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Summary

Introduction
The transformation of urban space today tends to be confronted to a more intensified degree of public expectations. These ontological shifts seem to manifest in a context in which the resources to induce action are increasingly dispersed over a widened range of public and non-public actors. The private sector in particular has since decades grown to be a predominant force in the collective determination of the fate of the Dutch territory. Hence, the scarce and intensively cultivated Dutch territory faces an increased complexity of territorial claims. The political responses seem to perceive and accept this complexity by promoting a greater degree of urban densification by means of mixed uses development (Nota Ruimte 5, 2006) in order to combine and synergize (divergent) interests. Moreover, in order to assure meaningful and realistic project formulations, dispersed visions and resources are ambitioned to be actively synergized by means of the creation of collaborative cross-sectoral governance arrangements.

In order to persuade collaborative efforts, the latest Dutch planning paradigm – ‘area development’ (van Rooy, 2009) – proposes an area-based planning model which is to merge the Dutch planning tradition to an integral cross-sectoral decision-making context. This paradigm reflects the ambition to forge interactive cross-sectoral linkages in order to potentiate the efficiency of the private sector, while assuring legitimacy by means of civil society involvement. The area-based approach is to assure that complexity in decision-making is framed by – and focused to the essential reflection of interests in coherence to the potentials within urban space. Thus, ‘area development’ proposes planning solutions as the unpredictable product of interaction, rather than a predictable technological inquiry.

This discursive transition has put the normative Dutch planning culture under jeopardy (Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000). That is, Dutch planning culture often is described as an exclusively public cause in which comprehensive – technocratic – plans are to facilitate and give direction to a centralized public decision-making practice. The embedded ideologies of representative control and hierarchy are challenged to anticipate to a politically accepted paradigm which in essence is marked by the ambiguity of perceptions and unpredictability of the outcome. We have argued that the transition is not easy to accomplish (Klijn and Teisman, 2002). That is, there seems to be a gap which is yet to overcome between the ideology of the area development paradigm and its actual methodological manifestation in practice. Hence, in this study we have tested the performance of planning under the conditions of ‘area development’, we have allocated the inconsistencies in its approach and proposed modifications from the perspective of planning.

Problem allocation: ‘Spoorzone Delft’
We have selected the planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ as a topical case through which we have tested the suitability of the planning approach in the context of ‘area development’. ‘Spoorzone Delft’ is an urban transformation project of dualistic nature within the city of Delft. The dualistic nature refers to the planned construction of a railway-tunnel of regional scope, which is to be brought under an integrated vision with an urban area development which is to improve local conditions of physical, social and economical nature. Hence, a comprehensive institutional context has been designed in order to enable for the active involvement of a large number of actors from different administrative levels and sectors in the planning process.
Whilst the planning process pursues to capture complexity and dynamics by means of intentional interactions, the continuation of the process has been assured by means of the consolidation of decisions on a regular base (Bijleveld, 2010). Accordingly, in 2008 the planning process formally succeeded towards the implementation phase. Today, however, unpredictability seems to have prevailed as disagreements between actors on the envisioned solutions hampered the continuation of the process. In order to overcome conflicts, former decisions are evaluated and pursued to be actively transformed towards a reframed focus in terms of meaningful solutions.

**Theoretical viewpoint: The goal and role of planning**

We witnessed that the normative ways of doing planning within ‘Spoorzone Delft’ did not lead to satisfying results. The underlying problems which have provoked conflicts might be interpreted in different ways, from different viewpoints. We have been interested to conceive the problem from the perspective of the planning domain in order to reach towards focused recommendations for the practice of planning. Thus, we have conducted theoretical inquiry in order to demark the planning domain within today’s conditions which has allowed us to conceive if and how planning could contribute in the resolution of conflicts.

Hence, we have studied upon both empirical- as well as formal theories. While the former has allowed us to construct an image of today’s planning context, the latter has contributed in order to conceive how planning could anticipate to its contextual conditions. Thus, we have delivered a proposition on the goal and role of planning under the conditions of area development. Though, we believe it should be contextually determined how planning should perform its role in order to achieve its goal. Hence, our theoretical inquiry is not meant to prescribe solutions; we accepted the notion that the world is too ambiguous and dynamic to be predictable and understandable in a comprehensive way (Faludi, 1979). Rather, planning theory allows us to focus our research perspective and to conceive and reflect what its value could be in contextual-bound complexity within which planning is to operate.

Under this notion, we have constructed the axiom which states that planning is a future-oriented practice, which is to perform within decision-making inquiry today. That is, planning practice should facilitate a solution-oriented process which is to appeal to consolidated institutional settings of power relations, while assuring societal legitimacy by inter-relating its course of development toward wider societal values. Planning professionals are thus challenged to adhere societal values to solutions in space by ‘making knowledge effective’ (Friedmann, 1987) within interactive processes. Hence, a meaningful planning approach in essence should confront the consolidated institutional structures and discourses in reflection to the dynamic subjectivities of socio-cultural bound values.

**Conclusion: An unsuitable planning operability**

We found that the institutional arrangement within which project ‘Spoorzone Delft’ is to be developed has adopted the principles of the ‘area development’ paradigm. That is, the planning process has been designed to provide deliberative spaces for cross-sectoral interaction, in addition to public representative control.

Though, our planning process analysis has indicated that the planning approach did not perform according to the spirit of the ‘area development’ paradigm. We observed that technocratic planning approaches and predominant public attitudes tend to have marginalized the deliberative potential for cross-sectoral collaboration. In particular, we found that planning decisions have been largely
consolidated by the public sector, prior to the consecutive cross-sectoral collaborations. Consequently, the collective spaces for mutual plan development – the ‘solution space’ (van Loon, 1998) – have been diminished and have only been loosely connected to formal decision-making structures.

Thus, we found that hierarchy and centralized decision-making inquiry tend to prevail above a collaborative decision-making practice. Though, this observation does not necessarily mean that ‘area development’ poses an unsuitable planning concept; rather, it means that its current operability cannot confront the challenge to overcome consolidated socio-cultural conditions for reaching towards a meaningful collaboration. ‘Integrality’, ‘mutual-added value’ and ‘learning’ today tend to be theoretical concepts which are difficult to be accomplished in practice.

**Recommendation: managing complexity and making knowledge understandable**

‘Spoorzone Delft’ has been pursued as an integral project. Though, the project in essence is dualistic in its nature: an underground railway tunnel with a regional scope of interests and an aboveground urban area development with an emphasized local scope of interests. The dichotomy is reflected in the planning process, as the distinctive objects within urban space resulted in a hierarchy of decision-making arenas, in which different actors have been represented.

If an institutional separation would be established between the planning process of the railway tunnel and the area developments, fewer limiting preconditions would be imposed upon the latter for controlling the solutions. Hence, a more locally based planning operability could be induced which would be less restricted to capture the dynamics on market fluctuations as well as citizens’ expectations. Hence, we recommend for limiting complexity by the persuasion of smaller urban projects in order to be manageable and adjustable towards meaningful outcomes.

Under this perspective, we argue for a planning approach which is to make choice and alternatives explicit in terms of the active combination of vision and the external effects. Hence, if planners are to shape clarity and coherency within the process, we believe decision-makers too will be enabled to learn in order to be explicit on what they really want in perspective to the potential in urban space.
Part 1

Introduction
1.1 rationale for this study

Planning solutions in the face of dynamic value judgments at ‘Spoorzone Delft’

The municipality of Delft is currently ‘under construction’ due to a comprehensive redevelopment of its station area at core of the city (fig. 1 and fig. 2). This undertaking is the largest project which has been managed by the municipality ever. For over a decade the citizens of Delft have to cope with traffic diversions and noise nuisance for the sake of a resolution of politically determined urban problems. At the initiation of this study, I visited the local informational centre of Spoorzone Delft and perceived a lack of sympathy among the visitors present for the chaos that has been brought to their living environment. I noticed people criticized the municipal decision-makers for taking up such an ‘oversized’ project for a mid-size city against such a great financial burden. Although they acknowledge the motives for intervention, they believed the decision-makers should have developed a more modest, ‘Delft-like’, alternative.

In the course of this discussion, an employee at the centre explained that it seemed unlikely that the project will actually be realized according to the plan that is promoted to the public. He explained that there seems to be a lack of commitment and persistence among the predominant investors for the persuasion of the project in its current setting.

However, the centre largely presented persuasive images and seductive, but selective, information on the determined end results. Though, the former seemed to indicate a very different perspective. That is, a planning process which is far from being arranged towards solutions. Then, from the perspective of dissatisfied citizens and investors, I found myself questioning why the city of Delft would even bother to initiate such an enduring and complex\(^1\) project. After all, whose interest is – and should be – served?

\(^1\) Complex refers to the dispersed nature of resources among social actors which are necessary to be combined in order to reach towards planning solutions
The socio-cultural dimension of spatial planning

This brief illustration exposes questions of planning potentialities and its societal legitimacy. It clearly demonstrates that the force opposing and supporting urban spatial transformations cannot be merely conceived from a technological – spatial – point of view. The spatial solutions which are to be adopted reflect the subjectivities of those in power to decide. Our illustration indicates that the feasibility and societal legitimacy of those solutions depend on the representational capacity they have for who has a share or stake in the area. Hence, we may pose that the value judgment upon planning solutions depends on the assigned meaning which is awarded to it by each involved or engaged to the subjected object within urban space.

Based upon this observation, we may pose that the domain of spatial planning covers the dynamics of socio-cultural conditions in relation to the object of focus within urban space. More concrete, it seems that the practice of planning is always in some way or the other connected to the politics of decision-making. After all, the point of planning is to add reason – or bring sense to support the construction of meaningful decisions that are being taken2 (Friedmann, 1987, Healey 2007). Though, we may critically question how the planning arrangement could cover the range of engaged interests.

Towards a meaningful research outcome

The focus of this study has been set; we are interested to uncover problems and propose recommendations on the suitability and legitimacy current planning approaches within urban area developments. Though, in order to be able to do so, the domain of planning and its normative paradigm within the Dutch context should be made explicit for understanding how Dutch planning is conditioned to relate to the former. Hence, we aim to construct a body of knowledge which allows us to deliver criteria for the evaluation and recommendation for the suitability of normative planning approaches. In order to construct a socially relevant and scientifically grounded framework within the boundaries of a specific case – ‘Spoorzone Delft’ – we allow ourselves to interpret and interconnect expert-, practical- and lay knowledge. We consider the intermingling of the different types of knowledge crucial, as we acknowledge that planning in essence is subject to subjective dynamics and normative structures. In other words, we recognize the biased nature of knowledge and therefore aim to draw our conclusions from meaningful knowledge: knowledge which is grounded within scientific inquiry, while being tested to - and enriched by the social context in which it is applied.

---

2 John Friedmann argues that decisions can be conceived rational when they adhere to formal criteria. These criteria can be conceived as the product of predetermined legislation in combination with the outcome of a decision-making process. Patsy Healey builds here arguments around Habermasian theories of communicative approaches. In this, she acknowledges threats of selectiveness and ambiguity in a pluralistic world which could result in a coexistence of multiple rationalities. In other words, different criteria could lead to different results, depending on the way the information is interpreted from the viewpoint of a social actor. In her line of arguments, legitimate decisions could only be reached if they make sense to those that are to be reached. This concept can be conceived as the main driver of renewed planning approaches that tend to focus on the social process of planning instead of a sole focus on the techno-spatial outcome.
1.2 Problem Statement

Introduction
Throughout this study, the problem statement has been a dynamic device for directing iterative inquiry. That is, the problem statement allows us to constrain our thoughts momentarily for the focused selection and interpretation of data. Though, by focusing and reflecting new insights may come to forwards, allowing us to reframe our focus by means of the reformulated problem statement.

In its final manifestation, the problem statement presents the framework of problem formulations from which we have developed our solutions in terms of recommendations for spatial planning practice.

Problem: Planning in the face of power relations
Friedmann (1987) posed that planning is a future-oriented practice which is meant to serve the public interest by making knowledge effective in informing public action. This statement indicates that the practice of planning is concerned with future solutions within urban space, which are to be planned today. Planning towards public action thus relates to the politics of decision-making between social actors as embedded within power relations. Forrester (1989) clearly pointed out that planning practice should recognize – and act upon – the institutional arrangement within which the power lies to induce transformative action. Under this conception, planning professionals are to guide decision-makers towards internal agreements. Faludi (2000) has qualified this goal by means of ‘plan performance’; the latter relates to the degree of influence planners have in the choices which are made by decision-makers. Hence, under this perspective planning can be considered as a facilitator.

Though, the goal of planning is widely considered to be twofold. That is, planners are too expected to pose their value judgments in order to steer the course of action towards a societal legitimate direction (Oxley, 2004). Micelli (2002) pointed that planners are to reach this goal if they make externalities explicit in order to be regulated. Hence, the challenge for planners to assure a legitimate decision-making process can be located in the range of conflicts between the interests of the most powerful and the demands and needs of those who are externally affected by the object within urban space.

However, Friedmann (1987) pointed out that planners throughout the 20th century rarely accomplished more than the most powerful actors have been willing to accept. Hence, in order to evaluate the performance and legitimacy of the planning practice, it is requisite to contextualize its approach in relation to power relations and socio-cultural dynamics.

---

3 In particular, Friedmann (1987) explained that planning has to be supportive to the interest of the market, as business is the main source of gaining livelihood within a capitalist society. Though, he continued “it must prevent these interests from eroding the foundation of a common life”.
4 Externalities refer to interests which are not reflected within the decision-making context. (Micelli, 2002)
Problem: Planning as a top-down exercise
Traditionally, under the notion of a sovereign state, the power to exert influence on planning and policy decision was largely allocated at the public sector. The representational capacity of the public sector was believed to capture externalities for the assurance for an effective and socially legitimate course of action. That is, a top down planning exercise was believed to be most suitable to control and regulate market forces in relation to societal interests. Hence, the spatial planning professionals were to produce knowledge of space and deliver plans which were to be selected and decided upon by public representative authorities.

However, since the 1970’s, all over Europe, we witnessed an increased societal mistrust in the representative capacity of the public sector. Many studies have indicated that a representative State driven planning approach cannot capture the dynamics of a so called public interests and could even marginalize the interest of the electorate. In fact, the government was widely believed to block effective welfare distribution by their course of action. Hence, state-driven planning instances were conceived to be inefficient, undesirable and unrealistic.

Problem: Planning for the support of market forces
Consequently, a global political will emerged which posed that governmental withdrawal and the liberalization of market forces in society were to induce social optimal solutions (Oxley, 2004). That is, the government was no longer desired to intervene in-, but rather to facilitate to the support of market forces. Hence, this ontological shift provoked a reframed role of the public sector in society: from the welfare state, which has to secure the well-being of citizens, towards the enabling state, creating a framework for interaction between individuals and groups (Stein, 2005).

Hence, by the end of the 1970’s neo-liberal spatial planning policies were to be constructed in the Netherlands. Consequently, the Dutch land-use planning tradition was subdued to change. That is, instead of posing plans and policies, the public sector merely operated in response to market signals (Needham, 2007); the market itself was to reach an optimal allocation of welfare distribution. Thus, neo-liberal policies evidently lead to a greater dispersal of decision-making power from the public to the private sector.

However, soon it became evident that the neoliberal discourse too was ineffective for assuring legitimacy. That is, neo-liberal planning paradigm was believed to provoke an unbalanced distribution of costs and benefits onto society: the welfare optimum was rarely to be achieved. In the contrary, it has been widely argued that neoliberal policies have conduced to a social, economical and spatial fragmentation in urban areas (Burgess, 2002). A liberalized market operability in itself did not seem to capture the dynamics and complexity of externalities.

5 The cause of this statement is often explained as a combination of an increased pluralistic society, in combination with an increased cross-sectoral dispersal of power.
Problem Planning for the persuasion of cross-sectoral linkages

Consequently, from the 1990’s onwards we have witnessed efforts by the public sector to regain competence for balancing growth and steering6 investments. However, the public sector was challenged to redefine its role in society in the context of a dispersal of power relations7 and increased public expectations8 (Klijn and Teisman, 2002). Due to this decreased state sovereignty, the recurrence of a centralized public governing model did not seem realistic as well as legitimate. Consequently, a new planning discourse emerged which stated that the public sector should provide the conditions within which plans and policies could be constructed in active collaboration with the sectors of society. In this way, the efficiency of the private sector could be potentiated, while legitimacy was to be assured by the active involvement of civil society. Hence, the opportunity rose to reassure a territorial coherence under a strategic planning approach (Healey, 2007, Alexander, 1992; in Nadin and Stead, 2008).

The product of this lasting political debate today has evolved to the paradigmatic shift of ‘Area development’. Spatially, Area development is based upon the notion of mixed uses developments for the assurance of a vital compact city (van Rooy, 2009). The process implications of this notion is that area development requires an increased amount of actors in order to integrate vision and combine resources for reaching towards mutually appreciated solutions. While ‘area developments’ are generally initiated within the boundaries of the public sector, the efficiency and legitimacy of practice is to be found in a consecutive governance arena which is to allow for a collaboration planning process between the State, market and civil society.

