable rules and norms, regional design seeks to assess their spatial, political and organisational impact on the ground. In this sense, it is a critical reflection used to justify governing based on its contribution to the resolution of real problems affecting communities in particular regions and areas. Building upon this understanding of regional design as a discretionary action, we argue that design can only thrive in situations which are characterised by a certain distance between actors in design practice and the formal planning apparatus. In particular an accountable distance between those who design and those who determine the relevance of design outcomes for revising existing rules and norms is required.

The chapter explores this necessary distance, taking the use of regional design in Dutch national planning as a case. This exploration has three main sections. The first section supports the understanding of regional design as discretion, by means of concepts from the fields of design and planning theory. The second section contains an empirical analysis and discusses the organisational setting of design practices in Dutch national planning since the mid-1980s. It investigates who took design initiatives, how design briefs and commissions were related to existing planning frameworks, who engaged in making design products and who acted as a ‘court of appeal’. Based on observed repetition of practices, as well as their formalisation in policies and policy-making procedures, we identify three consecutive periods in the institutionalisation of regional design in Dutch national planning. The empirical section is followed by a discussion on the implications of this analysis for Dutch national planning. The last section comes back to the starting point, reflecting on the added value of regional design in planning and governance, and how its contribution to territorial synchrony can be further enhanced.

3.2 Perceiving Regional Design as a Discretionary Planning Practice

Design activity is a daily routine, deeply rooted in human behaviour (Lawson 2009; Rittel 1987; Van Aken 2007). It decides the best possible next steps to take, by means of imagination: ‘All designers intend to intervene into the expected course of events by premeditated action. All of them want to avoid mistakes through ignorance and spontaneity. They want to think before they act’ (Rittel 1987, p. 1). In daily life, design draws on individual experience and intuition. When a body of expert knowledge is used, the practice turns into a professional one. Architecture, urban and regional design all involve expertise on multiple facets of the built environment and the intricate factors that determine the course of its development. The way that this professional practice evolves is most precisely articulated in the fields of architecture and urban design. In these fields, design appears to be a process of argumentation oriented towards desirable, valuable spatial change. Design thinking is said to engage with holistic wholes and complex interdependencies among parts, which turns the practice into an exploration of problems by means of imagined solutions (Caliskan 2012; Cross 1990; Hillier and Leaman 1974; Hillier et al. 1972; Moughtin 2003; Schönwandt et al. 2011). Instead of a linear problem-solution path, design argumentation follows one of ‘conjecture and refutation’, as Caliskan (2012) noted, referring to Popper (1957). The building of arguments involves creativity and ingenuity, luck and also doubt (Cross 2004).

To argue for change, a designer imagines design solutions whilst simultaneously imagining the world around him or her. The latter is a process of abstraction that leads to the recognition of ‘types’: simplifications of real, material settings sited

between general, abstract categories and highly specific ones (Caliskan 2012; Hillier and Leaman 1974; Schön 1988). Such simplification is instrumental in design because it enables a designer to take account of matches and mismatches between an imagined design solution and the context within which the solution is expected to perform (Schön 1988). The sorts of conclusions drawn during iterative design processes can be threefold. Firstly, the testing of solutions against types of real-world settings (the ‘design world’, as it is called by Schön (1988, p. 182)) may lead to the modification of a design solution. Secondly, it may also lead to a changing appreciation of this design world: ‘The transaction between familiar type and unique design situation is a metaphorical process, a form of seeing- and doing-as, in which a designer both transforms a design situation and enriches the repertoire of types available to him for further design’ (idem, p. 183). Whatever conclusions there are, they rely on recognition of the interdependence between imagined solutions and perceptions of the environment. A third sort of conclusion or design product is implicit in this recognition of interdependencies—the rules that are deduced from testing the imagined solutions against the types that constitute the design world.

Compared to the literature on architecture and urban design, there is relatively little scholarly writing on *regional* design and thus few notions on communalities between practices. What literature there is, however, suggests that regional design is often situated in a context of spatial planning or, to use the above terminology, a ‘spatial planning world’. Multiple theories and modes of representation from the field are used to explain concrete regional design outcomes and also their less tacit influence on decision-making. The literature shows that regional design is particularly intertwined with what Davoudi et al. (2018) call ‘spatial imaginaries’ (see also Van Duinen 2004). Indeed, the relevance of regional design solutions is frequently explained by references to dimensions of collective spatial concepts or ‘geographic ideas’, for example: the knowledge of spatial development that they imply (Klaasen 2003), the imagery that represents them (De Zwart 2015; Neuman 1996), the concepts, doctrines and discourses that rationalise them (Van Dijk 2011), the planning and governance routines that put them into practice (Balz and Zonneveld 2015; Kempenaar 2017), and the power structures that sustain them (De Jonge 2009). Regional design practices are concerned with highly diverse situations in regions and often refer to multiple dimensions of the spatial imaginaries that underlie the spatial planning frameworks in place. The multiple references that unique practices assemble hinder our understanding of them as one unified approach. However, when grasping regional design practices as a form of rule-building that evolves in the context of preconceived planning frameworks, the following generalisations about the interrelations between regional design and spatial planning become theoretically plausible.

Schön (1988, p. 183) compared design processes to legal procedures: ‘As rules of law are derived from judicial precedents, ... so design rules are derived from types, and may be subjected to test and criticism by reference to them ... [A] designer’s ability to apply a rule correctly depends on familiarity with an underlying type, by reference to which the designer judges whether the rule “fits the case” and fills the inevitable gap between the relatively abstract rule and the concrete context of its application’. This perception of design as rule-testing bears a resemblance to *discretion* that is, in popular terms, ‘the art of suiting action to particular circumstances’ (The Rt Hon Lord Scarman 1981, p. 103), who famously promoted legal discretion in the UK). Discretion, evolving in the context of generally accepted law or regulation, is a search for ‘leeway in the interpretation of fact and the application of precedent to particular cases’ (Booth 2007, p. 129). It aims to improve rules by judging their implications for particular situations. Understanding regional design as a form of discretionary action (proactive and focused on geography) has implications for the role and positioning of the practice in planning decision-making (for an elaboration of the argument, see Balz 2018), in particular its organisational setting within institutionalised decision-making routines.

In design theory, there is an emphasis on the ‘epistemic freedom’ of a designer, which is in the ‘logical or epistemological constraints or rules which would prescribe which of the various meaningful steps to take next’ (Rittel 1987, p. 5). With discretion, the ‘room for interpretation’ that rules provide in the first place—their flexibility—is a central issue because the choices built into rules determine the discretionary nature of local responses. When there are many choices, discretionary action will likely constitute a refinement of rules based on their application to particular situations; when there are few choices, on the other hand, such action will likely challenge rules and call for their revision (Booth 2007). Depending on the number of choices, decision-making likely evolves in the form of policy argumentation, with a strong collaborative rationale, or else in the form of more contentious dispute (Booth 2007; Tewdwr-Jones 1999). When assuming that regional design is a form of discretion, what in design theory is called ‘the relative abstract-ness’ of contextual geographies equally predefines the performance of design practices. The ambiguity of these geographies determines if proposed design solutions are either likely to (1) be deduced from premeditated ideas about the built environment, or (2) uncover new aspects, and thus confront the existing ideas. Scholarly literature indicates that regional design is often a collaborative effort involving experts, planners, politicians and designers (De Jonge 2009; Kempenaar 2017; Van Dijk 2011). These distinctions imply that collaboration differs in the light of given choices or degrees of freedom: it may entail pragmatism, where actors commonly

work to operationalise a shared spatial imaginary, or it may be a form of advocacy where they pursue different ideas about the imaginaries that constitute the existing ‘spatial planning world’ and are thus divided by controversy and conflict.