However, we found that contemporary planning processes on area developments tend to fail to perform according to its ambition. We found that these processes generally result in a fragmented conjuncture of decision-making arenas, which do not necessarily correspond well to each other (Klijn and Teisman, 2002). In particular, we indicated a dichotomy between traditional public decision-making arenas and its governance-based counterpart. In this, we found that the participative empowerment9 of non-public actors within the governance arena tends to be under jeopardy as results of a too authoritative public sector. Consequently, weak cross-sectoral linkages could fail to appeal to market-based resources and marginalize the interests of the public due to threats symbolical reassuring participative practice.

---

6 Steering relates to ways of exerting influence
7 In particular, the emergence of economies of scale have provoked a private sector as a predominant stakeholder in urban areas
8 Civil society was referred to as an active sector along the public sector
9 Empowerment: to give authority or power to’ (OED online) individuals or groups engaged in decision-making (Bailey, 2010)
**Problem: The limits of planning?**

Linguistically, Friedmann’s statement on the failure of planning performance does not imply that planners cannot confront the difficulties in crossing the boundaries of (sectoral) power to induce a collaborative process. Rather, his statement merely poses that the normative planning approaches, in terms of methods and instruments, do not seem to perform well. We believe today the need for a well performing planning practice for shaping coherency is higher than ever for reaching meaningful decisions within a context of dispersed interests and resources.

*However,* we found that many scientific interpretations on the normative Dutch planning practice pose that the planning discipline pays very limited attention to the decision-making context in which planning is to take place (Kreukels 1997, Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000). In our illustration, we too observed that planners tend to impose their professional bias upon the process, rather than facilitating the process. Hence, while ‘Area development’ proposed a paradigmatic shift on the relation between the sectors of society – the planning context -, the Dutch planning practice too is challenged to reframe its performance in order to facilitate decision-making towards solutions in space and assure legitimacy within the decision-making context.

Figure 3 present a comprehensive overview on the logical inter-relation of problems.
Fig. 3: the field of problems; conceived from the perspective of planning practice (own illustration)
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1.3 Research Questions

Main research question
- To what extent can Dutch public sector spatial planning assure socially legitimizing practices on spatial developments?

Sub-questions
- What are the main social forces that mark today’s Dutch spatial planning context?
- How is societal legitimacy to be conceived within today’s spatial planning context?
- What is the purpose of spatial planning?
- What could be the meaning of spatial planning in the light of today’s spatial planning context?
- To what extent does today’s Dutch planning paradigm enable to tackle today’s’ challenges on legitimate public policy productions?

Research question on empirical enquiry:
- To what extent does spatial planning support community involvement into the Delft Spoorzone planning process?

1.4 Objectives for this study
- To (re)formulate propositions by combining scientific concepts from a wide variety of sources in order to generate an understanding on the legitimacy and suitability of today’s Dutch planning paradigm.

- To test if the theoretical framework is suitable for understanding the nature of conflicts within an area development instance – ‘Spoorzone Delft’ – which tend to hamper actions on urban spatial interventions

- To propose an alternative engineering of the planning process for the improvement of planning performance towards legitimate action in terms of urban spatial interventions

Considering the complexity and contextual-bound character of our research object, a single case study will be conducted in order to reach towards appropriate recommendations in the light of local conditions.
1.5 Methodological framework

Epistemological concept

Space is socially produced
The discipline of spatial planning and design is subject to the object of urban space. In particular, its practice is concerned with the way how urban space could be (re)organized and (re)shaped. In the course of this study, the underlying assumption has been that space is socially produced. That is, ongoing processes of urban spatial change, which can be induced by active – planned – intervention or unprompted evolving dynamics, are the consequent of human patterns of interests and their embeddedness into co-evolving relational routines\(^{10}\) “through which bias is mobilized” (Healey, 1997) (fig. 4).

Hence, it can be argued that the spatial planning discipline is subject to the object of urban space, interrelated to social values, beliefs, identities and power relations. It is the latter through which direction for action and legitimacy evolves for reaching towards material outcomes in space. The design of urban spatial change then seems to be subordinate to the biased nature of (evolving) human perception, norms and structures in society.

\[\text{‘Mobilized bias’ through practices of power exertion} \]
\[\text{‘Material outcome’ planned effects and externalities} \]

Fig. 4; own illustration

The future, thus, can be conceived as a reflection of what is believed today by those which are in the position of power\(^{11}\). These beliefs and structures of power, however, are not fixed. They can rather be understood as temporal fixes towards decisions in time, “positioned in the complexity of relational flows” (Healey, 2007) within which learning\(^{12}\) occurs and perception evolves.

\(^{10}\) Institutionalism (Healey, 1997) acknowledges that situations are the function of institutions. That is, “our thinking is embedded in ‘where we come from’, in our relational position to others, in power structures etc. Hence, institutionalism rejects that the social world is constituted of autonomous individuals which evolve in isolation.

\(^{11}\) Power is the ability to exert influence (De Leeuw, 2002)

\(^{12}\) Learning can be understood as the behavioral changes which are believed to be appropriate for the adaptation to a perceived environment. (de Leeuw, 2002)
Planning within ‘the unknowable society’

Friedmann (1987) clearly explained that planning could be understood as “decision-making in advance”. More particular, he noted that planners are to guide towards legitimate decision-making agreements within contexts that are marked by ambiguity. In this, he stated that knowledge is the resource planners have to perform their task.

Though, we stressed the sociological nature of the context in which planning is to perform. Hence, the world is highly complex and highly unpredictable in its future course of development (Faludi, 1979). That is, there is an innumerable amount of possible variables which can be perceived and acted upon in different ways. Lessons from the past indicated that continual unforeseen effects and unexpected developments stress our argument.

Then, if planning is to add knowledge to the value-laden decision-making processes, marked by unpredictability we are interested what role (scientific) knowledge could have in the “unknowable society” van Gunsteren and Ruyven, 1995, cited in Edelenbos et. Al., 2004). In acceptance of a world subjected by bias and ambiguity, it seems inappropriate to suggest that scientific knowledge can be an objective source to predict the future.

Friedmann continued its story by explaining that planners are challenged to make knowledge useful for specific actors… ...in order to make it effective for reaching towards action. Hence, we believe that the applicability of knowledge does not depend on its objectiveness or comprehensiveness; rather we believe knowledge is effective if it makes sense for the definition of action.

A postnormal perspective upon knowledge production

We embraced the notion of a post-normal perspective (Edelenbos et. Al., 2004) or post-positivist on knowledge production. The latter refers to the belief that knowledge is socially constructed. The knowledge that is presented throughout this report, therefore, does not serve a purpose for determining the relation between the research object in its real life context. Other interpretations upon the same set of data may lead to different arguments. Though, by rejecting the comprehensiveness of knowledge, we do not reject the potential value knowledge production could have in practice. We believe knowledge, in this case ‘expert knowledge’\textsuperscript{13}, could be of value in the course of social debates and interaction in order to increase the (collective) understanding on how a common object is conceived. That is, within a social reality in which an innumerable amount of variables co-evolve and intersect, science can fulfill a role in providing society a simplified coherent way for looking at the world as it evolves. The latter is generally described as meaningful – or inter-subjective - knowledge as it reaches out, and connects the multiple truths within a context. By accepting such a role of science, the conceptualized – selective - image of the future then seems to become predictable. As pointed out by Faludi (1979) “A predictable experience of the world is one that can be controlled and planned”. (fig 5).

\textsuperscript{13} Knowledge which is based on training and professionalism ((Edelenbos et. Al., 2004)
Though, as we pointed out, the image of reality in essence differs from reality in its full complexity. Thus, we consider the production of knowledge rather as an ongoing process, which could have meaning within temporal fixes in time and place.

**Methods**
The methods are the research instrument through which data can be gathered. Due to the iterative character of the research process, the formulation of the problem has been dynamic throughout this study. Therefore, shifting demands on data, which means shifting methods, marks this research process.

In particular, in the initial phase of this study I believed I could build theory and underestimated the amount of valuable scientific knowledge which has been produced by others. However, as I started to explore the theoretical domain, I found an immense amount of theoretical concepts that relate to my object of interest. Therefore, a great part of the process has been the exploration of theories that might potentially relate to our research domain.

Further, while testing my theoretical findings to empirical data, and reflecting it back, I realized the deeper meaning of theoretical concepts. That is, I realized that theoretical concepts are deducted generalizations of reality which merely deliver us (alternative) ways on how to conceive reality. Thus, in order to reach towards meaningful conclusions, next to the exploration of a theoretical domain, the accumulation of contextual based data was at least as important. It is the latter through which we could evaluate if our theoretical findings could be of value for the improvement of planning in a specific context.

Thus, next to the exploration of theories, I have conducted a single case study. This case study has been conducted from the perspective – and contributed to the contextualization of – our body of knowledge. In the course of this case study, I have analyzed formal and informal planning documents as well as constructed stories through interviewing in order to understand how the planning process is valued by those involved and affected.
By doing so, I have addressed to following themes:

- Exploration of theory on
  - macro-sociological, economical and political developments which tend to have changed the planning context
  - Concepts on the meaning and purpose of spatial planning
  - The legitimacy of planning practice from a democratic perspective
  - Interpretations on the Dutch planning paradigm

- Case study instance on:
  - The performance and legitimacy of the “Spoorzone Delft” planning process

- (Potentially) theory building on
  - Concrete guidelines on the effective embedding of participatory governance-based planning schemes into the consolidated Dutch planning paradigm.
1.6 Plan of this report

Data management principle
In order to reach towards meaningful, contextual-bound and scientifically-grounded research conclusions and recommendations, the logical framework in which data is managed reflects an interaction between scientific concepts and knowledge from practice. In this way, we have attempted to overcome the dichotomy between ‘universal’ scientific concepts and contextual-based perceptions through which meaning is assigned to knowledge.

Hence, this study aims to utilize and build upon a scientifically-based frame of reference, while assuring a logical interpretation towards practical instances.

The logicality of this relation is to be assured through our 3-steps consideration, as shown in figure 6. On the first level we explore theoretical concepts on the purpose of planning and global changing tendencies. These concepts are globally known and widely in consideration as they are the subtractions of lasting scientific research.

Within the second level, we explore the character of the consolidated Dutch planning paradigm and its adaptive capacity to change. Within this level, the research focus derived from the first level first of all provides direction for selection and interpretation. That is, the concepts which have been dealt with within the first level could generate a common understanding on how to conceive the challenges for the Dutch planning context, while evaluating if those challenges are actually present within the Dutch planning domain.

On the third level, the same method is applied. That is, we observe the reality of a specific planning instance that fits our study domain and interpret it from the deducted view of our conceptual framework that has been shaped by level 1 and 2. As a case study enables us to perceive the object of study in its real life context, our theoretical assumptions can be readjusted in order to reach towards meaningful scientific and practical knowledge.
The explicit hierarchical and reflective inter-relation between the most ‘universal’ concepts on planning and manifestations within a concrete planning instance is to assure clarity on the conditions within which our study results could be of value. We believe that planning approaches and scientifically-based advice often tends to lack in clarity on the former. For instance, we found that ‘universal’ concepts on citizen participation tend to be taken up as one-dimensional solution, without any adaptive reflection towards the cultural conditions within specific cases. Hence, scientific inquiry in such cases could deliver normative prescriptive recommendations on planning practices which do not connect to the *contextualities* (Healey, 2007) of place\(^\text{14}\).

At the other hand, scientific concepts may contribute to a cultural framed context in order to enable practitioners to evaluate if their ways of doing are (still) appropriate in the light of complexity and dynamics. In other words, as explained obviously by Forester (1989), “planning theory is what planners need when they get stuck… ... it helps us to understand what planners do... ...rather than as instrumental action, as means to particular ends” (Forester, 1989).

Our study focus lies upon the performance and legitimacy of spatial planning in the light of today’s conditions which manifest under the concept of ‘area development’. Thus, we are interested in the interplay between two dimensions: (1) the meaning of the spatial planning discipline and (2) its context in which it is to perform. Therefore, on each level of conceptuality we study upon the planning discipline and the planning context (figure 7). By taking this approach, we presume that planning is not an autonomous discipline, but is a discipline that finds its meaning in the inter-relation with its context. That is, we believe that each planning context, in terms of its institutional arrangements and wider socio-cultural conditioning, pose the limiting conditions and potentials for the formulations of a suitable planning approach.

Further, we consider our study to be a continuous challenge in order to define and refine a contextual-based problem, rather than the design of new solutions of a presumed general problem. In this way, we enable ourselves to reflect upon the legitimacy of current ways of doing and the potential direction for innovation of practice.

\(^{14}\) For instance Bebeejaun and Vanderhoven (2010) noted that the design and management of participatory activities for citizen inclusion within planning inquiries tend be withdrawn from textbooks as absolute solutions for increasing the legitimacy of practice. They explained that “the notion of participation, far from being an obvious and automatic solution to a complex problem, can make matters worse for all those involved”.
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Fig. 7: thesis structure
Figure 8 represents our research framework in representation to its content.
Part 2

Theoretical framework
This chapter presents the logical frame of theoretical-based propositions which we have drawn from an extensive theoretical review (Annex 2) upon the spatial planning practice in relation to the social cultural dimension of its decision-making context.

2.1 Reframing the meaning of urban space

In recent decades we have observed significant social, economical and technical development. These changes of ontological nature tend to have jeopardized the consolidated institutional arrangements and managerial approach within which plans and policies are constructed. A great diversity of causalities which may vary from place and time may lie beneath these changes. Though, as noted by Healey (2007), apart from undeniable ‘contextualities’ the world today is increasingly too is facing ‘commonalities’. Hence, many scientists have attempted to identify and generalize the nature of change in order to review consolidated ways of planning.

Within our theoretical review we have rationalized on the basis of a logical interpretation on a few predominant common tendencies. From this conceptual base, we noted the effects these commonalities tend to have upon the context of planning. In particular, we have argued upon the tendency of shifting social, political and economical relations, which generally is captured under the common umbrella of globalization (Sassen, 2001). From this, we learned that urban planning potential today increasingly faces a dispersal of resources to act as well as a higher public commitment to be involved in the planning process (fig 9). Under pressures of these conditions, the forces through which urban space is subjected have increased in their complexity, dynamics and unpredictability.

Fig. 9 Globalization is widely believed to have increased the complexity and dynamics on decision-making on public plans and policies in the face of increased market involvement and societal individualization.

(adaptated from de Jonge, 2007)
Within such a context, we noted that deterministic vision on urban space\textsuperscript{15} is not suitable to capture the dynamics and complexity of those who have an interest or stake within urban space. Hence, we embraced a conceptual understanding of urban space as a socially produced inter-subjective reality, evolving in complex relational webs (Hillier, 2001, Healey, 2007)\textsuperscript{16}. Within this perspective, we learned from formal theories (Healey, 2007) that the planning domain increasingly is considered to be a socio-cultural challenge (van Rooy, 2010) for guiding social actors towards effective and legitimate urban spatial transformation.

This reframed perspective rejects the notion of urban space as a coherent entity. The latter implies a city which can be determined comprehensively under the expert – technocratic - view of the planning professional and steered centrally by a sovereign public sector. It is the latter which, according to Healey (2007), expressed the dominant European planning culture throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. In particular, as Hajer and Zonneveld (2000) have explained, technocratic planning\textsuperscript{17} marks the rooted Dutch planning tradition. The technocratic planning culture correlates to the embedded spatial malleability ambition, which has marked Dutch spatial planning since the early land reclamation activities (Needham, 2007).

While the traditional technocratic planning methods do not seem to perform\textsuperscript{18} well under today’s conditions (Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000), this reframed perspective on urban space can provide the conceptual frame under which renewed planning methods can be explored and tested within practical inquiry.

\subsection{2.2 A process-oriented planning practice}

Under the recognition of shifting social-cultural, economical and governance-political balances, we witnessed a politically announced need to combine sectorally dispersed resources for shaping urban interventions. Joint cooperation and synergy, rather than top-down control and regulation, today are widely accepted as the best possible way out. Hence, active territorial governance today faces increased cross-sectoral inter-dependency.

Consequently, since decades, governance arrangements have become fashionable ways to manage urban change. Governance can be conceived as an institutional arrangement which is to forge cross-sectoral linkages for potentiating the efficiency of the private sector and civil society involvement towards a collaboration-based policy-making discourse. More concrete, governance allows a wider range of societal actors to be included at earlier stages than before in the process in which plans and public policies develop. The conceptual consequence of a governance-based decision-making arrangement implies a dispersal of steering power\textsuperscript{19}. That is, while traditional planning decisions

\textsuperscript{15} Under a spatial deterministic vision, urban space is referred to as an entity which can be objectively grasped and acted upon, preferably under the guidance of expert’s vision.

\textsuperscript{16} This reframed perspective upon urban space is most strikingly formulated by Healey (2007), in which she argues upon urban space as “geographical spaces transected by very many webs of relations that weave across, in and around each other, generating nodes of activity and identifiable places”.

\textsuperscript{17} Technocratic planning falls under the positivistic philosophy that urban space can be objectively identified and transformed under to guidance of objective directive criteria.

\textsuperscript{18} “the performance of planning” (Faludi, 2010) relates to the degree planners have to influence the decisions which are being made on shaping urban spatial change

\textsuperscript{19} Steering relates to goal oriented influence (van Loon e.a., 2007).
were largely to be formulated centrally by the public sector, a joint-cooperative planning concept is inherent to a lack of the power to steer centrally. The alternative means a course of decision-making within which steering only could take place if a mutual agreement is obtained. The latter is usually referred to as “intrinsic steering” (de Leeuw, 2002).

![Figure 10 Central steering (left) and intrinsic steering (right) (own illustration)](image)

Traditionally, spatial planning merely was meant to rationalize choice on public policies and plans for the guidance of representative public decision-makers. The latter generally operated within modes of top down steering and control, largely legitimized by the objective scientific criteria through which planning experts rationalized (Throgmorton, 1996). We explained that today’s conditions under which policies and plans are produced seem to have changed; Government is no longer conceived in its central role for steering and control. Instead, cross-sectoral complexity is accepted and perceived desirable for assuring a legitimate and prosperous course of action within the urban spatial domain. Though, accepting complexity means embracing ambiguity and uncertainty. That is, the process in which plans and policies evolve is subject to an increased variety of viewpoints, which are embedded in institutional structures and evolve in interaction. As explained by Oosten (2005) actors tend to behave according to their biased perspectives upon what space means for them. That is, each actor in the decision-making arena has its own viewpoint, based upon the limited information through which the world is perceived. Therefore, relational conflict of interests tends to be inherent to collaboration-based planning arrangements.

Within these conditions on decision-making, a traditional – technocratic – planning approach seems to be unsuitable to guide a decision-making context which is marked by ambiguity. We have argued that planning professionals do not produce objective information, as the production process is the product of ongoing selection and interpretation from a professional, but biased viewpoint. Though, we noted that viewpoints are dynamic and can be influenced to a certain extent within a social interactive process. Thus, while planning cannot assure the deliverance of objective information towards the decision-making arena, we noted that planning could fulfill a meaning role for guiding actors towards an inter-subjective agreement on a specific goal. Hence, we argued that the science

---

20 This argument relates to the concept of ‘methodological individualism’ and ‘the actor’s viewpoint’ (van Loon, 1998)
of planning and the politics of decision-making have moved closer together. Edelenbos et. Al (2004) noted that science today has “politicized and entangled in the policy process”. They continued by arguing that knowledge has lost its superior status, while it found a new role in its “persuasiveness, negotiating ability and the approach to policy consumers”.

Hence, we have argued that planning in the face of ambiguity on planning solutions can be best understood as a managerial challenge for guiding a process towards mutual agreement upon collective object of interest within urban space. In this, recalling Friedmann’s (1989) renowned statement; knowledge can be an asset for mobilizing collective action. In the light of this conceptual perspective on planning, Following Forester (1989), we explained that planners should be politically sensitive to their decision-making context by listening and arguing meaningful about the content for guiding a process towards mutual agreement. Faludi (2000) clearly explained that the role planning in the context of collaboration relates to learning situations. In this, he defined the goal of planning as follows: “planning should allow decision-makers to learn about what their situation is and [if desirable] what they, individually or collectively, can do about it”. Thus, it is the latter which generally is described under the notion of the argumentative turn in planning (Fischer, 2010) (fig 11 and 12).

![Fig. 11 Traditional planning role conception (own illustration)](image1)

![Fig. 12 Planning in the face of governance (own illustration)](image2)

---

21 Learning is concerned with gaining a better understanding of a context and the way how decision-makers are positioned in that context (Faludi, 2000). Hence, a learning-oriented planning approach in the context of inter-dependency could improve the competence of decision-makers to formulate mutual-appreciated solutions.
Under these conditions we have argued upon the concept of strategic planning (Healey, 2007) as a means to reach towards a collective understanding between actors. A strategy as such can be best understood as a persuasive goal-oriented story in connection to the object in space which maintains, according to Healey (2007), “a critical understanding about relationships, qualities, values and priorities.” Hence, planning through strategies should in essence be able to reach towards the transformation of limiting (organizational) vision and boundaries of power towards an appreciation of an inter-subjective reality among a shared object of interest, accompanied with a synergized potential for action.

2.3 Legitimate practices in the face of power

Hence, the spatial planner can be best conceived as a facilitator in a multi-actor environment, which is meant to guide the decision-makers towards an internal agreement. What is more, above all we pose that planner should not merely facilitate, but steer towards a socially legitimate planning process. This notion implies that planners should not automatically accept and be subjected to the consolidated relations of power. Instead, planners are to be sensitive to the course of decision-making in relation to wider societal interests and effects. It is the latter which has always been the fundamental goal of planning22 (Friedmann, 1987). This argument stresses the value-laden role planners should have for exerting influence upon the direction of action. Hence, knowledge that is presented and argued upon in terms of seductive plans and persuasive stories to frame a collective focus could be conceived as instruments of power. Under this notion, Micelli (2002) noted that planners should regulate externalities23 in order to bridge the gap between consolidated power relations and societal representation.

Traditionally, the incorporation of externalities was to be assured by the representative capacity of a sovereign state. Though, as we noted, planning decisions today cannot be merely conceived as the spatial reflection of public sector politics. That is, planning decisions in many instances are the product of a cross-sectoral collaboration, as embedded within a governance arrangement. Within these processes, information is shared and knowledge is produced in interaction with each other. Therefore, the planning process within governance arrangements can be conceived as a continual mutual adjustment between participating actors, based upon the perceived knowledge available.

Thus, the outcome of the planning process does not necessarily correspond to the will of the electorate (fig 13). From this perspective, we may pose that legitimacy on planning decisions cannot be merely assured by means of traditional political representation. This argument is stressed as today’s societal conditions seem to reflect an increased individualization and increased societal expectations which cannot easily be captured within political agendas. Hence, in addition to the representative democratic system, we found that there is an increased public commitment today to be included directly in the collaborative process in which knowledge is to be adjusted mutually

22 Friedmann (1987) noted that planners are challenged to add societal rationality to the planning process which tends to operate in the light of market rationality. By stating, we could argue that planners themselves can be conceived as actors which are interested to facilitate a course of development which serves the idea of a public interest.

23 Externalities relate to interests which are not reflected within the decision-making arena. For instance, these interests could refer to possible affected citizens by a planning decision, or even to next generations which are to be assured for the well-being.
towards collectively determined solutions. Thus, if planners are to assure legitimacy of practice, may argue that planners are to persuade the direct relation between citizens and decision-makers within the planning process.

An inter-active decision-making arrangement on planning instances between the state, market and civil society seems represent a logical consecutive concept. Though, we have pointed out and reflected upon the notions of inequality in power relations. Friedmann (1987) noted that planners rarely accomplished more than private actors are willing to accept. Hence, we are interested if planners are able to overcome bounded structures of power for the sake of a more legitimate outcome. Hence, planning might be conceived as a managerial challenge to confront relational interactions, marked by conflicts and struggle, for the cause of a perceived meaningful and legitimate outcome.

On the basis of extensive empirical studies upon inter-active planning efforts for involving citizens in decision-making, Edelenbos, et. Al (2006) and Brownill, et. Al (2010) shared a concerning perspective on the legitimacy of these efforts. They noted the lack of actual inter-action between the formal decision-makers and the engaged public. They explained that inter-active planning efforts are usually not attended by the formal decision-makers and the produced information often does not reach the formal decision-making arena. We could therefore critically argue if inter-action ambitioned planning efforts are truly meant to empower the people or merely a device for a symbolical reassurance on legitimate decision-making. In fact, this conclusion validates the discussion if collaborative planning actually reaching a higher level of legitimacy than traditional ways of planning.

---

24 Empowerment means ‘giving authority or power to’ (OED online) individuals or groups engaged in decision-making (Bailey, 2010)
Their empirically derived concerns above all indicate that contemporary collaborative planning efforts tend to be located in different decision-making arenas, represented by different actors. Hence, the performance of planning does not rely on the performance of a singular decision-making arena, but depends on the interconnection between them (fig 14). Their conclusion merely notes that the gaps between decision-making arenas result in a weak collaborative planning process.

We therefore argue that the performance of planning should always be evaluated in the light of its wider institutional arrangement. In the course of this notion, Teisman (2009) explained that area development instances today require the capacity to govern inter-organizational collaboration in terms of consolidating commitment in relations. In our view, the later can be considered as the challenge for planners today.

![Diagram](own illustration)

### 2.4 A robust planning system in the face of change

The former concepts and shared concerns seem to be common for a whole range of western countries. The underlying forces which validate these concepts and concerns may affect different countries in different ways. That is, each planning culture and its embedded structures and processes is challenged to consider if and how it could anticipate to those tendencies. Hence, in this chapter we will conceptualize the Dutch planning culture and its adaptive capacity to anticipate to today’s challenges.

The Dutch planning culture is marked by the persuasion to control and regulate centrally the uses and shapes of the territory. Therefore, the Dutch planning system has evolved into a robust system, which is known to be unusual in its institutional comprehensiveness (Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000). The comprehensiveness of the embedded system is to be found in the inter-level consensus-based collaboration between the national State, the province and the municipality\(^\text{25}\). In this way, it is

\(^{25}\) the national government, the provincial government and the municipal government together have the statutory task to ensure that living conditions and the environment are protected and improved as formally stated by article 21 of the Dutch constitution.
pursued that planning solutions are to evolve which confront local and wider territorial interests. Though, municipalities are in the most advantaged position of power, as they control the land-use plan, which is the only legal planning document in the Netherlands. The ambition of consensus-based decision-making is pursued by the enormous amount of indicative plans which are produced on different levels of government.

Yet, we noted that the renowned features of the Dutch planning system do not obviously guarantee a continued legitimate and effective practice of planning. In particular, the Dutch planning culture and its system design is exclusively engaged to a conservation of decision-making power between the boundaries of the public sector. However, this character could be jeopardized by a planning context which is marked by cross-sectoral interdependency and the ambition to collaborate for governing the territory.

In recent decades we have witnessed a number of efforts to adapt the planning system to perceived ontological dynamics. In the 1980’s, in the light of a neo-liberal discourse, the influx of market forces for directing urban development was believed to lead to social optimal solutions (Oxley, 2004). The public sector redefined its role towards spatial planning for the disposal of land in response to market signals (Needham, 2007). Hence, urban land increasingly was sold to private developers which were expected to steer developments in a prosperous direction.

However, while the betterments of increased land values were unbalanced distributed over private developers, externalities could not be controlled effectively. Especially the lack of a wider territorial coherence (Albrechts, et Al, 2003) and an increased tendency of urban fragmentation (Burgess, 2002) were conceived to be main threats to the assurance of socially legitimate developments; the expected ‘spin-off’ effect did not seem to occur. Thus, from the 1990’s the public sector increasingly endeavored to regain steering competence for the regulation on land-uses.

Though, as we explained before, the inheritance of neo-liberalism caused a situation which could not be controlled centrally, as the resources to direct action tend to be cross-sectoral dispersed. Furthermore, if those resources are to be combined, collaborative challenges manifest for combining sectoral interests and limiting visions. Hence, since the 1990’s a renewed policy discouar was embraced which ambitioned to integrate sectoral interests for the persuasion of goal-oriented action in urban space. This paradigmatic shift clearly forwarded the local spatial dimension in decision-making in order reach towards mutually satisfying area-based solutions. This ideal on spatial planning approaches on the operable level lead to the construction of public private partnerships and cooperative arrangements in which inter-active spaces were to be reserved for citizen inclusion. Hence, the political ambition was set to produce plans in collaboration in order to reach towards collectively appreciated solutions.

Though, lessons have taught us that a collaborative system design cannot be imposed from the textbook, but should connect to the values of those participating within the collaborative governance

---

26 The Dutch planning system is connected to a set of legal arrangement for the regulation of negative externalities on finances. That is, citizens can submit legal objection for expected financial damages as a result of new developments. Though, in practice these procedures tend to be costly and long-lasting procedures, which all too often do not turn out positive for the applicant (Needham, 2007). Though, this arrangement does not appeal to the potential of positive externalities as a result of the mix of functions and the redistribution of betterments.
landscape (Klijn and Teisman, 2002). Hence, empirical evidence has shown that sectoral interests do not easily combine as they are framed by the socio-cultural conditioning of social actors.

Since 1998 another 27 influx was absorbed in the Dutch political arenas on spatial planning. It became increasingly evident that the socio-cultural dynamics which are determining the fate of the territory cannot be captured within administrative boundaries. Hence, local spatial vision was to be combined with a wider territorial focus. Though, empirical evidence showed that the public sector does not easily operate as a coherent body, but tends to be fragmented in ‘closed boxes’ on different levels and departments 28.

These ongoing debates evolved towards the politically embraced concept of ‘area development’ 29. Area development proposed an area-based integral planning operability which is based upon an inter-level agreement between the formal levels of government for setting the boundaries within which a local trans-sectoral collaboration can be induced between the state, market and citizens. In other words, area development is based upon the notion of subsidiarity 30 and the co-production of solutions between the state, market and the people (Fig 15).

Fig. 15 the ‘area development’ planning paradigm (own illustration)

27 Conclusion presented by Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR) (Scientific council for government policy construction).
28 Municipalities tend to act according to the Not In My BackYard syndrome. This behavioral pattern, in combination with their veto power on land-uses, provides a great managerial challenge for the government to ensure a regional strategic vision (Needham, 2007).
29 ‘Area development’ was introduced in 2003 in the national House of Representatives.
30 The subsidiarity principle poses the belief that central governments should only perform task which cannot be performed by lower levels of government. This principle is posed within the European Spatial Development Perspective (1999).
Despite this paradigmatic shift, Studies have shown that the culture of central malleability by the public sector still prevails (van Rooy, 2010). The latter has been particularly notable due to the ongoing predominant municipal attitudes for the determination of the course of development within their administrative boundaries. (Needham, 2007). Klijn and Teisman (2002) even noted that public-private partnerships are doomed to fail in its current manifestation. In this, they have drawn upon theories of Jacobs (1992) and (1990) which rationalized that the value systems of the public sector and private sector are mutually exclusive as they operate under very distinctive principles.

Hence, while governance-based collaboration seems to manifest, research has shown that the produced solutions within these interactive arenas often do not connect to the formal decision-making arena which is still marked by the boundaries of the public sector (Edelenbos and Klijn, 2004). That is, a high degree of fragmentation between decision-making arenas – inherent to a lack of coherence – seems to hamper a well performing mutual decision-making process.

2.5 Exploration of practice

Up until this point, we have explored empirical theories in order to conceptualize the conditions which are believed to relate to the planning discipline. Secondly, we have explored formal theories in order to frame how planners could anticipate to these conditions. We found that the science of spatial planning in essence relates to its practice. That is, knowledge building is meant to improve the performance of planning in practice. Having said, the process of scientific inquiry is a continual process which is clearly expressed by the expression ‘standing on the shoulders of giants’. Hence, a scientific discourse evidently can be considered as a distinctive culture, as it relies on formerly done selections and its conceptualizations today.

As planning in essence is a practical discipline, we argue that meaningful scientific planning inquiry should be accompanied by a clear reflection to the practical context in which scientific knowledge is to be applied. That is, we believe scientific concepts in essence may have a different meaning in different context. In fact, some may be functional for improving planning in practice, while others may even worsen the normative planning approach. For instance, we indicated before that the practical interpretation of the concept of ‘citizen participation’ could, according to Connelly (2010), marginalize the position of citizens in some contexts. Hence, parallel to our theoretical exploration we have sought to test the societal relevance of our selections and interpretations in the context of complex planning processes in the Dutch planning system. Our consecutive case study inquiry has been the most predominant notion in which we tackled the meaning of our theoretical framework. Though, prior to the case study, we have tested the relevance of our direction to practical debates on area development.

We found that the need to enhance a critical understanding upon the legitimacy and performance of planning within complex decision-making contexts is a matter of topical interest. In order to direct our theoretical focus towards a societal relevant direction, we reflected our propositions to the debates and lectures which were presented at a conference on urban area development (‘Spiegeldag, 2009). This conference was aimed to inform and share knowledge between public representatives and private developers on matters of suitable collaboration. Yet, this conference was not directly meant for spatial planners and designers; we noted that the subjects discussed clearly
articulated a challenge for the engineering of a complex decision-making process on urban area developments. That is, the need for a process-oriented planning operability for guiding decision-makers towards agreements. We perceived the following inter-related conclusions:

- **A need for active bottom-up participation**
  There is an urge to involve citizens into decision-making arrangements to ensure a ‘successful’ planning outcome. ‘Successful’ in this sense can be measured from two distinctive perspectives. From the public sector’s perspective, an area development project can be considered successful if it adheres to criteria of societal legitimacy for the representation of the electorate. In the context of ‘area development’, societal legitimacy increasingly tends to be found by means of active bottom-up citizen inclusion in decision-making. Secondly, from the private developer’s perspective, ‘successful’ relates to the degree of consumer-orientation. That is, it seems preferable to involve the potential consumers of the land redevelopment in early stages of the decision-making process for the assurance of a profitable outcome in terms of the list of requirements and esthetical formulation.