An equivalence between regional design and discretion not only leads to a distinction in the collaborative rationales of regional design practice, it also brings the different roles of design actors to the foreground, as well as the relations between them. One critical implication of all this lies in the power of the regional design commissioner, the party who frames design tasks and thus provides room for interpretation (or epistemic freedom) in the first place. By formulating problem definitions, policy agendas or design briefs, the commissioner predetermines the outcomes and performance of practices as outlined above. Room for interpretation in preconceived rules also predetermines the relations between commissioners and the ‘authors’ of design proposals—those who engage in the making of design proposals. Whilst in a pragmatic use of regional design both are united by shared spatial imaginaries, they are divided by them in case design is used for advocacy. Last but not least, the equivalence between regional design and discretion implies a need for judgement. In discretion, there is a distinction between discretionary action—the constitution of precedent, or the interpretation of rules on the ground—and discretionary control which is in judging if discretionary action should indeed lead to rule reform. In legal and administrative practice, the quality of discretion is accommodated, like any legitimate rule-building, by transparency and accountability. In organisational terms, distance between a court of appeal and those who seek exemption is essential. Actors need to be free to define objectively whether an imaginary future is a relevant interpretation of fact or an arbitrary fantasy; a precedent to be considered in future planning decisions or a negligible incident.

Above we have explained our perception of regional design as a discretionary planning practice. Below we investigate the implications of this perception by analysing the organisational setting of regional design practices that occurred in the Netherlands between the 1980s, when regional design first appeared as a distinguished discipline in the country and the 2010s. The main focus of this analysis is the constellation of actors involved: those who initiated design practices and formulated briefs or commissions, who engaged in the making of designs and also who judged the outcomes. To provide insight into their motivation for involvement, we also pay brief attention to regional design commissions and products, as well as to the expectations that the practices raised beforehand. For the sake of consistency, this analysis focuses on practices related to Dutch national spatial planning. All the practices chosen involved the national government as a commissioner, advisory and/or court of appeal.

There is widespread recognition that the use of design-led approaches in spatial planning decision-making is relatively mature in the Netherlands (Neuman and Zonneveld 2018). This maturity, reflected in part by the frequent use of practices, allows us to take an institutional perspective on the use of regional design in Dutch national spatial planning. Institutions are ‘social practices that are regularly and continuously repeated, that are linked to defined roles and social relations, that are sanctioned and maintained by social norms, and that have a major significance in the social structure’ (Jessop 2001, p. 1220). Following this definition, we identify practices that gained prominence in Dutch planning discourse over time, were repeated, adopted in formal policies or else have become enshrined in dedicated organisations with distinct roles in regional design practice. This institutional perspective, in conjunction with our perception of regional design as a discretionary planning practice, has led us to identify three particular periods in the use of regional design in Dutch national planning. These are presented below in three separate subsections. Each starts with a brief description of the aspects of spatial planning frameworks that played a role in regional design practices at the time. We then identify the organisational settings of practices that, in our view, set precedents for others to follow. In the final part of each subsection, we discuss the characteristics of those practices and demonstrate institutionalisation.

3.3 Institutionalisation of Regional Design in Dutch National Planning

3.3.1 The 1980s to Late 1990s: Regional Design as Professional Advocacy

Using design-led approaches in planning was not a new phenomenon in the Netherlands in the 1980s. On the contrary, their use built upon a long tradition that can be traced back to the emergence of urban planning during the early twentieth century. When urban planning appeared as a discipline to address the explosive growth of European cities, the Dutch planner and designer Cornelis van Eesteren became a distinguished figure in a Europe-wide debate on where to take the new discipline in the future. As a member (and chairman of the fourth) *Congrès Internationaux d’ Architecture Moderne (CIAM)*, van Eesteren sought to consolidate calls for the realisation of a radical, utopian social program with calls for the consideration of the complexities and evolutionary change of existing cities in planning discourse (Van Rossem 2014). As a Dutch design practitioner, he engaged in making a series of highly influential urban plans—the most famous being the General Extension

Plan (AUP) for Amsterdam—in close collaboration with the more analytically minded Theodoor Karel van Lohuizen (Van der Valk 1990).

Their common work established design as an evidence-informed search for the essence of spatial structures and also as a practice that turns such insights into simple and persuasive guiding planning principles (Van Bergeijk 2015; Van der Valk 1990). Design, as the production of such principles, has become deeply embedded in Dutch planning practice since then. However, it was not until the 1980s that regional design appeared as a particular strand of design, in the context of broad discontent with Dutch national planning (Balz and Zonneveld 2018). The early 1980s were a period of deep economic recession. Planning, which had turned into an overly rigid system largely relying on prohibitive and restrictive land-use regulation, was accused of restricting economic development, specifically by neglecting emerging entrepreneurial, development-led initiatives on the ground. Furthermore, it was perceived to be inward-looking and locked in self-involved procedural complexity. This was because its main emphasis was on administrative reform, expanding the bureaucratic apparatus with projected high costs but unclear benefits (Den Hoed et al. 1983).

The first and most prominent example of regional design initiatives in this period was titled ‘The Netherlands Now as Design’ (*Nederland Nu Als Ontwerp*, NNAO). The initiative, officially launched by the dedicated NNAO Foundation in December 1984, was taken up by individual planning and design professionals. It was also supported by the Dutch town planning institute (*Bond van Nederlandse Stedebouwkundigen*, BNS), a non-governmental organisation called Architecture Museum Foundation (*Stichting Architectuur Museum*), the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (*Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid*, WRR) and an organisation representing Dutch building industries (Van der Cammen 1987). NNAO’s motivation was rooted in unrest surrounding the rigidity and introverted character of Dutch national planning, as outlined above. In particular, it was driven by dissatisfaction regarding the recurring government’s neglect of regionalisation and the impact that had on the different regions and areas (Hemel 2013; Salewski 2012). The NNAO initiative was set up to organise a public exhibition to pillory neglect and was prepared using a carefully staged, three-year design process. In the first instance, robust regional spatial development trends were analysed by experts. In the second instance, these trends were associated with four major political streams (socialism, liberalism, Christian democracy and a self-invented stream developed from trends in technological innovation). The scenario technique was used to illustrate the willingness of political parties to act upon development. In the last instance, these four scenarios were turned into ‘images of the future’ (*toekomstbeelden*), portraying development in national and regional territories as well as 32 so-called design fragments, each imagining the local spatial interventions that the scenarios could lead to (Fig. 3.1). Together these renderings of plausible spatial outcomes, accomplished by experts and professional planners and designers, were to indicate the political weight of planning decisions (De Zwart 2015).