- **A need for communication and flexibility to ensure mutual adjustments**
  There is a need to overcome patterns of static limited vision (in Dutch: ‘verkokering’) of actors involved in a joint cooperative planning arrangement. That is, a greater degree of flexibility and transparency is required from actors and their sectoral-based policy framework. It has been explicitly noted that the former is a condition for equilibrating sectoral resources towards a mutual added value above traditional centralized decision-making arrangements. In other words, joint-cooperation in planning requires for a committed and reliable relationship between participating actors.

- **A need for explicitly defined roles and responsibilities**
  Collaborative decision-making can only be effective and satisfying if roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. When there is a lack of agreement on this matter, actors tend to fall back into traditional ways of working whilst cross-sectoral interaction would only be conceived as necessary evil. For instance, private actors often complain about the dominant and centralized role their public counterparts tend to take.\(^\text{31}\)

- **A need to embed inter-active governance landscapes into traditional decision-making**
  The design of inter-active decision-making arrangements tends to be disconnected from inter-active governance arrangements. The formal public regulations and legal procedures too tend to be unsupportive of an open-design collaboration. That is, the design of the decision-making arrangements and its instruments tend to be of support of an outcome-imposition-\(^\text{31}\), rather than a process-oriented planning

---

\(^{31}\) The predominant attitude of the public sector does not necessarily have to be conceived as a static sectoral feature. In the 1980, within the neo-liberal policy discourse, we have witnessed a very transparent and market-oriented public sector. Private developers largely took advantage of this stance by the purchase of land that was to be redeveloped. The result has been that private developers obtained the betterments of land value fluctuations, while they did not seem to be very collaborative and transparent (van Rooy, 2010).
process. That latter should be inherent to a dispersal of decision-making power in which solutions can be merely be the product of a open-ended process of mutual adjustments.

Hence, these conclusions seem to indicate that the problems on ‘area development’ relate to three dimensions:

1. Socio-cultural conditioning of actors
2. The design of decision-making arrangements
3. The management of the process

The first feature is a socio-cultural which can only be partially influenced (Klijn and Teisman, 2002) as it relates to human behavioral patterns. The second and third are both designable and meant to appeal to the former for reaching towards a mutual added value. In fact, the performance of planning (Faludi, 2000) clearly prescribes that planning in a learning oriented environment is meant to confront this challenge. In this, the second feature relates to the ‘shared spaces’ which are created for enabling interaction. The third is meant to guide the process of mutual adjustments in which the relation between the involved actors and the planning subject - in urban space – is in continual dynamic motion towards agreement.

2.6 Conclusion

We pointed out that spatial planning today faces an increased complexity and dynamics of power relations and societal expectations, while the subject in space is a static scarcity. Spatial planning thus faces the challenge to ensure a justifiable distribution of urban space in the light of enhanced spatial demands and needs and dispersed resources to do so. Collaboration-based decision-making today is widely embraced in Dutch political as the most satisfying way to ensure the former. Accepting collaboration means embracing uncertainty, dynamics and complexity which are intrinsic to socio-cultural interactions. Hence, we indicated that planning increasingly has become a socio-cultural challenge for guiding towards meaningful action within urban space (Fig 16).
The latest collaborative planning paradigm is known under the concept of ‘area development’. Though, We found that the Dutch planning paradigm tends to be in struggle to cope and adapt its approach to forge cross-sectoral linkages in order to reach towards mutual added value. Although the area development paradigm seems to be scientifically grounded, discursive conflicts between centralized and collaborative planning approaches tend to manifest in practice. We particularly found that there is a need for a system and managerial approach (to be designed) to combine the interests of actors (To be partially influenced) in collaboration.

Based upon these lessons within the conditions of the ‘area development’ paradigm, the need for a well performing planning practice seems to be more important than ever. That is, there is a need to persuade actors for expanding their biased visions in order to recognize inter-dependency and mutually adjust in collaborations towards a common goal in space. Hence, we believe that the spatial dimension increasingly can be considered as a device within the planning process for the stimulation of negotiation between actors. That is, in the face of complexity, the spatial dimension seems to be the only central point of focus within a decision-making context.

We conceived the traditional Dutch planning approach to be ‘technocratic’, as it is merely meant to inform - and not to intermingle with - a centralized consolidated concentration of power. Thus, planners are challenged to anticipate to this challenge and to adapt their traditional ways of doing planning for shaping sense - instead of imposing solutions - within a dispersed network of power.
Part 3
Empirical inquiry
3.1 Introduction

Theory for the sake of practice
We noted that the spatial planning domain today increasingly tends to incline to the guidance of the decision-making process. We have put this approach in perspective to a more traditional planning concept which is merely focused upon the planning product terms of exclusive technocratic blueprint plans upon urban spatial interventions. Within the course of this shift, we indicated that the science and practice of spatial planning strongly relates to a variety of empirical sciences such as sociology, urban economy and political sciences. These empirical disciplines can be of value to understand what is happening today which is relevant for the design and evaluation of an appropriate spatial planning approach. Thus, it is the latter which helps us to filter and focus towards a selective, but meaningful conceptualization of the planning context which, as noted by Forester (1989), “provides direction, strategy and coherence”. Secondly, we too have explored formal theories of planning which describe normative ways how planners could anticipate to their contexts (fig 17). The reaching out to deductive theoretical concepts is further validated by the belief that today’s urban spatial dynamics and challenges are too a certain degree facing commonalities (Healey, 2007) on societal, economical and political tendencies.

An absence of truth
Having said, we too have argued upon the unique character of the forces and fixes through which urban places evolve. Healey (2007) continued to explain that each planning context has its own “particular evolving interaction between institutional sites and a wider context of political, economical, social and environmental forces”. Thus, we acknowledge that each situation is facing its own, never-ending, trajectory. Hence, given tendencies of complexity, dynamics and ambiguity which mark the context of planning, Faludi (1979) explained that theories should not be meant to predict the future. Accordingly, in the light of ambiguity, we argued that the truth can never be captured through an objectified, comprehensive image of reality. The ‘perceived truth’ is subject to the conjuncture of socially constructed stories which highlight different viewpoints upon a common object. In spatial planning, the latter can be best described as the perception upon space and the process of exploring possible interventions within. Even more, from these notions we could learn that a suitable planning approach cannot be merely drawn from prescriptive textbooks.

---

32 We have defined the context of spatial planning as the conjuncture of societal values and fixes of power in which urban spatial evolves
33 Suitable to its particular context
Knowledge as a directive for action
Nonetheless, by exploring and interpreting the viewpoints which are rationalized in theories, and interpreting them in the light of a specific context, meaningful conclusions could be drawn. These conclusions could help to improve and communicate upon – existing planning approaches towards action and the process of building theory by enrichment. That is, by gaining insights on the problems and potentials upon the course of development within specific planning instances, as planners we could learn how to improve our intervenient-based planning approaches. Conversely, by analyzing stories and formal processes in real-life cases, we knowledge can be generated which too could contribute and give direction to an ongoing process of theory building.

![Logical framework on the role of science in practice (own illustration)](image)

The validity of our theoretical frame, towards a meaningful case study focus is to be found in the hierarchical steps we have defined in chapter 1.6 in order to capture common tendencies in terms of theories and concepts and to contextualize them towards the level of operability of planning in the Netherlands.

Reflecting theoretical recommendations to consolidated practice of Dutch planning
Considering the latter, Stuart et al. (2002 cited in Dul and Hak, 2007) noted that many case studies lack a discussion of their fundamental aspects, such as a clear focus and aim. Based upon our theoretical exploration, we are in the position to define a specific case study goal, research question and strategy. That is, we have created clarity on what objects to focus on and from which perspective to interpret them.

We have included a single case study as part of our research strategy in order to reach towards qualitative data. As argued, we presuppose that “context” is crucial and therefore we do not aim to tackle our case study by means of determinative impositions, drawn from theory. Rather, we explore our case from the perspective of our theoretical concepts, but we aim to incorporate knowledge-from-practice in order to re-evaluate the validity and adaptive capacity of our theory-based position. More particular, we believe that abstract scientific concepts – such as ‘collaborative planning’ or ‘participation’ – could be conceived and treated differently in different contexts.
3.2 Towards the design of our case study

We have built a theoretical framework, in compliance to criteria for scientific knowledge production. The constructed body of knowledge merely delivers us an axiomatic system34, creatively derived from a deductive set of empirical theories on the context of planning, as well as formal theories upon potential planning approaches. As argued in chapter 1.5, we believe that knowledge is socially constructed35 which thus implies that theoretical-based arguments do not prescribe objective arguments, nor do they represent a comprehensive image upon reality. Rather, by posing a selective professional viewpoint we believe new insights and interpretations on problems and approaches can provide a meaningful direction for improvement in planning practice.

Case study goal and outcome

Theory has enriched and focused our thoughts upon the role and goal of planning within today’s conditions of area developments. The resulting framed perspective provides focus through which we can evaluate and recommend upon the suitability of consolidated planning approaches in a practical case. By doing, our theoretically-based perspective will be contextualized due to interpretation towards the variables which are perceived to matter within this case. By doing, the scientific notions will be enriched by practical – and lay knowledge. In this, we are interested if our theoretical inquiry can be adapted to the context of a specific case in order to highlight those variables which may support or oppose the performance of planning. It is the latter which can be defined as our scientifically-based research goal.

In particular, we are interested to raise our understanding upon the actual performance and legitimacy36 of spatial planning in compliance to the perceptions of those involved and affected. This analysis will result in conclusions which reflect the successes, difficulties and challenges for the performance of planning. Based upon these conclusions, we will present concrete recommendations which could increase legitimacy and performance of planning within this specific case. The latter can be defined as our practice-oriented research goal.

Our conclusions and recommendations may contribute to the scientific and political debates concerning the strengths of the normative Dutch planning approach which is to perform within the conditions of the ‘area development’ planning paradigm for reaching its goals.

34 An axioma is a position which is generally accepted [in this case within the boundaries of the academical culture] but not yet proven when reflected to the full complexity of variables within its context. In fact, by accepting planning as an intervenient engineering discipline within a social system, we argue that theoretical-based positions on planning can never be proven. That is, the complexity and dynamics of social systems, facing an innumerable amount of both visible and hidden variables which may be of influence, imposes contextual bound conditions on the performance of a planning approach.

35 The post-positivist or post-normal perspective on knowledge production. This perspective opposes the neopositivist perspective. The latter refers to the scientist as an independent researcher or adviser who supplies objective, unbiased knowledge to policy-makers (Edelenbos et Al, 2004).

36 According to Faludi (2000) “plans perform their role if they help decision-makers to make sense of their situations”. Next to this facilitative perspective upon planning, we too have pointed out that knowledge could be a source of power which should be exercised to steer towards a socially legitimate course of development. Thus, within the concept, the performance of planning does not relate to the material outcome.
Case study research questions

- How is complexity perceived and managed within the planning process?
- How does the planning process relate to normative principles upon legitimacy?
- To what extent do spatial planners engage to social expectations and public participation?

Case study selection
We have chosen the planning process the Delft station area development (“spoorzone Delft”) as our laboratory of study. We believe ‘Spoorzone Delft’ is a striking example of how today’s ideas and concepts on ‘area development’ have been adopted and adapted to practical planning approaches. There are a number of reasons why we estimate this case of value for our objectives:

- “Spoorzone Delft” faces a very complex planning process as a great number of actors are involved in decision-making.
- The organizational governance setting has been designed and managed locally. Thus, formal decision-making with stakeholders and public expectations are closely related. That is, “Spoorzone Delft” is in the “backyard”.
- The project addresses themes which relate to national planning interests: the design of an infrastructural node within the Randstad metropolitan area and the identity and transformation of an historical city.
- The city of Delft inhibits a great number of professional planners and architects as well as the faculty of architecture.
- The quality of empirical research depends upon the possibilities we have to collect data. The municipality of Delft offers transparency to the process through their public accessible website (spoorzone Delft). Next to this, my 2nd mentor, dr. P.P. van Loon is directly professionally involved in the planning process, which offers me a convenient potential to reflect upon the particularities in the process which take place today.

We will narrow down our focus towards the planning process within the governance arrangement which has been established since 2003 and participatory activities, organized by the municipality, which have run parallel ever since. Though, the performance of planning within this arena will be evaluated in the light of its wider institutional context as it evolved through time. That is, the preceding steps can be best considered as the public – public negotiations which resulted in financial state support and mobilization of actors.

---

37 One of the barriers for planning in The Netherlands is generally described as the Not In My Back Yard-syndrome (NIMBY) (Needham, 2007).
38 The activities which have been induced by the development company OBS, as established by the Municipality of Delft.
Case study strategy and methods
As pointed out, we are interested to conceive how the planning process is organized and managed and how it addresses the interests and expectations of those involved and affected by the process. That is, we will evaluate upon the performance of planning.

The following consecutive steps will be taken:

- **3.3 Project description**
  The nature of the project is inherent to the complexity of its decision-making context (Wolting, 2006). That is, the project definition defines the scope of the project in terms of ambitions, dependencies and possible effects. As our main interest lies in the performance of planning in the phase of trans-sectoral collaboration, we will present the problem and definition of the project as how it has been articulated within the public – public arena until processed further within the governance-based negotiation phase.

- **3.4 Planning process analysis**
  We will present an overview upon the planning process, as how it evolved from the initiation phase until today. We will seek to inter-relate the complexity in the course of decision-making (process) to the dynamic scope of planned spatial interventions (project). In particular, we are interested in the performance of planning within and between the different decision-making phases within the process. The purpose of this chapter is to understand the conditions and nature of conflicts which are perceived today within the process.

- **3.5 The societal legitimacy of the planning process**
  In this chapter, we will seek to map the legitimacy of the planning process. Public expectations and the way how citizen’s interests are captured by the planning operability. We have conducted interviews with a variety of actors from different sectors, which are in different ways related to the planning process. By weaving and interconnecting their stories, we have constructed an image upon expectations and contentment of actors in relation to their role in the process. Further, we have reflected these expectations to the capacity of the planning operability to confront these expectations. This method is known as the concept of ‘narrative analysis’. It is legitimized in research by the notion of ambiguity and ongoing dynamics which mark the context of planning. For the sake of comprehensiveness, we will elaborate briefly upon the relevance of this research method in the next paragraph. The purpose of this chapter is to understand in what way the current phase in the planning process is perceived. By reflecting these findings back to the former chapter, a notion can be presented upon the performance of planning within the process so far.

- **3.6 Inconsistent features for planning performance**
  Based upon the highlighted conditions and today’s viewpoints upon the planning performance, we will present an overview of inconsistencies between actor’s viewpoints and the planning operability which - from a learning oriented perspective - should allow actors to reflect and deliberatively (inter)act from their position upon a common intention. It is the latter which we formerly described as the plan performance. Thus, based upon this analysis we are able to identify difficulties and challenges for collaborative planning. Further, we will
argue if those difficulties resemble the limits of planning or if they could be dealt with by enhancements of the planning operability. Figure 19 represents the rationality of this approach schematically.

Fig. 19; narrative analyses as a discursive frame for the evaluation upon the suitability of the planning operability (own illustration)

**Narrative analysis**

As we noted before, ambiguity is a key feature which marks the domain of spatial planning within complex decision-making contexts. Thus, we explained that planners ‘perform’ if they facilitate a legitimate decision-making discourse. Under this notion, we have argued that planners should connect to the viewpoints of those participating in the process, in order to coordinate between them. In this, the planning goal has been defined to converse ambiguity towards a collective sense on an object defined within urban space, accompanied with the disentanglement of necessary resources.

In the course of this perspective, we are interested to evaluate if the current planning approach does enable the construction of deliberative spaces for communication and negotiation. Hence, we are interested if planning efforts actually play a role in the choices that are made concerning future urban interventions. It is the latter which defines if a plan ‘performs’.
Thus, if planners are to coordinate between viewpoints, insights should be gained into the conjuncture of stories which co-exist among a collective object. Hence, we are not interested to pursue an objective image of the truth; nor are we interested to judge if viewpoints are ‘true’ or ‘false’. Hence, we are interested to resemble an image which reflects how biased viewpoints transform in relation to others in account to the object of communication.

**Studying upon stories**

Connelly & Clandinin (1990) noted “In analyzing narratives, the researcher works to actively find the voice of the participant in a particular time, place or setting”. Healey (2007) continued that strategies themselves are stories - rather than objective “truths” - which are to appeal to other stories in the process of inter-subjective transformation. Thus, we are interested in the way how stories have evolved in relation to each other in respect to a common object of interest. In this case, this object can be best described as the future spatial developments which are too be executed around the railway station area in Delft.

The narrative analysis will be conducted in two consecutive steps. In the first step we will conduct interviews which resemble stories with a variety of involved actors. The interview reports are presented in annex 1. In the second step we weave and interconnect those stories for the sake of creating a coherent view upon the actual performance of planning. These interviews have been semi-structured. That is, some structure for direction was given in order to stay focused upon the research theme, while space for deliberative dialogue was reserved in order to uncover those variables which conceived related by the interviewee.

In particular, the following themes have been addressed:

- The internal organization and management of the planning process
- Expectations towards public expectancy and mobilization
- The actual role and performance of spatial planners
- The role of expert knowledge within the planning process
3.3 Project description

Nature of the project
With less than 100,000 inhabitants, we may refer to Delft as a mid-size city, considerably smaller than its neighboring municipalities Den Haag and Rotterdam. Nonetheless, the city of Delft has both nationally as well as internationally been famous for centuries. Apart from its historical features, the city today provides space for a variety of distinctive technical and creative industries, such as the Delft University of Technology (DUT) and a well-known Dutch scientific research institute (TNO).

Since 1847, a railway connection between Den Haag and Rotterdam passes the city centre of Delft. Along with consecutive urban expansions, in the 20th century soon the rail track became to be considered a physical barrier between the city centre and the newly built western city districts (Duin and Wilms Floet, 2007). In 1965 a solution was brought to practice in terms of a viaduct, providing space for two rail tracks. This solution not only created space for new physical crossings, it was considered to be an ‘esthetical gain’ for the city of Delft, whilst too it provided many new parking lots underneath the viaduct.

Fig. 20; the current situation in Delft; The railine fragments the city. Own adaptation from aerial photograph Delft 1970 source: J. van Geest and S.J. van Embden, Rotterdam, 1996
Fig. 21; source: www.spoorzonedelft.nl

Fig. 22; the ‘south wing’ of the Randstad (own illustration)

Today, the rail track has grown to be most intensively used track within the Randstad public transport system. Each day 350 trains pass the train station of Delft. (www.spoorzonedelft.nl, 2010). This intensity is expected to rise further as each year the amount of travelers by train increases with 3% in the Netherlands (www.kennisinhetgroot.nl, 2010).

Considering its embeddedness in a vast regional transportation network, the city of Delft has become a distinctive node within a vast metropolitan region: the Randstad with approximately 7.000.000
inhabitants. In particular, considering Delft’s relational proximity to Den Haag and Rotterdam, Delft can be conceived as a meaningful link in the development of the South wing of the Randstad.

In order to sustain the facilitation of future needs on public transportation, the contemporary rail line capacity is considered to be insufficient. It has become a political urge since the 1980’s that the amount of rail tracks need to be expanded to four. Initially, a design alternative which was based upon an expansion of the current viaduct 39 soon was to be rejected. A great variety of other interests gradually were mobilized by political debates upon the connectivity-based urge for transformation.

Apart from a connectivity-based interest, which for the most is situated on the regional level of scale, explicit locally-based interests have been articulated ever since. That is, the viaduct and passing trains were soon to be conceived as objects of nuisance and pollution locally 40, while the political attention mobilized debates on possible improvements. Considering from an historical perspective, the most striking argument seems to be that the viaduct has been considered as a barrier which divides the city centre from its surroundings. It seems ironical that the same argument, few decades earlier, validated the construction of the happily embraced viaduct; the temporal dimension, in which bias mobilizes change, is striking.

Hence, connectivity interests and local urban quality interests intermingled ever since. In integral consideration of connectivity and urban quality objectives, the construction of a railway tunnel has been proposed 41 by the municipality of Delft in collaboration with ProRail 42. The proposed tunnel was to provide space for four tracks, with a length of 2300 meters. Along with the political debates which increasingly took place on national level, local public support increased.

By accepting this alternative solution, which implies the demolition of the current viaduct, a vast area at the border of the city centre would become vacant. Hence, throughout the 1990’s debates have evolved on ambitions and potential solutions on how this area should be used. Soon, a complete active urban spatial transformation of the area was to be proposed, which reflected an integral planning.

---

39 NS initially proposed a vision – ‘Rail 21’ – in 1988, which required an expansion of the viaduct. This proposal was rejected by the municipality as it did not comply to local development objectives. Instead, this solution would only worsen the current perceived nuisances.

40 The house of representatives of the States General (de Tweede Kamer) noted in 1996 that the current urban situation around the Viaduct is unacceptable in terms of the quality of living environment.

41 The proposal was based upon the study “projectnota Spoorzone Delft”, which has been conducted by the “stuurgroep ondergrondse vervoersinfrastructuur” in 1993.

42 ProRail is the company responsible for the maintenance of the Dutch railways.
approach to meet physical, social, economical and environmental goals. Thus, while the project initially merely reflected connectivity objectives, along with enhanced ambitions, complexity in terms of dependency relations for decision-making and spatial outcome increased.

Considering the proposed densities, the value of the area was to be capitalized to its greatest extent while plan production was to offer direction towards the articulation of the physical outcome. Figure 23 represents the project area which will become vacant as a result of the removal of the viaduct. This area therefore has been appointed as the object of focus for potential development within the planning process.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 24; own illustration**

**Thematic embedding: a station area redevelopment**

Railway station areas today often tend to be locations of topical interests for municipal governments and project developers. In these cases, it is commonly believed that the railway stations do not meet up to future demands on capacity, circulation and quality (Wilms Floet and van Duin, 2007).

Consequently, Many Dutch cities today are facing new station area developments in terms of the reorganization of public transportation and the development of real estate in the area\(^\text{43}\). In each of these projects there is a tendency to disentangle transport flows, improve the connection between the station square and the city centre (Wilms Floet and Duin, 2007). Each of these project are characterized by the collective efforts which are being put to reach towards an integral solution in terms of the intermingling of social, economical, cultural en environmental goals.

Though, this common trend on station area transformations only reveals part of the motives and interests which are at stake. Each planning instance is facing its own unique conditions and trajectory as capital assets, actor involvement and public expectations are contextual bound and thus have resulted in different configurations of decision-making arenas and planning operability’s.

---

\(^{43}\) These developments have for instance been notable in major cities such as Utrecht, The Hague, Amsterdam and Rotterdam, but also in smaller towns such as Haarlem, Leiden, Gouda, Dordrecht and Delft.
3.4 Planning process analysis

Area development
Our theoretical framework presented an analysis of the features which validated the evolvement of the Dutch planning paradigm towards the normative concept of ‘area development’. The latter suggests ways how conditions upon - and potentials within urban space should be dealt with within institutional arrangements on decision-making upon urban spatial intervention. We explained that ‘area development’ can be considered as a political embracement of complexity as a potential for development.

We pointed out that the guidelines for area development seem to suggest ways to forge linkages between the Dutch comprehensive inter-level planning tradition and contemporary ideas on subsidiarity principles and joint - cross-sectoral - cooperation. This ambition is reflected in figure 25.

This representation indicates that inter-level public-public collaboration mainly is meant to create deliberative conditions and shape potential for a decentralized non-hierarchical governance setting. The latter is to allow for the mutual evolvement of market interests, consumer orientation and governmental policy agendas. We explained that the challenge for planners, within the context of area development, is to generate collective sense by the communication of knowledge within – and between decision-making arenas.

![Diagram of institutional planning context]

Fig. 25 The institutional planning context can be roughly divided into two consecutive phases in which collaboration takes place in different decision-making arenas. (own illustration)

---

44 Subsidiarity relates to the principle that a central government should have a facilitative – subsidiary – role, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed at a local level.
This normative conceptual framework on area development processes provides us a referential frame through which we can reflect upon the actual planning process as how it occurs within the decision-making process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’. In this, we are interested if the actual planning operability allows for a deliberative – collaborative – planning approach within satisfying public boundaries. Thus, in this chapter we will describe the way how planning throughout the process has performed in managing the conjuncture of complex relations and dispersed resources towards concrete – collectively appreciated – solutions. Hence, we will identify the variety of decision-making arenas in which plans evolve, as well as their relational consecution.
The initiation of Spoorzone Delft

In 1988 the Dutch railway company ‘NS’ presented their future vision: Rail-21. On the basis of this document they proposed a duplication of the existing rail line capacity between Den Haag and Rotterdam, combined with a list of proposals for physical interventions. In particular, along Delft Central station they proposed that the existing viaduct was to be expanded by an additional overpass on top of the existing one.

The municipal council of Delft almost immediately activated their veto position in order to reject the proposed intervention unanimous. The proposal only would make matters worse in terms of local nuisance and spatial fragmentation. Though, this proposal mobilized local political force to induce debate on a collectively perceived problem which up till then was considered to be ‘necessary evil’.

Consequently, in 1991, Delft contracted the urbanist Frits Palmboom to conduct a feasibility study on possible ways how the infrastructural problem could be resolved. The outcome of his study indicated that a rail track expansion was inevitable. Further, he proposed that the construction of a railway tunnel, with 4 tracks, would be the best possible solutions for resolving infrastructural problems and local nuisances. Besides, the relocation of the rail line into a tunnel would create an enormous potential for an inner city urban area development.

Rail 21

Until 1992, the NS actively contributed to the debates around future mobility prospects by means of presenting visions and indicative plans (kennisgroep Uw Spoor, 2009).

Rail-21 was presented in 1988. In this they proposed an ambitious expansion and distinction between the amounts of trains which are to serve future travelers. In order to facilitate this proposal, a number of spatial interventions have been proposed for alleviating infrastructural bottlenecks and railway expansions.

These interventions were proposed to minimize additional costs by making use of the existing rail tracks as much as possible. For this reason, they posed the idea that the viaduct near Delft was to be expanded by the construction of an additional storey on top.

Though, the political climate in the 1990’s was much more in favor to integrate mobility-based undertakings to wider urban interventions. Thus, most of the proposals within ‘Rail-21’ have been rejected. However, a number of them have accelerated political debates for prioritizing these problems.

45 The policy document “rail-21, sporen naar een nieuwe eeuw” predicted, on the basis of a comprehensive societal analysis, a duplication of travelers by train in the near future. On the basis of the existing rail line network, they proposed a number of specific interventions for meeting future demands on travelers (http://www.ovnet.nl/?h=begrip&m=begrip&b=rail21, 2001).

46 Already in the existing situation, a sound level of 90 dB was measured next to the facades along the rail line, while only 65 was allowed.
Palmboom’s proposals were happily embraced by the municipality. Hence, the planned tunnel construction was from then on announced in several indicative planning documents47.

Thus, local political will was activated. This collective will was based upon the following explicit arguments (adapted from Klijn, 2004):

- The tunnel could provide space for rail line expansion
- The tunnel could divide ‘fast’ and ‘slow’ tracks
- The underground track could make the existing curve in the current track undone; therefore, passing trains do not anymore necessarily have slow down along Delft
- The tunnel would be a solution for dealing with locally perceived hindrances
- The tunnel could improve and integrate the infrastructural junction at Delft Central Station

Although at that time the main point of focus was the construction of the tunnel; the municipality preliminary put forward that the potential area development would provide space for 1600 homes and 50.000 m² office space. This estimation did not change much over the next 2 decades which followed. Soon another study followed; Delft appointed Frits Palmboom in 1992 to conduct an additional study which aimed to highlight local threats and opportunities for area developments if the tunnel would be constructed (fig. 27). Gradually, the project became to be conceived by the municipality from a more integral perspective; combining connectivity objectives to local demands and potential for urban transformation. Though, if Delft wanted to transform this perspective into a viable solution, relations needed to be build in order to appeal to necessary resources from a wider set of committed actors. That is, a higher ambition on the outcome requires a greater complexity within the process for getting things done.

Palmbout (1992) – ‘Studie naar inpassing Spoortunnel en herontwikkeling omgeving’

Palmbout suggested to subject the length and allocation of the railway tunnel to the potential of a comprehensive urban area development. In his proposal, a development potential would emerge for a 40 ha. urban space. In particular, he proposed to construct a tunnel which would cross the current ‘ireneviaduct’. By doing so, the area at the south of the station could become an interconnection between the city centre and its surrounding districts.

On top of the railway tunnel, he suggested the allocation of an urban park. Though, in order to capture the value of the area, both sides of the park were designed for a high density mix of functions: 1600 homes and 50.000 m² b.v.o. office space.

47 Structuurschets 1991, Ontwikkelingsvisie Delft, 1993
Planning for seduction towards mobilization

Up until this point, which was at the beginning of the 1990’s, the process was mainly directed to increase the social support base within the municipal council in Delft. Though, if Delft was to execute an ambitious project of this scope, a greater actor involvement for reaching to the necessary resources is requisite (fig 28). Hence, other actors were to be seduced for shaping attention and building relations.

Delft actively started to lobby in higher political arenas for shaping attention. In an interview (Annex 1a) the former director of the process, Mrs. Bijleveld, clearly explained this approach as following:
“In order to generate the means to get things done it is requisite to actively search for allies in the process... ...therefore we have pursued a strategy of seduction for connecting –adapting - to existing policy frameworks as well as showing off – attracting - by means of conducting lots of research for showing potentials on what could be. For instance, instead of asking the NS what their interest is, they already decided in advance to present a design alternative to the NS in which the current obstructive curve in the rail track has been resolved in a future tunnel construction” (Bijleveld, 2010)

Meanwhile, the dynamics from wider political forces seemed to both oppose as well as support the interest of Delft. First of all, the NS pronounced that an expansion of the rail line at Delft did not anymore have any priority within the scope of Rail-21. At the other hand, a political debate at national level emerged on the construction of a high speed train connection (HSL). This train line was suggested to pass Delft Central Station, which was to be accompanied with the necessary interventions.

The ministry of traffic and water management (V&W) was particularly committed to the latter, as this ministry carries formal responsibility for sustaining public transport in terms of future-oriented interventions. An initial feasibility study indicated that the existing viaduct does not provide a sufficient track for the allocation of the HSL. Thus, it was suggested that a separate tunnel for the HSL was to be constructed, complementary to the existing railway viaduct. For efficiency reasons, this conclusion was immediately rejected by the NS, which implicitly served the interest of the municipality of Delft.

Thus, momentum seemed to be working in the interest of Delft, as the potential rose for combining local political agendas and national political interests. That is, although problem formulations seemed of different nature, coherency on the solution – the construction of a railway tunnel - could serve the interest of those parties who are conceived to be interdependent.48

Delft actively responded to these emerged conditions. Though they did not have any particular interest in the allocation of the HSL, as a way to show their commitment they partly financed a new subsequent study on the HSL, which was to be conducted by the Stuurgroep Ondergronds Vervoersinfrastructuur49 (SOVI) in 1993. Mrs. Bijleveld clearly explained why they chose to do so:

“Collaboration requires durable social relationships which can only induce effective operation if they are based upon mutual trust and commitment... ...While the municipality of Delft did not have a great deal of financial resources compared to the big players at national level, they invested intensively in conducting and presenting technical studies for both showing their commitment as well as retaining a degree of steering power within the process.” (Bijleveld, 2010)

48 Planners should be more engaged to the design of possible solutions, than to impose extensive analyses of the problem (Teisman, 1997, Klijn et al., 2000 cited in Klijn, 2004)

49 The SOVI was established in the light of an intensified political attention for building knowledge on underground infrastructure in relation to intensified mix-use urbanism. They conducted several studies. (http://www.bouwweb.nl/wmr/thema.html, 2011)
The outcome from their report noted that a railway tunnel with 4 tracks would be the only viable solution which corresponded to the objectives of those involved. This conclusion seemed to be of support to the municipality of Delft.

Thus, so far we witnessed that while NS initiated the process, the municipality of Delft ever since largely determined the course of the process and dealt with the increased complexity in terms of state involvement. As a result, a consensus based solution, which served the interest of both national actors as well as the municipality, was evident. (fig. 29)

Though, dynamics and unpredictability have proved to be intrinsic to complexity. In 1996, the decision has been made that the HSL will be allocated upon another route. This decision can be considered unpredictable as it has been made in a different decision-making arena, in which the municipality of Delft has not been represented. Consequently, national political interest in the construction of a railway tunnel in Delft tended to dissolve as new priorities emerged.

A shifting focus

Though, the municipality did not give up at that time. Considering the alternative decisions on the allocation of the HSL, the ministry of V&W seemed to be difficult to be reached as an ally in the process. Thus, Delft actively started to combine forces with local actors. As the local interest mainly covers the fate of urban spatial area at the surface, and not so much the concrete which lies underneath the surface, a greater amount of attention was given to the potential of urban area development.

A current municipal process manager, mr. van der Post, noted during an interview (2010) that Delft from the start attempted to map and incorporate the complex relations that are engaged with the fate of ‘Spoorzone Delft’. Thus, apart from seeking allies within public structures, they too reached out to private partners preliminary. In 1993, Delft found an ally in the private company Ballast Nedam 50. Together they developed plans and studies for an integral area development. Consequently, Ballast Nedam was selected as developing partner.