A second prominent regional design initiative that occurred in the 1980s was taken by the EoWijers Foundation, set up in 1985 by members of BNS and the association of Dutch garden and landscape architects (*Bond van Nederlandse Tuin- en Landschapsarchitecten*, BNT), in collaboration with national and provincial planning agencies. The organisation was named after a former director of the National Spatial Planning Agency (*Rijks planologische Dienst*, RPD) who advocated, like the NNAO initiative, the consideration of regional spatial development in planning decision-making by means of design. To develop (and maintain) professional expertise on these matters, from the outset the foundation organised frequent design competitions, generally every three years. Over time, design briefs were formulated to reflect changing tendencies in planning approaches (De Jonge 2008, 2016). The first brief asked designers to identify innovative guiding principles that enhance the characteristic spatial structures of four typologically different Dutch river landscapes whilst simultaneously adapting them to new functions and uses. Its overall aim was similar to that of the NNAO initiative. Regional designs were to bring regionally differentiated, spatial-planning approaches to the foreground by considering spatial development on the ground, and to thus inspire national spatial planning (De Jonge 2009; Eo Wijers Stichting 1986).

In terms of their organisational setting, these two early regional design practices shared a set of characteristics. Both were established by non-governmental actors and both were deliberately placed outside the formal planning apparatus. Their framing, embodied with references to prevailing planning approaches, was self-imposed. Both sought to challenge the rigidity of national planning by advocating more attention to the particularities of regions. Although appealing to different audiences (the general public in the NNAO case, and design and planning professionals in the EoWijers case), the judgement of designs was separated from the framing and conduction of design tasks. Both practices also shared a similar appreciation of design. Van der Cammen (1987, p. 10, our translation), a prominent member of the NNAO organising committee, claimed: ‘Artists bring the unconscious to the conscious and in this way create meaning from the meaningless. Conscious action is ... highly determined by our ability to position behaviour in a cultural-historical perspective which not only includes the past but also the future’. He saw design as a serious effort to create such consciousness, as a base for planning.

A depiction of regional design as an artistic and inspiring practice can also be found in the EoWijers initiative, albeit with a stronger (and growing) emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness in practice (De Jonge 2008).

Advisory boards and individual members of the national government participated in the first regional design initiatives. A more structured engagement of the government came about in the mid-1990s, with an expansion of the scope of its policy to stimulate architecture design. This policy was first introduced in 1991, to enhance the quality of building across the country, nurture public concern about it and enhance the competitiveness of Dutch professional designers in an international context. In 1996 urban design, landscape architecture and infrastructural design were added to the professional practices that were seen to deserve public support (Ministeries van OCW et al. 1996). More ministries became involved and a set of institutes was associated with the policy, among them the Netherlands Architecture Fund (*Stimuleringsfonds voor Architectuur*, SfA). This was founded in 1993 to set out more detailed funding calls and award funds to design proposals and initiatives. The SfA gained much freedom in facilitating the new focus on design at ‘higher levels of scale’ (idem, p. 14). Policy guidelines merely indicated that fundable practices had to address the ‘cultural dimension’ of the built environment, ‘spatial quality’ and stimulate a diversification of approaches on the grounds of regionalisation, decentralisation and policy-sector integration. Funding was linked to a few substantive design tasks (e.g. the integration of infrastructure, natural and urban development). Above all it was to stimulate the reflexive capacity of design, by means of exhibitions, competitions and publications. The NNAO was mentioned as an inspiration for this approach to the building of critical stances towards planning. It was noted that similar practices are difficult to forecast, due to the creative nature of the design. The policy agenda was deliberately kept broad to ‘create room for new opinions and ideas’ (idem, p. 18, our translation). Design was to ‘mobilise thinking capacity’ so ‘to enhance policy-making later on’ (Ministeries van OCW et al. 1996, p. 18, our translation). In a review of the impact of these early policies, the Netherlands Institute for City Innovation Studies (NICIS) noted: ‘In fact, a policy of “soft institutionalism” ... was used which—mostly unintentionally—has increased not only the quality, but also the competitiveness of the industry’ (Stegmeijer et al. 2012, p. 55, our translation). Policies were seen to have enhanced design expertise on the ‘supply side’ as well as the quality of commissions and the ‘demand for such expertise’ (idem).




Fig. 3.1 The Netherlands Now As Design (NNAO): scenarios discussing the impact of societal trends on the spatial development of the Netherlands, from Collection Het Nieuwe Instituut/NNAO, by (from left to right) H. de Boer and T. Koolhaas (Dynamisch scenario), H. Bakker and W. Hartman (Kritisch scenario) and J. Heeling, H. Bekkering and H. Lörzing (Zorgvuldig scenario)

3.3.2 Early to Mid-2000s: Regional Design as a Governance Practice

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, planning approaches in the Netherlands, as in other European countries, shifted as a result of the increasing importance of regions in the liberalising European market economy. Upcoming approaches moved attention away from the planning of formally bounded territories towards the planning of regional spatial networks that stretched across multiple, multi-scalar administrative boundaries. As in other European countries, decentralisation became a

more prominent issue in Dutch national planning, resulting in an enhanced appreciation of regional governance (Hajer and Zonneveld 2000; Salet 2006; Salet and Woltjer 2009). To facilitate change the earlier, narrowly defined spatial-planning frameworks were expanded in both their spatial and organisational scope (Balz and Zonneveld 2018). In response to these changes, subnational governments started to form partnerships, on a voluntary basis at first. As will be shown below, some of these became engaged in regional design, thus triggering the emergence of a new generation of practices.

The first Dutch regional design practice that reflected these new planning approaches emerged in the mid-1990s and was concerned about the Randstad region. It was initiated in academic circles when a group of professors at the universities in Delft and Amsterdam set up a discussion platform to denounce the neglect of regional spatial development in national spatial planning once more. The discussion, called The Metropolitan Debate (*Het Metropolitane Debat*, HMD), was led by means of design proposals, largely undertaken by students within design studios at universities (Frieling 1998). The proposals exemplified desirable futures for the region, promoting in particular the integration of urban and open land as well as internationalisation. On the HMD platform, the proposals were used to challenge the rigidity of national planning and also to discuss alternative governance-led approaches. As with earlier initiatives, the HMD sought a broad, public outreach: ideas were debated not only within academia but also in the public arena. Beyond that, planners and politicians at subnational levels became a targeted audience, in an attempt to create broader organisational support for the novel ideas about spatial development and planning. Frieling (2002, p. 494 ff), a key figure in the HMD initiative, noted retrospectively: 'The designs made ... expectations visible, publicly debatable and subject to planning and decisions on investment priorities'. He emphasised that these designs were made not only to foster the consideration of spatial development in planning and politics but also to 'forge societal alliances' (Frieling 2002). In 1998, after two years of lobbying efforts, a group of local governments in the Randstad embraced one of the designs, called the Delta Metropolis (*Deltametropool*) and presented the idea to national government as a much-needed alternative for the long-lived Randstad/Green Heart doctrine (Van Duinen 2015). They used the proposal to call for more sector integration in the national planning for the Randstad region and also to advocate their greater autonomy in spatial planning.

In the same year, 1998, the co-operation that had emerged around the Delta Metropolis design was consolidated in the Delta Metropolis Association (*Vereniging Deltametropool*, VDM, an organisation still existent at the time of writing) (Vereniging Deltametropool 1998). In 2001, the Delta Metropolis was adopted by the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (*Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordeningen het Milieu*, VROM). It became one of the national 'urban network' territories that the Fifth report on spatial planning—a new national plan then in the making—had laid out in order to facilitate regionalisation and regional governance (Ministerie van VROM and Rijksplanologische Dienst 2001). Possibly inspired by this precedent, at least four practices resembling the Delta Metropolis then emerged from 2002 onwards: Studio IJmeer 2030+, conducted between 2003 and 2006 and concerned with integrated spatial development in the greater Amsterdam region (Koolhaas and Marcusse 2006); the Arnhem-Nijmegen Node project, concluded in 2003 and considering such integration around the two eastern Dutch cities of Arnhem and Nijmegen (Urban Unlimited 2003); the Design Studio Brabant City, dedicated to development around Den Bosch, Eindhoven, Breda and Tilburg (Bosch Slabbers 2007); and the Studio South Wing, conducted between 2005 and 2007 and concerned with a region approximating the highly urbanised part of the South Holland province (Fig. 3.2) (Atelier Zuidvleugel 2008).

When considering their organisational setting, these four successive regional design practices shared characteristics with their Delta Metropolis precedent. Most remarkable is the strong involvement of coalitions of subnational governments in practices. Design products were created during collaborative processes, led by one or several design professionals, and involved a broad array of experts, politicians, planners, market parties and civil organisations in 'design dialogues' (De Jonge 2009, p. 180). The 'studio' setting, facilitating communication and exchange between participating actors during workshops, excursions and panel debates, became a common format. Communalities between practices are also found in their shared main expectation. The capacity of regional design to 'forge societal alliances', to contribute to effective regional governance, became a key proposition (Balz and Zonneveld 2015). The brief to the Studio South Wing expressed this expectation in an exemplary way: 'The studio is a machine to make an inventory of the relevant projects, plans and programs on local, regional and supra-regional levels of scale; to denominate the relations among these (horizontal); to define nodes and gaps; to distil a hierarchy from this (vertical)' (Provincie Zuid-Holland 2004, p. 2, our translation).

However, an examination of their organisational set-up also highlights the differences between the Delta Metropolis regional design practice and its successors. As already mentioned, the Delta Metropolis design proposal became an 'urban

network' of national importance in the fifth Dutch national spatial plan. Besides the Delta Metropolis, the plan had identified a range of other such networks across the country, calling upon local governments to develop regional project and strategy proposals to foster integrated regional spatial development. Subnational governments were expected to act in unity and to coordinate their plans and actions (Balz and Zonneveld 2018). The later regional design practices mentioned above were a response to this open call. Governance arrangements adopted the broad national urban-network agenda, as is evident from the many references to the concept in design briefs. Regional design was used to reflect on how this agenda could best be operationalised in the light of the particularities of each region. These practices thus had a different relationship with Dutch national spatial planning in comparison with the Delta Metropolis design approach. As we have seen, this approach challenged the rigid dichotomy between a (red) Randstad and a Green Heart. The later practices sought the refinement of a national spatial plan that was more flexible. Consequently, the role of the national government changed. The national government was an addressee of criticism in the Delta Metropolis regional design practice. Through framing the later design initiatives with its soft urban-network concept, it became also a commissioner in these, albeit in an indirect way. The national government's engagement in regional design practice was predominantly informal. However, as the Ministry of VROM was a co-funding body of practices and/or a member of the boards that advised and supervised them, in some cases engagement also took more formal shapes.

When comparing this new generation of regional design practices to the earlier ones, which we called 'professional advocacy', a clear shift towards pragmatism is their common characteristic. The examples show that regional design practice started to play a more important role in the implementation of Dutch national planning policies. This tendency was also reflected in revisions of the architecture policy mentioned earlier. The third version of the policy, published in 2000 and entitled 'Designing the Netherlands', had already identified ten 'large projects' that were to be explored by means of design (Ministeries van OCW et al. 2000). Among those projects with a regional scope, one was concerned with the impact of a future international rail connection, another one with increasing the aesthetics of highway infrastructure, and a third one with developing the cultural-historical landscape around the Dutch Water Line, a former military defence (for a review of this national project, see Luiten 2011). Furthermore, the Delta Metropolis had become a 'large project' that was to be explored through design. For this purpose, a coalition of ministries set up their own design studio called the Delta Metropolis Design Studio (*Ontwerpatelier Deltametropool*) (Ministerie van VROM 2003). Four well-known design professionals were invited to engage in a search for the identity of the Randstad region, its 'unity in diversity' and also to reflect on the role of regional design in spatial planning.

In the fourth revision of the architecture policies, published in 2005 (Ministeries van OCW et al. 2005), the relationship between 'fundable' design practice and national planning became even stronger and more formalised. The new policy note was published not as a stand-alone document but as an extension of the National Spatial Strategy, a 2006 revision of the Fifth report by a new government of a more centre-right political colour (Ministeries van VROM et al. 2006; see also Zonneveld and Evers 2014). Under the header 'an action program', funding for design practice was thoroughly linked to the implementation of this plan. Of the ten 'large projects' few were maintained. Projects that were added were more strongly associated with ongoing national policies, most importantly the Belvedere policy which targeted cultural heritage, and the Room for the River programme (*Ruimte voor de Rivier*) (for an analysis of this programme see Rijke et al. 2012). Fundable design was now to be engaged with 'best practice' in the application of these policies and programmes, often within clearly predefined project boundaries. The assessment of funding also became more regulated. The note criticised the way earlier design funding schemes were evaluated and judging the success of future design practices became an obligatory part of assessing national spatial planning (Stegmeijer et al. 2012). A particular trajectory, entitled 'Elaborating professional commissioning', was set up to investigate effective organisational formats in design practice. An independent board advising the national government on architecture policies was enlarged, where previously the Chief Government Architect of the Netherlands (*Rijksbouwmeester*) had fulfilled this task on his own. In 2005, the Board of Government Advisors (*College van Rijksadviseurs*, CRA) was established, adding two professionals with expertise in landscape architecture and infrastructure design, respectively. Altogether expectations regarding the contribution of design to national planning changed: whereas it was initially seen as an approach that inspires planning by means of constructive criticism, the 2005 action programme portrayed it as an approach that first and foremost enhances the efficiency of national planning.




Fig. 3.2 Studio South Wing: scenarios discussing the impact of regional planning agendas on transit-oriented development in the South of the Dutch Randstad region, from Atelier Zuidvleugel (2006)

3.3.3 The 2010s: Regional Design as a Governmental Practice

Whilst the early 2000s produced a strong emphasis on collaborative spatial planning in the Netherlands, from the mid-2000s onward, enthusiasm for involving subnational government in national planning diminished. The National Spatial Strategy published in 2006 indicated the further decentralisation of planning tasks and responsibilities, though not through greater co-operation between levels of government, but rather by minimising the involvement of national government in regional planning. The national planning agenda was slimmed down too, in particular through a diminishing interest in ‘spatial quality’. Integration and simplification of national sector policies had to be facilitated by combining ministry strategies and merging their organisation. Planning instruments were also sorted out. Under the purview of this plan and its successor—the 2012 National Policy Strategy (Ministerie van I&M 2012)—direct investment into (largely infrastructure) projects became virtually the sole spatial planning tool (Needham 2015). This had a particular impact on regional design practice.