Meanwhile, the municipality actively continued to lobby within national arenas and presented their plans and ongoing research. In 1998, the ministry of VROM (spatial planning) - today known as the ministry of infrastructure and environment - became committed to the project. The proposed plans by the municipality seemed to correspond to their policy framework as communicated within the latest national spatial policy document (‘Vijfde nota Ruimtelijke Ordening’). They awarded subsidy to the project from a fund (stIR; Stimuleringsprogramma Intensief Ruimtegebruik) which was to promote densification and mixed use within urban areas.

50 They collaborated within the frame of a ‘intentie-overeenkomst’.
Another success was booked too; the ministry of Traffic and Watermanagement reserved subsidies for the tunnel construction in Delft (174 million €). This amount was initially reserved for another Dutch infrastructural project – the extension of the A4 highway – which got delayed. Thus, for the second time, Spoorzone Delft was embraced within the national political arena (fig. 30).

Though, the House of Representatives (‘de Tweede Kamer’) posed particular conditions if they were to subsidize the project:

- The Ministry of V&W would only subsidize if part of the betterments from the area development would be transferred to cover the costs of the railway tunnel. The latter was to be achieved through a public-private partnership. Thus, a new dependency relation was initiated between upper- and underground developments; one of financial nature which imposed a new condition on the consecutive decision-making.

- The business plan so far did not cover all costs. In order to appeal to other resources and to co-align municipal policy agendas with a wider territorial interest, the municipality of Delft was demanded to induce collaboration between separate levels of government. These are the State, province, the (informal) region ‘Haaglanden’ and surrounding municipalities. The outcome of this collaboration should result in a feasible business case.
Re-enforcing urban spatial quality and public support: the masterplan

While public-public collaboration was initiated and political agendas seemed supportive, the municipality reset their focus to the persuasion of their locally-based interests. Their main objective at that time was to increase the public support base for the project in Delft. Hence, in 1999 they hired an internationally renowned urban designer, Joan Busquets, to develop a coherent spatial vision (fig 33 and annex 3) for the area developments. Busquets articulated the following conditions in his presentation of the former (Klijn, 2004):

**Busquets (1999) – ‘Spatial vision Spoorzone Delft’**

Busquets articulated the following conditions through which the spatial vision was designed:

- Delft central station has to remain its central location;
- The urban configuration should enable an improved intermodal setting;
- Public space should become more functional and accessible;
- The historical identity of Delft should be accentuated explicitly by means of a creative combination of old and new;
- The list of requirements should be translated into a mixed uses area;
- Infrastructure should shape coherency in the plan;

The following main design elements lied at the base of his vision:

- The traditional water canal will recur along the ‘Phoenixstreet’
- Car traffic will be removed from the border of the city centre, while another bypass will be created
- An inter-modal public transport node will be constructed
- A fluent functional and visual connection will be established between ‘Spoorzone’ and the city centre
- New building activities will be mainly located south of the current station building
- The building heights will be ‘moderate’, having only a few higher accents.
- An urban park will alleviate connect the northern and southern parts in the plan area.

---

51 The invested stIR subsidies – which were awarded by VROM - for this purpose.
Fig. 33; spatial vision Spoorzone Delft (own illustration, adapted from Bestemmingsplan Spoorzone, 2006)
In 2003, Busquets developed his vision further into a masterplan (fig 34). This plan merely pointed out ‘what could be’ in relation to the situation today. Though it was indicative in its nature, the plan was very much comprehensive in its construction. Even in this preliminary phase in the decision-making process, it was explicitly noted that the plan area, the list of requirements, the spatial allocation of functions, the direct surroundings of the station, the building volumes and the desired atmosphere are to be legally consolidated. In other words, strict conditions, limiting the solutions space, were to be imposed on following decision-making arenas which were not yet established, with a vast amount of actors which were not yet selected. A persuasive ambition was emphasized as this plan too proposed a detailed time span for implementation. Hence, this plan seemed to presume a large degree of centralized steering power. Though, today, it is clear that this planning proposal by far has not been succeeded.


This (indicative) masterplan is aimed to set the boundaries within which future plans can evolve throughout the process. Apart from design related inquiries, the masterplan too is said to be based upon a financial-economical analysis in order to assure that the plan provides space to develop towards a feasible project.

**Scope of the project**

- A railway tunnel of 2300 meters for the alleviation of local nuisance.
- An infrastructural node in order to integrate flows of traffic
- An area development (aprox. 30 ha.) for the construction of 1500 homes and 50.000 m² office space

The explicit note has been made that ‘Spoorzone Delft’ will not become a VINEX suburb, but an inner-city – Delft-like – district which will fluently merge with its surrounding.

**Plan description**

*Northern part*

Due to the removal of the railway viaduct, the ‘phoenixstreet’ and ‘Spoorsingel’ will be rearranged. An underground parking garage of 2 stories, and a water canal at the surface, will be constructed. Due to the construction of the tunnel, the ‘Bacinol’ building in the north will be demolished, while a newly designed office building will be rebuild on this spot.

*Middle part & southern part*

A long urban park will be allocated on top of the railway tunnel. Along the park, a high density of building blocks will be constructed. The size of the building blocks is adapted to the morphology of the city centre. These blocks will be a mixture of offices and homes. The ‘Coenderstraat’ will become a prominent street within the newly built city district. The building heights will vary from 3 to 7 stories, in order to assure a dynamic street impression.

At the north of the current station, a new building, containing a station and city council, will be constructed. Along with a bussstation and a new underground bicycle garage, a more compact infrastructural node will come to existence. The current station will be transformed into a catering building.
Conclusion:
The plan is said to provide a better functional and visual connection between the city centre and its surrounding districts in the west. The rationale on the choices for building typologies and morphology are based upon the adaption to its inner-city context. Existing monuments, such as the old mill at the phoenixstraat, will be preserved. Apart from a high density urban district, ‘spoorzone Delft’ too will provide space for extensive green and blue areas.

The area development which is the object of discussion within the scope of this study is located in the middle and southern part of the total plan area of ‘Spoorzone Delft’.

Quantitative program of requirements

Table 1; Quantitative list of requirements as proposed within the Masterplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Homes</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Building Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market housing</td>
<td>City council</td>
<td>(semi)</td>
<td>Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>29.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>Underground</td>
<td>3 to 5 floors/block (accents up to 7 floors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1230 homes</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>600 places</td>
<td>266.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front façade preconditioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back façade variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution space: pre-conditions & negotiable variables

Preconditioned:
- All infrastructural lines.
- The list of requirements: 1600 homes (200.000 m2) and 50.000 m2 offices.
- The allocation of the infrastructural node, offices, homes, parking places, water and public space within the plan area.
- The orientation and façade direction of the buildings

Negotiable
- The types of living units per building plot
- The building heights within preconditioned boundaries of 3 to 7 stories (fig...)
- The backsides of the buildings
- Parking lot typologies at building block. Semi-underground/underground.

Relation to follow-up plans
The masterplan will be translated into a more detailed - legally-binding - land-use plan. The land-use plan will be complemented by a ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’. The beeldkwaliteitsplan is mainly concerned to provide guidelines and restrictions on the esthetical features of the project. Next, an urban plan on the design of public space will be conducted by ‘de architecten Cie’. At last, each plot will be built conform a detailed plan which will be set up close to the implementation phase.
Fig. 34 Overview plan area; division of functions (own illustration)
Fig. 35 plan area ‘Spoorzone Delft’ (own illustration)

Fig. 36; overview and section railway tunnel and plan area within (own illustration)

Fig 37; masterplan overview; the contour indicates the non-negotiable building envelopes (own illustration)
Fig. 38; masterplan overview; Proposal building heights. The definite scheme is still negotiable as long as its resulting m2 GFA. are within the regulated boundaries. Further, it has been written that a dynamic street impression is to be assured in terms of a variable division of floors per block. (own illustration)

Fig 39; masterplan overview: the non-negotiable division of functions (own illustration)
Fig. 40; masterplan overview: the division of parking places (own illustration)

Fig 41; masterplan overview; comprehensive planning proposal on the implementation (own illustration)
Planning for the enhancement of public support
For the gain of public support, the municipality actively promoted this plan by means of informational activities such as public presentations and later on the establishment of an information centre near the construction side. Complementary, the municipality established ‘Platform Spoor’ in 1999. This initiative was meant to inform to - and share knowledge with civil society organizations and local entrepreneurs. The platform was merely focused on practical matters on changes and externalities in the city during the process of implementation. This has been clearly explained by mr. van der Post (2010):

‘Platform Spoor discerns from the public participation gatherings, as access is only given to civil society organizations which represent collective interests of groups which could be affected by the project. The goal of this platform is to inform and to consult on certain practical matters which relate to the constructional period. Individual interests and design-related issues are not taken into discussion. There are already other options for citizens to react to the urban design decisions. Though, it seemed that some participants from below considered this platform as a decision-making arena resembling to the municipal council.’ (van der Post, 2010).

It has been noticeable that the participation-based initiatives were merely meant to inform the public; they did not raise the actual decision-making power ‘from below’. At the time the local effects of public activities seemed convenient; citizens were largely mobilized to support the project. Even more, lots of the citizens which directly live along the current viaduct have pointed out that they have always accepted, and appreciated, the current situation in Delft. However, during the course of the planning process, many of them declared to trust the experts which claim that an urban spatial transformation is inevitable and they rely on the quality of the plans as presented by the municipality. By stating, they claim to automatically accept the consequent decade or so, in which they have to cope with the effects of the building activities in their living environment.

The established public support did not seem open-ended; it has been evident that the masterplan, accompanied with its promotional activities induced a vast public support base. In 2000 Delft sold their stocks (120 million euro) which were invested in the provincial electricity company (electriciteitsmaatschappij Zuid Holland). The citizens of Delft were asked, by means of a referendum, how the revenues should be spent. The outcome indicated that citizens of Delft wanted to see 20 million euro spend in the project ‘Spoorzone Delft’.

---

53 Since the initiation of the process, a number of civil society organizations have been established: Werkplaats Spoorzone Delft (WeSD), Bewoners Overleggroep Spoorlijn/Delft (BoS/D), belangenvereniging Olofsbuurt-Westerkwartier, Delftse modelbouw vereniging, Belangenvereniging Zuidoost, Buurtvereniging Delftzicht, de Koestalling (http://www.spoorzonedelft.nl/Contact/Bewonersinitiatieven/index.aspx, 2010). All of these organizations can be conceived as platforms which are to represent a specific - locally-bound - interest.

54 Decision-making power refers to the ability to exert influence upon decision which steer the course of action.

55 Conclusion drawn from 25 interviews which have been been conducted in 2009 and 2010 by the civil society organization: ‘Werkplaats Spoorzone Delft’. They interviews have been published under the name ‘Leven aan het Spoor’.
Public –public collaboration

While locally ambitions and interest were translated into indicative plans, the municipality of Delft was challenged to co-align its evolving ambitions to policy frameworks which are located at other levels of government. That is, the dynamic boundaries – or solution space - in which public – public collaboration can evolve, are conditioned by the interests of each governmental body which is conceived as requisite partners. These policy frameworks generally are accompanied with funding opportunities. Hence, within the consecutive public-public decision-making arena, the masterplan too served a purpose for directing focus towards the object of interest (Fig. 42).

Following, we will define the interest of the separate governmental bodies in relation to their commitment to the project. In this, it is noticeable that the informal level of the Randstad region serves as a discursive framework which reflects the policies of the separate levels of government. Even more, in order to reach towards an inter-level sense making process, the level of the Randstad seems to be an effective framework to induce a strategic planning approach for guiding a process of mutual adjustments.

Fig. 42; public – public collaboration (own illustration)

---

56 For instance, the financial support from the ministry of VROM related to the policy framework of ‘stIR’, which was founded in the light of the latest national spatial planning strategy (Nota ruimte).
Public policy frameworks in relation to ‘Spoorzone Delft’

National policy
Documents:

- ‘Nota Ruimte 5’ and ‘Bereikbaarheidsoffensief Randstad’:
  The Nota Ruimte 5 proposes to integrate urban- and infrastructural developments within a cohesive network perspective on the ‘Randstad’. Within this thematic perspective, urban regeneration of deprived inner city districts near infrastructural nodes are the core focus of attention.

The network perspective on the ‘Randstad’ is based upon the prospect for an increased future demands on homes and office spaces: A vast amount of these prospects are to be captured within the boundaries on existing urban tissue.

Delft is conceived as an essential node within the Randstad infrastructural network, while its station area is a focal point for urban spatial densification.

Provincial policy
Documents:

- De zuidvleugel, van visie naar uitvoering, 2000
  This vision explicitly noted that the conceived railway bottleneck along Delft is a threat to the (inter)national economical competitive position of the south-wing of the ‘Randstad’. Further, they pointed out that Delft’s railway surroundings provide potentials for mixed-uses area developments.

- Streekplan Zuid-Holland West, 2003
  Delft central station has been classified as an above-regional node in which it is desirable that a mixed uses urban area will be developed. That is, a mix of public transport, culture, tourism, knowledge and business.

- Regionaal structuurplan Haaglanden, 2002
  Economical developments, in coherence to the infrastructural network, has been posed as a requisite condition for further urban developments. In this, they appointed the enhancement of railline capacity between Den Haag and Rotterdam as a priority.

Municipal policy
Documents:

- Ontwikkelingsvisie Delft 2025, 1998
  This vision presents Delft from the perspective as a compact/network city. The latter relates to the desired embedding within the regional network for connecting to surrounding cities. The former relates to the multifunctional densification which is ambitioned within the areas of ‘Zuidpoort’ and ‘Spoorzone’.

Busquet’s urban spatial vision and masterplan has been subjective and complementary to this vision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Spatial reflection</th>
<th>Envisioned solution</th>
<th>Resources and roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National V&amp;W</td>
<td>To resolve infrastructural bottleneck. Committed, but low priority. ‘Bereikbaarheidsoffensief Randstad’</td>
<td>Railway tunnel; as cheap as possible</td>
<td>Participant costs: € 330 mln.</td>
<td>Risk carrier tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VROM</td>
<td>Mixed use urbanism and densification. ‘Nota Ruimte 5’, ‘Randstad 2020’</td>
<td>mixed uses urban area</td>
<td>Participant costs: € 75 mln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Zuid Holland Strengthen the South-Wing of the Randstad</td>
<td>Railway tunnel</td>
<td>Participant costs: € 30 mln.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Delft Local nuisance and fragmentation Masterplan</td>
<td>Integral area developments</td>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant costs: € 43 mln.</td>
<td>Risk carrier director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the 3 formal levels of government, a number of other public and semi-public actors\(^{57}\) showed to have a recognized interest in the project and became funding partners. However, as pointed out by the process manager mr. van der Post (2010), these actors have been largely supportive to the municipal agenda and therefore did not increase the actual complexity in decision-making. In the end, it seemed that the ministry of V&W has been the most demanding and least flexible actor within the public-public collaboration. This seems to be a logical consequence of the fact that they by far are the most extensive funding partner. Their dominant attitude appeared evident as the ministry of V&W imposed that they would not be willing to spend any more that they agreed upon in the course of the process, even while the project at that time was facing uncertainties due to hidden variables.

Altogether, it is possible to say that the municipality as well as the ministry of V&W have been the most dominant actors in the process. However, their position has been very different. The ministry of V&W was the most extensive funding partner, while the municipality used a continuous flow of knowledge production as a resource to steer the course of decision-making. Next, the ministry of VROM has been less dominant, but very committed and cooperative. The roles of the three governmental bodies have been elaborated more detailed below:

- The railway tunnel has been recognized by The House of Representatives as ‘state infrastructure’. (Rijksinfrastructuur). This assignment has had deep consequences which have been both supportive as well as threatening to the continuation of the project. The supportive fact is that it means that the Ministry of V&W will subsidize significantly and will carry responsibility for the tunnel. This support has been crucial for the feasibility of the project. Though, the threatening fact has been that they stated that the tunnel has to be constructed in the most efficient way in financial terms. In particular, they posed the condition that 80 million euro of betterments from the urban area developments should be transferred towards the tunnel construction. The latter was to be recouped through the construction of a consecutive public-private partnership. This partnership was to be established between the municipality and a private developer which would be competent to be involved in both the tunnel construction as well as the urban area developments. This condition can be considered threatening as the ministry does not have any interest in the quality and feasibility of the urban area developments, nor do they award any flexibility towards the process continuation. Thus, this condition can be considered as a burden imposed on a consecutive decision-making arena on the plan development in which the Ministry of V&W will not be participate, but control from above. Hence, they presumed that a certain degree of top-down control and predictability would be possible.

- The relationship between the municipality and the Ministry of V&W has been rather problematic due to too much authorative behavior of the latter and a lack of commitment for mutual learning through collaboration. In the course of this struggle, the ministry of VROM showed off commitment (Bijleveld, 2010) as they invested time

---

\(^{57}\) For instance: region ‘Haaglanden (mobiliteitsfonds)’, Rotterdam and Den Haag.
and efforts in order to alleviate limiting vision of participating partners. In particular, they facilitated communication between the municipality and the ministry of V&W.