The Long-Term Program for Infrastructure, Transportation and Spatial Development (MIRT) is dedicated to the distribution of the Dutch Infrastructure fund (*Infrastructuur fonds*) and the implementation of nationally funded infrastructure projects. Since 2008, it has been revised several times (for an analysis of this process Van Geet et al. 2019). In 2008, it became compulsory to consider the spatial impact of new infrastructure, thus in fact turning MIRT projects into integrated area-development projects. In 2010, the MIRT ‘rules of the game’ were adjusted, with strong implications for the role and position of regional design in Dutch national planning: it became mandatory to employ the practice during early stages of decision-making (Ministerie van I&M 2010). The adoption of design in the highly regulated MIRT procedure had an efficiency rationale regarding the length and complexity of decision-making. The expectation was that design would help to identify proactively the multiple effects of infrastructure change, to identify potential conflicts early on and thus to avoid delays due to ongoing political discussions and battles in judicial courts at later implementation stages. Commenting on the new position of regional design in the MIRT procedure, the then acting Director-General for National Spatial Planning noted that ‘the complicated decision-making process had run aground because certain things had been overlooked in the early stages of planning. ... [If] you don’t do your homework beforehand you’ll have trouble through the whole planning process’ (Blank et al. 2009, p. 29). Shortly after becoming an obligation, a manual for regional design practice was published by the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment (*Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, I&M*), successor of the former ministries of VROM and Transport and Water (*Verkeer en Waterstaat, V&W*) (Enno Zuidema Stedebouw et al. 2011). It contained detailed instructions on how to use design for different purposes during MIRT procedures. These included the refinement of problem definitions, the identification of preferred solutions as well as the investigation of their spatial and organisational implications. Prescriptions were meant to help funding applicants—usually governance arrangements in predefined so-called MIRT regions—in defining how design will be used during decision-making since it had become compulsory to indicate such use in bids.


Examples of regional design practices under the MIRT programme include Spatial Models SMASH 2040 (*Ruimtelijke Modellen SMASH 2040*), conducted in 2012 and discussing alternative infrastructure solutions for the Amsterdam-Schiphol

Airport-Haarlemmermeer region (Fig. 3.3) (Zandbelt and Van den Berg 2012) and the 2017 MIRT study Accessibility Rotterdam The Hague (*Bereikbaarheid Rotterdam Den Haag*) which elaborated preferred infrastructure change in the Metropolitan Region The Hague-Rotterdam (MRDH) (De Zwarte Hond et al. 2017). The role of the national government differed in these two practices. In the SMASH design practice, it was the sole commissioner because its corresponding territory was projected to become the subject of a national structural vision. The study into MRDH, which lacked this status, was commissioned by the Ministry of I&M in collaboration with governance arrangements in the South of the Randstad. There were similarities in their briefs that included, next to MIRT objectives, multiple references to relevant operational sector policies of both national and subnational government. The design processes also exhibited resemblances. Led by individual design professionals, they involved experts, different ministries, subnational governments, private and civil actors in workshops, expert sessions, panel discussions and also surveys. Their aim was to prepare for Administrative Consultation MIRT (*Bestuurlijk Overleg*, BO MIRT) where the Ministry of I&M, who until 2017 held the sole responsibility for the distribution of the Infrastructure Fund, was to judge the outcomes.

The Ministry of I&M thus embraced regional design as a practice that can help to speed up the implementation of national projects, formalising it under the MIRT programme in 2010. In the same period, the ministry followed a similar rationale when becoming engaged with the International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam (IABR). Since its first edition in 2003, the IABR has been funded by the Sfa. The fifth edition, entitled 'Making Cities', had a particular interest in the implementation of design proposals, especially by means of collaborative and participatory planning (Brugmans and Petersen 2012). Next to projects that illustrated tacit outcomes of such approaches on 'test sites' in Brazil, Turkey and the Netherlands, its programme incorporated a distinct branch called Studio Making Projects (*Atelier Making Projects*). The studio was initiated and programmed by the Ministry of I&M, in collaboration with the IABR curators (among them the Director-General for National Spatial Planning). Seven projects were selected for elaboration, all tied in with ongoing national policies. Ministries, other actors with a stake in the projects and design studio supervisors (the latter acting on behalf of the IABR) all became co-commissioners of the professionals selected to develop design proposals for these projects (Boeijenga et al. 2013). The organisational structure around the studio was complicated and deliberately diffuse. The IABR catalogue explained that such diffusion was necessary to meet the twofold objective of the biennale: to enhance the implementation of projects and, at the same time, appeal to broader research and public interest. The explanation concluded: 'So not just double commissioners but also—deliberately—double hats. Welcome to the world of Making Projects, because this will increasingly be the way things are done. Fewer and fewer projects will exist just because they have been started; we can no longer afford to do so. Changing coalitions, connecting interests and joining forces are all part of making a project' (Brugmans and Petersen 2012, p. 42).

The aforementioned regional design practices vary, especially when considering their addressees: a formally appointed commission to judge infrastructure project proposals in the case of MIRT regional design practices, exhibition curators and a critical public audience in the case of the IABR design studios. Their main similarity is the firm position that the Ministry of I&M took as a regional design commissioner, next to its role in 'courts of appeal'. Funding for regional design practices via the architecture policy was reduced at the same time: the production of art should comply more with market mechanisms in the future it was argued (Ministerie van OCW 2011). In 2012, the Sfa was merged with other public institutes in the cultural sector to form the Creative Industries Fund NL. In the same year, a new update of the architecture policy was published (Ministeries van I&M et al. 2012). Fundable design efforts were to contribute to the implementation of a national vision on the preservation of cultural heritage, the quality of decision-making in MIRT procedures and the implementation of innovative projects by means of design dialogues under the framework of IABR. A brief paragraph summarised expectations on the performance of funded regional design practices. They were associated with the creation of spatial quality and added societal and economic value as well as innovation. At the same time, they were also expected to deliver a 'better, faster and therefore cheaper process' (idem, p. 9).

Fig. 3.3 Spatial Models SMASH 2040: scenarios discussing interrelations between national infrastructure projects and policies by decentral governments in the Amsterdam-Schiphol Airport-Haarlemmermeer region, from Zandbelt and Van den Berg (2012)



3.4 Discussion

In theory, regional design appears to be testing how imagined local solutions for problems caused by autonomous regional spatial developments can function within a world of planning that is composed of geographic ideas, spatial imaginaries and spatial concepts. Above it was argued that in this testing regional design functions as a form of discretion: it aims to improve planning rules by judging their implications for particular situations. It was further argued that, when employing regional design as a form of discretion in spatial planning, the involvement of actors requires scrutiny: a distinction and distance between those actors who initiate practices, conduct design, and judge the quality and relevance of design outcomes for the revision of rules is essential, as in any other form of legitimate and accountable rule-building. Drawing upon this argument, the organisational setting of regional design in Dutch national planning between the 1980s and the 2010s was analysed, as well as its institutionalisation through repetitive use and formalisation in policies and organisations.

The results of the analysis show that the Dutch national government has become increasingly caught up in regional design practice, during three, at times overlapping, stages. When in the 1980s regional design emerged as a distinct discipline within spatial planning, it was professional designers and planners who first used the practice to challenge Dutch national planning. Supported by their long-established professional associations and policy advisory institutes (operating on behalf of but separately from government), they called upon the public to help them express their discontent about national planning. Although the national government was criticised, it embraced the approach via its architecture policies and channelled grants towards design as a critical reflection on governmental planning.

Distance between professional and governmental realms diminished when decentralisation and governance became prime issues in Dutch national planning. In the mid-1990s, the Delta Metropolis design practice was the first to involve subnational government in the making of a regional design proposal. By adopting the practice as a precedent, the Ministry of VROM gave rise to a generation of comparable practices. The 'design studio' emerged as a format for collaboration, engaging a multitude of actors from different levels and sectors of government and civil and private organisations in the setting out of regional design tasks, the making of designs and judgement of their implications. The national government still had one distinct role in the Delta Metropolis practice, namely to act as a kind of court to which lower levels of government could appeal. From the mid-2000s onwards, it diversified its engagement with the design studios. It remained an important judge, but also started to participate in the framing and running of design practices in particular via its 'urban network concept' policy.

During a third stage, it strengthened its role as a regional design commissioner. From 2000 onwards, funding for regional design practice became ever more tied to projects of national importance, which themselves became increasingly refined in terms of their scale and scope. In 2010, regional design became a mandatory practice in the highly regulated MIRT programme. Two years later the Ministry of I&M became an important commissioner of regional design at the International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam. In the same year, funding for regional design became dedicated to these two national programmes. Subnational government remained involved in the production of designs; however, its role became largely confined to that of a co-designer.

Above, it was noted that the 'room for interpretation' that rules provide in the first place is important for discretion because the choices built into the rules determine if discretionary action is likely to be a refinement of the rules or a challenge to them. It was argued that a similar distinction can be applied to regional design practices. Depending on the ambiguity of premediated spatial imaginaries, they tend to evolve either as a form of advocacy or else play a pragmatic role in their operationalisation. Our empirical analysis based on this distinction reveals that since the early 2000s the national government developed a preference for a pragmatic, instrumental use of regional design for planning decision-making. This is reflected in attempts to unite actors under the umbrella of nationally important projects. It is also reflected in expectations about the performances of regional design. Design was first primarily understood as an artistic and inspiring practice that builds a cultural understanding of regional spatial planning and unleashes 'thinking capacity'. Implementation could come later on, it was argued. During later stages, regional design was expected to perform as a form of territorial management above all, aiming at the formation of societal alliances, the acquisition of organisational capacity, the speeding up of decision-making and, in this way, the reduction of the costs of non-coordination. To employ regional design for pragmatic reasons is certainly a legitimate choice. However, criticism regarding the institutionalisation of regional design in Dutch national planning can also be raised.

One such criticism concerns the re-occurring actor constellations in regional design practices. In any use of regional design, a distance between actors with different roles is required to enhance legitimacy and accountability. When used in the operationalisation of planning, design commissioners and designers are bound by their agreement on a preconceived design task. Discretionary control gains importance in considering, for instance, the implications of conflicts that regional design can bring to the foreground. By occupying a strong role in both the formulation of design tasks and the judgement of design outcomes, the national government has refrained from being truly open to critique.

A second criticism concerns the overly high expectations about the performance of regional design. A pragmatic use of regional design focuses on easing the implementation of national projects, as noted above. However, pre-existing performance expectations were not dropped when the use of regional design in Dutch national planning changed: in a highly pragmatic setting shaped by the commissions and actor constellations described above, design also remained to be seen as an adventurous and inventive practice that can bear unexpected and inspiring results.

A final criticism concerns public support for regional design practice, particularly as provided via the national government's architecture policy. This policy was first dedicated to the creation of a critical spatial planning audience. The nurturing of what was early on called a 'cultural-historic perspective' on planning, or a broader awareness of 'spatial qualities', has faded away into the background—a rather unfortunate development.

3.5 Conclusions

In the introduction to this chapter, it was argued that regional design, through its close resemblance to discretion, may contribute to territorial synchrony: an alignment between societal processes that produce problems and opportunities in particular situations, politico-administrative structures that effectively and efficiently address these problems and opportunities, and cultural adherences that explain the appropriateness of action through shared knowledge and understanding. The analysis presented here indicates that Dutch national government has, to some extent at least, shared our argument: that regional design practice can help to fill the institutional void that results from a lack of synchrony. It employed regional design for an enhanced understanding of its planning implications on the ground, in both cultural and practical terms. Over time, it used practices to enhance understanding of its planning—to create a conscious and critical public that appreciates it. The Dutch government also used regional design practices to accelerate efficiency and effectiveness. When assuming that regional design can indeed assist territorial synchrony, not just in the Netherlands but also elsewhere, a more sophisticated understanding of its performance in spatial planning and territorial governance is required.

Our analysis reflects a particular perspective on regional design: design forms a discretionary practice that assists planning decision-making. Taken from this perspective, two uses of regional design should be distinguished, each with different outcomes: design can be used as expertise that translates a holistic understanding of spatial development and planning into comprehensive, refined planning action on the ground, or it can be used as a more adventurous practice that challenges planning frameworks with unexpected results and surprises and thus expands existing planning frameworks. In theory, these two uses and their outcomes are highly dependent on the choices or 'room for interpretation' that are provided beforehand. Choices predefine the different uses. They also influence the type of collaboration in design practice.

The conceptualisation of regional design as discretionary action emphasises an institutional perspective on practice. This means that actor constellations come to the foreground as an important determinant of the quality of regional design. Distance between those who formulate designs (including the design commissioner, as we have argued) and those who judge the relevance of design outcomes for the revision of rules and norms is particularly required in order to create the legitimacy and accountability of rule-building. In governance and planning theory, there is a distinction between governance that follows a collaborative rationale, based on the appreciation of a broad involvement of actors ('good governance'), and governance that is oriented towards the resolution of real problems on the ground. The latter rationale requires strategic selectivity which in turn often incites conflict, overly pragmatic behaviour and political hidden agendas regarding the rules and norms on which plans are based. Regional design, providing there is distance between actors who pursue different roles in practices, can function as a powerful tool to connect these two governance domains. A precondition for its contribution to territorial synchrony is recognition of the tensions that exist between these domains.