Nonetheless, after the consolidation of public-public agreements the ministry of V&W assigned ProRail to conduct their tasks in relation to the tunnel construction. This meant that the municipality no longer had to forge collaboration directly with the ministry. Instead, ProRail was assigned to direct the planning process of the tunnel construction and to collaborate closely with the municipality in order to safeguard the integrality of the process (Fig 44). This seemed a positive development for the municipality, as they would anymore have to cope with the authoritative behavior of the ministry. Though, soon it became clear that the ProRail too was a difficult partner in collaboration. That is, they behaved too dominant within a context which in essence was meant for a shared division of power (van der Post, 2010).

![Fig 44; ambition on public-private setting (own illustration)](image)

- The municipality has been operating in two different decision-making arenas. That is, one which aimed to persuade political force at different levels government and one which was aimed to seduce for a local support base. In the former, the primary object of negotiation was related to the railway tunnel, while the latter merely concerned the area developments, as a consequent of the tunnel.

**Uncertainty which threatened the strategic direction of development**

The political commitment at national level proved to be uncertain while in 2003 the minister of V&W - Minister De Boer - decided to relocate 24 million euro of subsidy to another infrastructural project. She reassured that ‘Spoorzone Delft’ will receive this amount at a later stage in 2010. Consequently, the municipality of Delft became concerned about the effects of this decision in terms of decreased potential and commitments from other partners.
At this point, a civil society organization in Delft (‘Spoorzone Delft NU’) was established to protest against this decision (fig 45). They collected 10,000 signatures from supporting citizens and offered this petition to the House of Representatives for persuasion. The effect of this petition turned out positive. That is, subsidy is definitely reserved with full political support.

Fig 45: interaction between separate decision-making arenas upon a common object of negotiation
(own illustration)

Conclusion on public – public agreements
There are four distinctive elements which mark the outcome of the public – public decision-making process. They have been consolidated in a formal agreement. These outcomes shape conditions and deliberative solution-spaces for the continuation of the process

- **Project definition**
  Due to the relocation of the rail track into an underground railway tunnel, an enormous potential for area development arises. This potential has developed into a plan which provides space for a mixture of functions in order to capture the value of the area in social and economical terms. In particular, it has been posed that the area development needs to be executed conform the guidelines which have been suggested in the Masterplan as designed by Joan Busquets.

- **Roles and responsibilities**
  While bounded conditions have been imposed ‘from above’, mainly by the ministry of V&W, the municipality carries full responsibility for the entire project – both area developments and tunnel construction. ProRail was assigned to conduct the infrastructural related tasks of the ministry of V&W further.

- **Functional list of requirements**
  The collaborating partners agreed upon the following list of requirements:
  - A railway tunnel with four tracks
  - An intermodal public transport node
  - 1500 homes
  - 50,000 m² office space

---

58 ‘Procesovereenkomst Spoorzone Delft, 2002’

59 In a later stage, in 2008, the responsibility of the tunnel construction was transferred to the ministry of V&W.
- **Business case**

The total investment has been calculated on 1 billion euro. The public actors altogether contributed 513 million euro for both the tunnel construction as well as the area developments. The ministry of V&W by far has been to most contributive actor (272 million euro). For the municipality of Delft, with an investment of 45 million euro, this project has been financially the most ambitious one ever. The costs to construct the railway tunnel, approximately 500 million euro, are by far not completely covered by the financial contribution of public actors. The consecutive cost for the area development will be carried by the private actors from the profits of homes and office developments.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public actor</th>
<th>Contribution (x million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of V&amp;W</td>
<td>€ 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of VROM</td>
<td>€ 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality of Delft</td>
<td>€ 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province South Holland</td>
<td>€ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region ‘Haaglanden’</td>
<td>€ 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betterments from area developments</td>
<td>€ 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 513</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the ministry of V&W is formally responsible for the maintenance and redevelopment of the Dutch railway tracks, for them the project did not have top priority. Hence, they contributed significantly, while they imposed the condition that 80 million euro needs to be recouped to the tunnel construction from the betterments of the area development. The latter has to be executed under the construction of a public-private partnership. This decision meant that a greater sense of dependency of private actors has been created and complexity therefore would increase. Former process director, Edith Bijleveld clearly explained: “if private partners are to carry an additional financial burden, a greater degree of decision-making power too needs to be awarded to these partners”. Thus, lots of decision-making between public and private actors was to be expected soon.

Hence, whilst agreements have been made, the municipality already started from 2000 onwards to obtain the grounds within the project area. The plots of land at the time were divided between private owners (homes), NS Poort (station area) and ProRail (the grounds on which the rail track is constructed). Although each landowner does have the right to develop its ground according to the proposed plans, none of the owners did possess enough lands to be able to do so in a profitable way.
A conjunction of decision-making arena’s

Whilst the scope of the project has been defined, the municipality, in close collaboration with ProRail, pursued the process further. The planning process, which was previously demarked by - and evolved in the light of national policy frameworks - now was relocated to a local decision-making setting. Within this setting – under the conditions of strict planning boundaries as reflected in the masterplan – the municipality was challenged to represent their electorate, whilst sharing decision-making with private partners in order to reach out to the necessary resources.

Although the integrality of the process was to be safeguarded under the construction of a public-private partnership\(^\text{60}\), it soon became evident that there was no single private company who was considered to be capable to carry risks for both the tunnel construction as well as the area developments. Therefore, separate contractors were selected which meant a division between the direct management of the tunnel construction and area development. Nonetheless, the project organization was believed to be successfully designed in an integral manner (van der Post, 2010). Considering the infrastructural features, ProRail and the municipality contracted the assignment out to a private contractor, ‘Combinatie Crommelijn’\(^\text{61}\), in 2008. The assignment included the following:

- To construct the railway tunnel
- The construct the underground Railway station
- To prepare the building site within the complete plan area
- To construction parts of the public space design

Considering the area developments, the municipality was assigned as the director of consecutive collaborations. That is, due to the complexity of the ambition on the outcome, the creation of a cooperative governance arrangement was preferred over a contracting-out procedure. Hence, it was believed that a greater degree of responsibilities and resources could be equally shared between public and private actors, which thus would potentially lead to an increased (intrinsic) steering competence in which higher ambitions could be realized.

Due to the managerial complexity and financial risks, Delft decided to separate the project management from daily politics. That is, “too much interference of the dynamics of local political agendas could jeopardize the effectiveness of decision-making” (Procesplan Spoorzone Delft, 2006). Instead, an independent development organization, which could execute value judgment merely on the basis of business-economical point of views, is believed to create more appropriate conditions for mutual collaboration with private partners. Therefore, in 2006 the municipality established a developing company - ‘OntwikkelingsBedrijf Spoorzone Delft bv’ (OBS) – to direct the process.

The administration of OBS is completely autonomous, though its course of decision-making can be considered representative for the municipal interest as the municipality is 100% stakeholder of this company and is, along with ProRail, represented in the board. The OBS was to operate under the conditions of consolidated agreements, while it operates under a strict non-profit policy framework

---

\(^{60}\) It was believed that a public-private partnership which would cover both the area development as well as the tunnel construction would lead to a more efficient outcome. Under this presumption, the 80 million euro betterment has been accepted.

\(^{61}\) ‘combinatie Crommelijn’ consists out of a partnership between: ‘Aannemingsmaatschappij CFE NV’, ‘Mobilis BV (Haverkort Voormolen)’ and ‘Dura Vermeer Groep NV’
which relates to a sense of societal interests. Under these conditions, OBS executes its tasks in collaboration with its partners, while public law remains in the hand of the municipality. The latter means that the municipality was to approve the definite planning decisions that are to be taken up in the legally binding land use plan. Apart from its representative capacity within the OBS, the municipality, thus, at this stage was in the most powerful position.

Within the boundaries of Busquets’ masterplan, the municipality, through OBS, continued its collaboration with project developer ‘Ballast Nedam’ as developing partner. Further, NS Poort was selected as developing partner. This collaboration was located under the construction of a public-private partnership. Hence, Ballast Nedam and NS Poort acquired the rights to develop real estate in terms of homes and office space. In order to so efficiently, Ballast Nedam and NS Poort established the ‘ontwikkelingscombinatie Spoorzone Delft’ (OCSD) a formal collaborative body which was meant to combine resources for directing the design and development – ‘drawing and calculating’ – of real estate. Though, the solution spaces which were the object of decision-making within the OCSD were conditioned by the public boundaries and the consecutive negotiations with the OBS (fig. 46).

![Diagram of non-hierarchical Collaboration within a wider context of hierarchy](own illustration)

Thus, whilst the amount of actors and decision-making arena’s increased, the complexity on decision-making and consecutive division on responsibilities increased. Table 2 demonstrates an overview on the interests and resulting tasks of the collaborative partners.

---

62 NS Poort is part of the Dutch Railway company (NS); their task is to (re)develop and manage train station surroundings (www.nspoort.nl, 2011).
63 NS Poort was awarded a concession to develop for transferring their grounds to the municipality.
Consolidating desired outcomes: the local land-use plan and its esthetical supplement

The hierarchy of the decision-making arenas suggests that the planning process on the area developments is allocated within the arena in which OBS and OCSD are expected to co-produce plans. As we have noted, the conditions in which the participating partners within this arena are able to optimize their plans are bounded by the limits which have been set within the masterplan. Though, we too noted that the municipality retains its veto power for deciding if the plans which are produced within the governance arena are to be adopted and consolidated in the land-use plan\textsuperscript{64}. That is, civil law remains in the hands of the municipality as a formal administrative public body. In other words, the power to co-produce plans is allocated within the governance arena, while the actual decision-making power, which is based upon the outcomes of the former, is retained by the municipal council (fig. 47). Hence, The consecutive land-use plan regulations are thus expected to be based upon the mutual agreements between participating partners within the governance landscape.

\textsuperscript{64} The municipal land-use plan is a formal instrument to which urban spatial development proposals have to be tested in order to estimate if a building permit can be awarded.
Though, the reality of practice has shown differently. Within our theoretical review we noted that the advanced position of power of Dutch municipalities, due to their control over the legally binding land-use plan, tends to results authoritative attitudes of municipalities too control what is being built upon their territories (Needham, 2006). Even more, Teisman and Klijn (2002) found that the authoritative behavior of municipal representatives tend to block an effective cross-sectoral planning process. These conclusions have been drawn from a wide variety of empirical studies. These conclusions seem to be confirmed in the case of ‘Spoorzone Delft’;

We noted that the OBS has been established in order to forge cross-sectoral linkages for the sake of a collaborative planning practice. Though, our observations have indicated that the municipality has taken too much of a dominant attitude which blocked a collaborative planning process. Bijleveld (2010) and van der Post (2010) noted during an interview that the municipality has rushed the consolidation procedure of the land-use plan\textsuperscript{65} in order to prevent too much of private sector interference in the planning procedure. Hence, instead of planning in collaboration for shaping the land-use plan regulation, the private partners now have to cope with the regulations which have been determined exclusively by the municipal council (fig. 48). In particular, they pointed out that the land-use plan is far too detailed in order to enable the OCSD to optimize their plans towards a feasible project.

\textsuperscript{65} The draft land-use plan has been presented in 2005. After several comments by the public, the plan was formally adopted in 2006.
The land use plan reflects a comprehensive zoning regulation. The allocation of functions is accompanied with detailed criteria such as building heights and orientation. Even more, the land-use plan is accompanied with an additional planning document which merely is focused upon the esthetical features of the plan area; this plan is called the ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’. Thus, in order to acquire planning permission, building proposal do not only have to be tested to the land-use plan regulation, but are too obliged to be tested to the criteria within the ‘beeldkwaliteitsplan’ by a specialized jury.

---

66 The ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ has been established in 2009. It is based upon Busquets’ masterplan and the consecutive municipal land-use plan. Among others, Busquets has been appointed as a member of the jury within the team that is expected to test proposed plans to the established esthetical criteria.

**Introduction**

The land-use plan can be conceived as a legal adaptation of Busquet’s masterplan. Though, while the masterplan merely was a visionary document which pointed out what the future urban developments within ‘Spoorzone Delft’ could be, the land-use plan poses a comprehensive set of criteria to which future urban spatial planning proposal have to be tested. The latter, thus, are the proposals which are developed within the OCSD decision-making arena.

**Design elements**

The land-use plan presents a clear list of qualitative conditions which have to be met by the land-use plan. This list is similar, but more extensive, than the conditions which have been made explicit within the masterplan:

- To enhance the cohesion between the urban districts at the western- and eastern of the current railway viaduct
- To enhance the cohesion between the urban districts at the north- and south of the ‘westlandseweg’
- To adapt to the existing building heights and urban morphology
- To enhance the cohesion on green tissue
- To enhance the water network
- To preserve existing landmarks
- To create a compact public-transport node

Although the design on ‘spoorzone Delft’ shows a desired area development which contains a vast number of homes and offices, it is noticeable that the design elements, as proposed solutions of urban problems, do not immediately require the construction of homes/offices. In other words, we may conclude that the urban transformation does not directly relate to a need to increase the capacity of housing/offices in Delft. Though, as argued before, the addition of homes/offices is way capture the value of the area and to transfer betterments towards to construction of the railway tunnel.

Compared to the masterplan, we notice that the building morphology is similar. The building heights too are in most places comparable, varying from 3 to 5 stories. However, we observed that in the south, a higher density is allowed in terms of 7 to 9 story buildings. Further, the plan area of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ extended to the south, which is the location on which ‘Delft Instruments’ is currently settled (fig 49). The functional (draft) proposal for this area is to locate apartment buildings of 8 floors.
Fig 49: building heights regulations (Adapted from Bestemmingsplan Spoorzone Delft, 2006)
**Quantitative list of requirements**

The following tables resemble the quantitative list of requirements on homes, offices, parking places and building volumes as proposed within the masterplan, and consolidated into the land-use plan. It is noticeable that a higher of market housing is allowed in the land-use plan. Thus, a slightly higher density in terms of floor space g.f.a. and building heights are evident. Further, we noticed that the land-use plan for the most resembles the masterplan. Though, the consolidated criteria in the land-use plan are legally binding and therefore no longer negotiable. However, the land-use plan is ‘not carved in rock’ (van der Post, 2010), therefore, official procedures for land-use plan modification are an option if the criteria cannot be met.

**Table 4; quantitative list of requirements as proposed within the Masterplan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Homes</th>
<th>Social housing</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Building Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>197.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>15.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>29.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>2627 places</td>
<td>3 to 5 floors/block (accents up to 7 floors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social housing</td>
<td>1230 homes</td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>600 places</td>
<td>266.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>City council</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>(semi) Underground</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>25.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>2627 places</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>283.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215 homes</td>
<td>1315 homes</td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>Facades</td>
<td>Front façade preconditioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back façade</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5; quantitative list of requirements as consolidated within the land-use plan; the yellow marks highlight the deviations from the original masterplan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Homes</th>
<th>Social housing</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Building Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>214.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>15.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>29.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>2834 places</td>
<td>3 to 5 floors/block (accents up to 9 floors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social housing</td>
<td>1315 homes</td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>600 places</td>
<td>283.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>City council</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>(semi) Underground</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>25.000 M 2 g.f.a.</td>
<td>2834 places</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>283.000 m 2 g.f.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215 homes</td>
<td>1315 homes</td>
<td>210 homes</td>
<td>Facades</td>
<td>Front façade preconditioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back façade</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coping with unsuitable municipal power exertion

The land-use plan is an instrument to exert influence on the course of development. In this case, this power was exclusively awarded to the municipality, as the plan was largely said to be constructed in exclusion of private partners. Though, in the light of a comprehensive urban transformation, the municipality believed that the land-use plan alone could not assure for desirable outcomes. Therefore, in addition to the land-use plan, another instrument to steer developments was constructed: the ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’. This plan was an esthetical supplement to the land-use plan which was meant to be a referential frame for guiding developers and testing their proposal on merely esthetical features.

Hence, while the land-use plan imposed criteria on building functions, -heights and -orientation, the ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ narrows down the solution spaces for developers and their architects by posing regulations upon the architecture of the buildings, such as the allocation of windows and doors.

---


**Introduction**

The ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ is a regulative document which is meant to regulate esthetical features of the architecture within ‘Spoorzone Delft’. Among other instruments, the ‘beeldkwaliteitsplan’ is a formal referential frame to which plan proposals have to be tested in order to be qualified for a building permit. The plan is described as a consensus-based outcome between OBS, OCSD and ‘the Architecten Cie’ as advisors. A specialized team, including Joan Busquets, is appointed to guide and test building proposals along the process.

The ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ is conceived to be requisite in order to assure a cohesive urban development along the extensive time span of the planning process towards implementation. Although some sense of flexibility in terms of adaptive capacity is explicitly assured, the plan in essence aims to restrict the potential design solutions which are to be designed within further stages of the process.

**Design elements**

The plan poses criteria on the architecture of buildings, in order to assure ‘variety and cohesion’ (Delft, 2009) throughout the plan area (fig 50 and 51). The latter results in a comprehensive set of esthetical criteria which are meant to limit the solution spaces on the design of the building blocks. For instance, on each separate building block in the plan, criteria are posed for the division of doors and windows within the façade, as well as the variations in building heights within the building block.