References

- Allmendinger P, Haughton G (2010) Spatial planning, devolution, and new planning spaces. *Environ Plan C: Gov Policy* 28(5):803–818
- Atelier Zuidvleugel (2006) Ruimte en Lijn: Ruimtelijke Verkenning Stedenbaan 2010–2020 [Spatial survey city line]. Den Haag, Provincie Zuid-Holland
- Atelier Zuidvleugel (2008) Netwerken in Zuidelijk Holland: 1000 Dagen Atelier Zuidvleugel [Networks in Southern Holland. 1000 days of Studio South Wing]. Den Haag, Provincie Zuid-Holland
- Bakker H, Hartman W (1987) Kritisch scenario. Nationaal Ontwerp Nieuw Nederland. Onderwerp van Ontwerp [The New Netherlands. An Object of Design]. Stichting Nederland Nu als Ontwerp, Staatsuitgeverij's Gravenhage, Den Haag
- Balz VE (2018) Regional design: discretionary approaches to regional planning in The Netherlands. *Plan Theory* 17(3):332–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095217721280>
- Balz VE, Zonneveld WAM (2015) Regional design in the context of fragmented territorial governance: South Wing Studio. *Eur Plan Stud* 23(5):871–891. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2014.889662>
- Balz V, Zonneveld W (2018) Transformations of planning rationales: changing spaces for governance in recent Dutch national planning. *Plan Theory Pract* 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2018.1478117>
- Blank H, Van Boheemen Y, Bouw M, Brouwer J, Feddes Y, Van Hees J, Hendriks M, Petersen JW, Wierenga E (eds) (2009) *Ontwerpen aan Randstad 2040/Designing Randstad 2040, Design and Politics #2* (vol 2). Uitgeverij 010, Rotterdam
- Boeijenga J, Gerretsen P, Wierenga E (eds) (2013) *Nederland Projectenland/The Netherlands in Projects, Design and Politics #7*. 010 Publishers, Rotterdam
- Booth P (2007) The control of discretion: planning and the common-law tradition. *Plan Theory* 6(2):127–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095207077585>
- Bosch Slabbers (ed) (2007) *BrabantStad Mozaïek Metropool* [Brabant City Mosaic Metropolis]. 's-Hertogenbosch, Programmabureau BrabantStad
- Brugmans G, Petersen JW (eds) (2012) *Making city*. 5th IABR 2012. Catalog International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam. International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam, Rotterdam
- Caliskan O (2012) Design thinking in urbanism: learning from the designers. *Urban Des Int* 17(4):272–296
- Cross N (1990) The nature and nurture of design ability. *Des Stud* 11(3):127–140. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(90\)90002-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(90)90002-T)
- Cross N (2004) Expertise in design: an overview. *Design Stud* 25(5): 427–441. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2004.06.002>
- Davoudi S, Crawford J, Raynor R, Reid B, Sykes O, Shaw D (2018) Spatial imaginaries: tyrannies or transformations? *Town Plan Rev* 89(2):97–124. <https://doi.org/10.3828/tpv.2018.7>
- De Boer H, Koolhaas T (1987) *Dynamisch Scenario*. Nationaal Ontwerp Nieuw Nederland. Onderwerp van Ontwerp [The New Netherlands. An object of design]. Stichting Nederland Nu als Ontwerp, Staatsuitgeverij's Gravenhage, Den Haag
- De Jonge J (2008) *Een kwart eeuw Eo Wijers*-stichting. Ontwerpprijsvraag als katalysator voor gebiedsontwikkeling [A quarter century of Eo-Wijers Foundation: design competition as a catalyzer for area development]. Gouda
- De Jonge J (2009) *Landscape architecture between politics and science*. An integrative perspective on landscape planning and design in the network society. Doctoral dissertation, Wageningen University, Wageningen
- De Jonge J (2016) *Ontwerpen in de regio* [Designing the region]. The Hague
- De Vries J, Zonneveld W (2018) Urban transformation in the Northern Randstad: how institutions structure planning practice. In: Salet W (ed) *The Routledge handbook of institutions and planning in action*. Routledge, Abingdon, pp 364–377
- De Zwart B (2015) *Republiek van Beelden*. De Politieke Werkingen van het Ontwerp in Regionale Planvorming [The Republic of images: the political performance of design in regional planning]. Doctoral thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Eindhoven
- De Zwarte Hond, Goudappel Coffeng, Rebel, Touw (2017) *Eindrapport analyse- en oplossingsrichtingenfase MIRT-onderzoek Bereikbaarheid Rotterdam Den Haag* [Final report study phase MIRT-research Accessibility Rotterdam The Hague]. Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu, Den Haag
- Den Hoed P, Salet WGM, Van der Sluijs H (1983) *Planning als Onderneming* [Planning as enterprise]. Staatsuitgeverij, The Hague
- Enno Zuidema Stedebouw, Studio Platz, veenenbos en bosch landschapsarchitecten, ECORYS Communicatie (2011) *Ontwerpen in het MIRT* [Designing in the context of MIRT]. Den Haag
- Eo Wijers Stichting (1986) *Nederland Rivierenland* [The Netherlands - River Land]. The Hague. Retrieved from Juryrapport [1st Eo Wijers competition, report of the jury]: <http://www.eowijers.nl>
- Frieling D (1998) *Het Metropolitane Debat* [The metropolitan debate]. THOTH, Bussum
- Frieling D (2002) Design in strategy. In: De Jong TM, Van der Voordt DJM (eds) *Ways to study and research*. Urban, architectural and technical design. Delft University Press, Delft, pp 491–500
- Hajer M (2003) Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy Sci* 36(2):175–195. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1024834510939>
- Hajer M, Zonneveld W (2000) Spatial planning in the network society: rethinking the principles of planning in The Netherlands. *Eur Plan Stud* 8(3):337–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713666411>
- Heeling J, Bekkering H, Lörzing H (1987) *Zorgvuldig scenario*. Nationaal Ontwerp Nieuw Nederland. Onderwerp van Ontwerp [The New Netherlands. An object of design]. Stichting Nederland Nu als Ontwerp, Staatsuitgeverij's Gravenhage, Den Haag
- Hemel Z (2013) *Nederland als Ontwerp* [The Netherlands as design]. In: Brouwer P, Hemel Z, Oxenaar A, Van Rossem V, Stissi V (eds) *Liber Amicorum Manfred Bock*. Cuypersgenootschap, Druuten
- Hillier B, Leaman A (1974) How is design possible? *J Arch Plan Res* 3(1):4–11
- Hillier B, Musgrove J, O'Sullivan P (1972) Knowledge and design. *Environ Design: Res Pract* 2:3–1
- Jessop B (2001) Institutional returns and the strategic—relational approach. *Environ Plan A* 33(7):1213–1235
- Kempenaar A (2017) *Design in the planning arena*. How regional designing influences strategic spatial planning. Doctoral thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen

- Klaasen IT (2003) Knowledge-based design: developing urban & regional design into a science. Doctoral thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft
- Koolhaas T, Marcusse E (2006) *Atelier Ijmeer 2030+*. Amsterdam Ijmeer Almere [Studio Ijmeer 2030+. Amsterdam Ijmeer Almere]. Uitgeverij 010, Rotterdam
- Lawson B (2009) *Design expertise*. Architectural Press, Oxon/New York
- Luiten E (2011) Gereanimeerd erfgoed: Nationaal project Nieuwe Hollandse Waterlinie als format voor het landschapsbeleid [Reanimated heritage: the national project New Dutch Water Line as a format for landscape planning]. *Bull KNOB* 110(6):223–230
- Ministerie van VROM (2003) *Ontwerpatelier Deltametropool* [Design studio delta metropolis]. Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (VROM), Den Haag
- Ministerie van I&M (2010) *Handreiking MIRT-Verkenning* [Manual for decision-making in MIRT procedures]. Projectdirectie Sneller & Beter, The Hague
- Ministerie van OCW (2011) *Meer dan Kwaliteit: Een Nieuwe Visie op Cultuurbeleid* [Vision on cultural policy]. Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap (OCW), Den Haag
- Ministerie van I&M (2012) *Structuurvisie Infrastructuur en Ruimte: Nederland Concurrent, Bereikbaar, Leefbaar en Veilig* [National policy strategy for infrastructure and spatial planning]. Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu (I&M), The Hague
- Ministerie van VROM, Rijksplanologische Dienst (2001) *Ruimte Maken, Ruimte Delen: Vijfde Nota over de Ruimtelijke Ordening 2000/2020*. Vastgesteld door de Ministerraad op 15 December 2000 [Fifth report on spatial planning]. Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (VROM), The Hague
- Ministeries van I&M, OCW, BZK, EZ, Def. (2012) *Werken aan Ontwerpkraft. Actieagenda Architectuur en Ruimtelijk Ontwerp 2013–2016* [Working on the power of design. Action agenda architecture and spatial design 2013–2016]. Ministeries van Infrastructuur en Milieu (I&M), Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap (OCW), Binnenlandse Zaken en Koningsrelaties (BZK), Economische Zaken (EZ) en Defensie (Def), The Hague
- Ministeries van OCW, VROM, LNV, V&W (1996) *De Architectuur van de Ruimte. Nota over het Architectuurbeleid 1997–2000* [The architecture of the built environment. Note on the architecture policy 1997–2000]. Ministeries van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschappen (OCW), Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (VROM), Landbouw Natuurbeheer en Visserij (LNV) en Verkeer en Waterstaat (V&W), Den Haag
- Ministeries van OCW, VROM, V&W, LNV (2000) *Ontwerpen aan Nederland. Architectuurbeleid 2001–2004* [Designing The Netherlands. Architecture policy 2001–2004]. Sdu Uitgevers, Den Haag
- Ministeries van OCW, VROM, LNV, V&W, EZ, Def, BZ (2005) *Actieprogramma Ruimte en Cultuur. Architectuur- en Belvederebeleid 2005–2008* [Action programme the built environment and culture. Architecture and belvedere policy 2005–2008]. Ministeries van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschappen (OCW), Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (VROM), Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij (LNV), Verkeer en Waterstaat (V&W), Economische Zaken (EZ), Defensie (Def) en Buitenlandse Zaken (BZ), Den Haag
- Ministeries van VROM, LNV, V&W, EZ (2006) *Nota Ruimte, Deel 4: Tekst naar parlementaire instemming* [National Spatial Strategy, after parliamentary approval]. Ministeries van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (VROM), Landbouw Natuur en Voedselkwaliteit (LNV), Verkeer en Waterstaat (V&W) en Economische Zaken (EZ), Den Haag
- Moughtin C (2003) *Urban design: method and techniques*. Routledge
- Needham B (2015) *The National Spatial Strategy for The Netherlands*. In: Knaap G-J, Nedovic-Budic Z, Carbonell A (eds) *Planning for States and Nation-States in the U.S. and Europe*. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge
- Neuman M (1996) *Images as institution builders: metropolitan planning in Madrid*. *Eur Plan Stud* 4(3):293–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654319608720347>
- Neuman M, Zonneveld W (2018) *The resurgence of regional design*. *Eur Plan Stud* 26(7):1297–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2018.1464127>
- Popper K (1957) *Science: conjectures and refutations*. In: Mace CA (ed) *British philosophy in mid-century*. George Allen and Unwin, London
- Provincie Zuid-Holland (2004) *Ontwerpatelier Zuid-Holland/Zuidvleugel* [Informal discussion note]. Provincie Zuid-Holland, Den Haag
- Rijke J, Van Herk S, Zevenbergen C, Ashley R (2012) *Room for the river: delivering integrated river basin management in The Netherlands*. *Int J River Basin Manag* 10(4): 369–382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15715124.2012.739173>
- Rittel HWJ (1987) *The reasoning of designers*. University of California, Berkeley
- Salet W (2006) *Rescaling territorial governance in the Randstad Holland: the responsiveness of spatial and institutional strategies to changing socio-economic interactions*. *Eur Plan Stud* 14(7):959–978. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310500496396>
- Salet J, Woltjer J (2009) *New concepts of strategic spatial planning: dilemmas in the Dutch Randstad region*. *Int J Public Sector Manag* 22(3): 235–248
- Salewski C (2012) *Dutch New Worlds. Scenario's in de Stedenbouw en Ruimtelijke Ordening in Nederland, 1970–2000* [Dutch New Worlds: scenarios in urbanism and spatial planning in The Netherlands, 1970–2000]. 010 Publishers, Rotterdam
- Schön DA (1988) *Designing: rules, types and words*. *Des Stud* 9(3):181–190. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(88\)90047-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(88)90047-6)
- Schönwandt WL, Hemberger C, Grunau JP, Voermanek K, von der Weth R, Saifouline R (2011) *The art of problem-solving—design and evaluation of a training program in solving complex planning problems*. *disP—Plan Rev* 47(185):14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02513625.2011.10557130>
- Stegmeijer E, Kloosterman R, Lupi T (2012) *Bouwen op een Sterk Fundament: Een Tussenevaluatie van het Architectuurbeleid* [Building upon a strong basis: intermediate assessment architecture policy]. N. I. P., Den Haag, p 31
- Tewdwr-Jones M (1999) *Discretion, flexibility, and certainty in British planning: emerging ideological conflicts and inherent political tensions*. *J Plan Educ Res* 18(3):244–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x9901800306>
- The Rt Hon Lord Scarman (1981) *The Scarman report: the Brixton disorders 10–12 April 1981*. Retrieved from Report of an Inquiry, London Urban Unlimited (2003) *Visie Stedelijk Netwerk KAN* [Vision urban network Arnhem-Nijmegen]. Nijmegen, Rotterdam
- Van Aken JE (2007) *Design science and organization development interventions: aligning business and humanistic values*. *J Appl Behav Sci* 43 (1):67–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306297761>

- Van Bergeijk H (ed) (2015) Van Lohuizen & Van Eesteren. Partners in planning and education at TH Delft. TU Delft Open, Delft
- Van der Cammen H (1987) Nieuw Nederland. Onderwerp van Ontwerp [The New Netherlands. An object of design]. Stichting Nederland Nu als Ontwerp, Staatsuitgeverij's Gravenhage, Den Haag
- Van der Valk A (1990) Het Levenswerk van TH.K. van Lohuizen 1890–1956. De Eenheid van het Stedenbouwkundige Werk [The livework of TH.K. van Lohuizen 1890–1956]. Delftse Universitaire Pers, Delft
- Van Dijk T (2011) Imagining future places: how designs co-constitute what is, and thus influence what will be. *Plan Theory* 10(2):124–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095210386656>
- Van Duinen L (2004) Planning imagery. The emergence and development of new planning concepts in Dutch National Spatial Policy. Doctoral thesis, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam
- Van Duinen L (2015) New spatial concepts between innovation and lock-in: the case of the Dutch Deltametropolis. *Plan Pract Res* 30(5):548–569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2015.1076155>
- Van Geet MT, Lenferink S, Arts J, Leendertse W (2019) Understanding the ongoing struggle for land use and transport integration: institutional incongruence in the Dutch national planning process. *Transp Policy* 73:84–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2018.11.001>
- Van Rossem V (2014) In search of a better world. Cornelis van Eesteren and the rise of urban planning. In: EFL Foundation & gta Archives (eds) *Atlas of the Functional City. CIAM 4 and Comparative Urban Analysis*. Uitgeverij THOTH, gta Verlag, Bussum, Zurich
- Vereniging Deltametropool (1998) Deltametropolis. A declaration by the spatial planning aldermen of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht regarding future Urban Development in The Netherlands
- Zandbelt, Van den Berg (2012) Ruimtelijke modellen SMASH 2040: Amsterdam-Schiphol-Haarlemmermeer [Spatial models SMASH 2040: Amsterdam-Schiphol-Haarlemmermeer]. Rotterdam
- Zonneveld W, Evers D (2014) Dutch national spatial planning at the end of an era. In: Reimer M, Panagiotis G, Blotevogel H (eds) *Spatial planning systems and practices in Europe: a comparative perspective on continuity and changes*. Routledge