---

67 Though, at the time the masterplan was constructed in coherence to a market exploration with Ballast Nedam. However, in the light of dynamic market forces, we may critically argue if the translation from market exploration towards a spatial design results into a feasible outcome. Further, the feasibility of the list of requirements might be jeopardized in the light of uncertain and dynamic market forces.
Fig 50; regulations to ensure the variations on building height, width and facade are based upon the analysis of Delft’s inner-city building typologies (Beeldkwaliteitsplan Spoorzone Delft, 2009)

Fig 51; conceptual representation of the building block typology: variation and coherence. (Beeldkwaliteitsplan Spoorzone Delft, 2009)
Public – private cooperative reality: a lack of mutual added value?

The OCSD, which main concern is to calculate and design towards feasible solutions, has been obliged to expose its plans to the criteria which are consolidated in the land-use plan, as well as in its esthetical supplement: the ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’. Despite the fact that the OBS was initially expected to collaborate with the OCSD on design solutions - within the regulative boundaries of the masterplan - we may critically argue if the actual course of action resembles a mutual cooperative course of decision-making.

We share our doubts on this matter, as we observed that the land-use plan and ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ were consolidated largely in exclusion of the OCSD. We observed that these imposed land-use plan regulations left minor spaces for an open design approach which is expected to be intrinsic to a collaborative cross-sectoral planning process. In other words, we found that the municipal public authorities largely tend to behave in a more traditional way, characterized by centralized steering and non-negotiable design context, while the planning schemes seems to be organized for a collaborative governance undertaking in which intrinsic steering was to be expected. We should therefore consider being careful for describing ‘Spoorzone Delft’ as a collaborative public-private undertaking within the rhetoric of ‘area development’.

Klijn and Teisman (2002) have rationalized upon this tendency of governance-based failures. In particular, they argued that public and private behavioral patterns do not easily combine within a collaborative, consensus-based undertaking. In this, they referred to Jacobs (1992) who explained that the public and private domains are located within different ethical value systems. The public domain is characterized by the guardian syndrome, the private domain by the commercial syndrome. Jacobs argued that those systems cannot be merged within equality based collaboration. In fact, he noted that they are mutually exclusive.

Though, we explained that differences between public and private have been recognized as potential threats, and acted upon by separating the management of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ from direct municipal administration: the establishment of the OBS development company. Despite these efforts, we noted that the municipality still involved to a greater extent than agreed upon in the course of action within the governance arena, as they consolidated the land-use plan before actual cross-sectoral agreements were made (Bijleveld, 2010).

This conclusion tends to point out that too much public interference could block an effective collaborative public-private planning operability. However, in order to counterbalance the bias, our observation may as well be interpreted differently. We explained that the municipality already in the 1990’s forged relations with a private actor – Ballast Nedam - in order to assure the feasibility on plan production. The collaborative efforts between Ballast Nedam and the municipality have constructed the initial foundation from which the masterplan and the land-use plan have evolved.

---

68 the guardian syndrome refers to values such as: avoiding trade and commerce, striving for discipline and loyalty and respecting tradition and hierarchy. The commercial syndrome refers to values such as: avoiding violence, achieving agreements on a voluntary basis, honesty and competitiveness. Simon (1990) has put it a bit more concrete: The public sector has principles such as **obedience, the absence of a profit motive, loyalty, and an orientation toward continuity**. The market has no principles, but they have clients. Although Teisman and Klijn explained that the former theories might explain the failures on public-private cooperation, it does not necessarily mean that the distinctive sectoral systems cannot complement each other if the supportive planning system adapts to the resolution of these problems.
Hence, the limiting boundaries which have been imposed upon the solution spaces which can be negotiated upon within the governance decision-making arena are too a certain extent based upon public decisions in the light of preliminary market explorations. In recognition of the former, van der Post (2010) noted that the private sector too often tends to appeal to the crisis-argument\(^{69}\) as a way to ensure their flexibility and to reject too much commitment. Nonetheless, this argument too seems to resemble to the conflicting value patterns of public and private actors.

Thus, we highlighted two arguments from different viewpoints, which could jeopardize the performance of public-private collaboration:

- The persuasion of hierarchy and control by public actors
- A lack of commitment by private actors

Despite of the question on who is to blame, the reality of practice is that both public and private actors are in the spirit of ‘area development’ conceived to be interdependently related. The consequent complexity tends to be dealt with by means of the creation of a cooperative governance arrangement. The latter is perceived to shape the most appropriate conditions for translating high ambitions into feasible plans on urban spatial transformations.

That is, if a high ambition is to be translated into feasible plans, a joint-cooperation has been embraced as the most suitable approach. In this way, resources can be shared, while risks and responsibilities can be distributed among those who are participating. Bijleveld (2010) has clearly explained the need for collaboration and the deficiencies which have appeared throughout the process:

“The public sector should potentiate the valuable knowledge that is located within the domain of private actors. Though, there seems to be a fear to share decision-making power which exceeds the traditional public boundaries. However, if the public sector expects the private sector to commit in collaboration and to carry risks and responsibilities, mutual-added value should be pursued in terms of equality based collaborations.”

Therefore, in the scope of this situation, we will not evaluate if a governance context is the most suitable alternative for an effective planning outcome. Rather, we will evaluate if the planning operability suits the governance context in which it is expected to perform. That is, we are interested if planning can perform within a cross-sectoral governance landscape in overcoming bounded vision towards collective agreements. The situation today indicates that the planning instruments which have been aimed to guide the collaborative process largely have failed - so far.

---

\(^{69}\) In this, he refers to unprosperous market fluctuations in times of economical crisis, which raises the need to re-evaluate upon earlier made planning decisions in order to assure the feasibility of plans.
Towards persuasion of a negotiation oriented planning approach

At the initiation of this study ‘Spoorzone Delft’ seemed to be an interesting case to test the successes on planning performance within a complex area development instance. At that time, the planning process seemed to have reached the phase of implementation. The former director of the planning process, Edith Bijleveld (2010) clearly explained:

“Since 2008 everything has been agreed upon and supported by a wide range of technical studies. From now on, it is only a matter of fine-tuning while executing”

Today, the situation indicates a very different and less prosperous perspective. That is, the concerns which we have shared above seem to have become valid threats to the continuation of the project. The formerly set – reassured – agreements have proven not to be resistant to the dynamics and complexity that marks a cross-sectoral decision-making context. Dissatisfied private stakeholders and disagreement on the expected spatial outcomes seem to have hampered the planning process. In fact, we found that the current plan proposal, according to Busquets’ masterplan, in the light of today economical prospects cannot be optimized by the OCSD towards a feasible project (van Loon, 2010).

In particular, the problem seems to be twofold:

- The solution spaces tend to be too narrow for further optimization. While the OCSD is concerned with designing and calculating towards a feasible outcome, the reality of practice indicates that their solution space to design and propose feasible solutions is too limited due to the boundaries which have been set within former decision-making arenas in which they have not been directly represented.

- The solution space is perceived to be too vaguely defined in terms of explicit variables and its parameters which can be negotiated. The ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ and its testing team, poses many qualitative restrictions which is meant to safeguard the quality of Busquets’ masterplan. This ‘safeguarding procedure’ does not seem to be effective for reaching towards a satisfying outcome. Instead, it has been noted that both Busquets’ as well as the locally involved planners tend to impose their professional bias upon the course of decision-making, rather than to serve the decision-making arena towards some sense of mutual agreement (Bijleveld, 2010). Therefore, the plan is largely perceived as a blueprint output, rather than a frame which reflects public boundaries and deliberative spaces for negotiation.

---

70 As noted before, while posing this positive prospect, she too admitted the illegitimate power exertion of the municipality which threatened the course of decision-making (Bijleveld, 2010).

71 In the light of today’s conflicts, Dr. van Loon has been contracted by the municipality of Delft to monitor and advise upon the management and design of the decision-making context. Van Loon is an expert on planning in the context of complex power relations. He became involved in the course of this study as a mentor and therefore could deliver information on the decision-making context which is not (yet) publicly accessible.
Hence, the current planning approaches are believed to be incapable of continuing the process on the basis of the consolidated plans and formerly made decisions. At the moment a complete new plan is being developed, which not only seeks to adapt to today’s economical prospects, but which too is aimed to be made appropriate as an instrument for effective negotiation within explicit communicated boundaries.72

Thus, the formerly set variables and parameters in the land use plan (table 6) will be completely revised and re-negotiated towards an alternative output. We did not get formal permission to present the latest data in which a feasible alternative has been published. We could only mention that a first exploration on a feasible alternative reflects a project which does not at all comply with the desires of the public and the initial motives for the area development. That is, this alternative reflects a mono-functional area, providing space for merely expensive private sector housing.

This latest alternative seems to have provided a very wide solution space for the private actors: the OCSD. Hence, the public sector is challenged to revaluate on the flexibility of solution spaces which is awarded to the private sector; a feasible project would not necessarily mean a more legitimate outcome. In particular, it seems that the latest negotiations are held in exclusion of civil society, which means that the outcome merely reflects an agreement between the market and the public sector, which is to represent the electorate. At the moment it is still unclear how these results will anticipate to the demands of the citizens in Delft.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Market housing</th>
<th>Social housing</th>
<th>City council</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>(semi)</th>
<th>Underground</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
<th>Facades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

72 The ‘urban decision room’ (van Loon, 2008) has been introduced as an planning instrument. The Urban Decision Room is a managerial planning tool for guiding an effective negotiation on explicit parameters within urban space towards collectively determined solutions.
The performance of planning throughout the process

Overall, we found that Busquets’ plan proposal performed well at the time public and non-public actors were to be mobilized by the municipality. We too noted that the masterplan provided a seductive referential frame for guide an inter-level public-public collaboration which has lead to a collective agreement between the involved governmental bodies. Though, we may conclude that the planning operability did not perform well for guiding a cross-sectoral decision-making process. In other words, we may note that the planning operability merely performed well while its domain was located within traditional planning boundaries.73

Table 7; classification on plan performance in chronological order (own illustration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning phase</th>
<th>Power division</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Centralized municipality</td>
<td>Busquet’s vision</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public – public</td>
<td>Inter-level public sector, Municipality and V&amp;W</td>
<td>Busquet’s masterplan</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>most centralized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public – private</td>
<td>Cross-sectoral dispersed,</td>
<td>land-use plan</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 clearly indicates that the normative planning approach seems to struggle to perform in complex environments, especially if complexity exceeds boundaries of the public sector. The urban plan of Busquets performed well to seduce and mobilize public and non public actors at the initial start. During the phase of public-public collaboration, the municipality was especially challenged to overcome conflicts with the ministry of traffic and water management (V&W). While an inter-active collaboration seemed difficult to be achieved between the most dominant actors in the process. Though, coincidences on the ministry its obligation to confront the Rail-21 proposals, and later on the high speed train connection (HSL) were of support to – and embraced by the municipality. Eventually, planning did perform as subsidies have been awarded. Though, strict preconditions were set which limited the solution spaces within the consecutive public-private arena. Finally, in the public-private governance arena, conflicts could not be captured within the normative planning approach, due to a lack of adaptive capacity. Thus, today the planning process which initially was conceived to be located in the implementation phase got completely stuck.

The most predominant concern has been the municipalities will to control the outcome of the process. This will was reflected in the early consolidation of the land-use plan. In this, we found a practical manifestation of the ‘guardian syndrome’. That is, Bijleveld (2010) explained that the municipal alderman at the time consolidated the land-use plan in a preliminary phase as she feared

73 The Dutch planning system is famous for its tradition in producing comprehensive plans which are based upon mutual agreements between public levels of government (Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000). Hence, we may conclude that there is a recognized inter-level interdependency for cooperation between public levels of government, while this recognition is acted upon by an accepted distribution of decision-making power. However, while this interdependency today too is recognized between public and private actors, we found that public actors are hesitant to actually share decision-making power which traditionally was located within the boundaries of the public sector. In other words, the habits on public regulation and control are not easily evolved within innovative cross-sectoral governance schemes.
to lose steering control which could result in outcomes which were to be conceived undesirable by
the electorate\textsuperscript{74}.

In fact, it has become clear that the formal planning process merely manifested as an interplay of
power between the public – and private sector. The actual power of citizens and civil society
organizations so far is vague and could be marginalized. Hence, before we continue to our general
conclusion, we will elaborate upon the societal legitimacy of the planning process.

\textsuperscript{74} Bijleveld noted that this fear was provoked by a previous urban development in – Zuidpoort – in which false
promises on building heights symbolically reassured the interest of the citizens in Delft. Consequently, she was
largely criticized by the electorate due to her weak political accountability.
3.5 The societal legitimacy of the planning process

Introduction

“Since constructional activities have started, we noticed the appearance of cracks in the walls of our home. Although we do not know for sure yet if the building activities are to blame, our interest has never been considered relevant as we do not directly live along the Phoenixstraat... ...even more; we do not have any possibility to argue upon this matter with the decision-makers.” (Slagmolen, 2010)

’Spoorzone Delft’ is evolving towards a comprehensive area development at the city centre of Delft. Considering its central position in the city we may pose that most citizens of Delft will notice the effects of the urban transformation. For which reasons whatsoever, these effects might be beneficial for some, while others will have to cope with negative externalities. In this chapter, we will evaluate in what ways the planning process confronts the notion of externalities in terms of citizens interests. In other words, we will evaluate upon the legitimacy of the planning process, so far.

The ethics of planning
We have presented an analysis of the plan performance in relation to the formal decision-making arenas. Though, within our theoretical inquiry, we posed that planning should not merely perform in the light of prevailing power relations, but the practice of planning should too take a biased stance in defining an approach which is societal legitimate. In this chapter we will address ways how the dynamics of citizen’s expectations and value judgments have been dealt with within the process. In other words, we are interested if and how the planning process regulates externalities which manifest locally. In this, we do not necessarily promote for a greater citizen involvement in decision-making practices as a goal on its own. Though, if the normative planning process does not capture the values of local citizens, participatory activities might prevent illegitimate practices.

By evaluating upon the design and management of the planning process we can appoint where and how citizen demands and needs have been incorporated into the process. The legitimacy of this approach can be measured to the narrative-based image which we have created upon public expectations.

Citizen involvement in the context of governance
We have explained that the planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ is a topical case which illustrates an empirical manifestation of the ideology of ‘area development’. Area development’ in essence is validated by its response to the changing tendencies on the relations between the public sector, the private sector and civil society. ‘Area development’ suggests a contextual-based, goal-oriented planning methodology which should evolve on the basis of a collective cross-sectoral learning experience in which interests, resources and information could synergize.

Within our theoretical inquiry we have noted that ‘area development’ has to cope with complexity, uncertainties and consolidated power relations. In particular, we found that ‘area development’ paradigm is challenged to anticipate to traditional governing procedures and sectoral values systems (fig. 52).
The inclusionary capacity of the planning process

Having analyzed the formal planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’, we argued upon the challenges and difficulties of collaborative steering mechanisms between the public and private sector. Indeed, it has been widely documented that cooperative models such as public-private partnerships are meant correspond the ideals which are posed ‘area development’ paradigm. Though, joint cooperation between the public and private sector only partially covers the rhetoric of ‘area development’. In fact, ‘area development’ does not merely propose a closer collaboration between the state and the market, it suggest “a way of conducting policies and plans whereby government involves [and interacts with] citizens, social organizations, enterprises and other stakeholder in early stages of the planning process” (edelenbos and Klijn, 2004).

However, from our analyses upon the formal governance arrangement between the OBS – representing the public sector – and OCSD – representing the private sector – we found that civil society did not actually interact within this decision-making arena. Instead, so far we found that the active role of citizens was bounded by more traditional ways which manifested through legal arrangements. For example:

- In 2002 three landowners have been expropriated. They have been financially compensated for their loss. In fact, each citizen in the Netherlands who believes to be negatively affected by an urban spatial development is empowered to legally apply for a financial compensation (Needham, 2007).
- In 2003 the citizens of Delft influenced the planning process by offering a petition of 10.000 signatures of citizens to the House of Representatives. By doing so, they provoked the grant of national subsidies which was crucial for the process to reach the next phase.
- In 2005, all citizens of Delft had been able to react to the draft land use plan. A few of these reactions have led to concrete modifications before the plan was legally consolidated in 2006.

These examples mainly illustrate the traditional opportunities of public engagement to planning; the involvement occurred prior to – the petition – or once the policy proposal had been developed – the land-use plan reactions and financial compensations.
We too have witnessed other normative examples through which the public has been enabled to engage to the process: recurring informational meetings and the establishment of an informational centre which is called “Delft Bouwt”.

Lastly, Platform Spoor was established by the municipality in order to inform civil society organizations on most practical matters may cause inconveniences during the construction period.

Each of these efforts has been aimed to relate the project dimensions to the public. The efforts were not directly meant to involve the public into the formal decision-making arena; they are uncoupled of the latter. In fact, they do not seem to perform in the spirit of ‘area development’. This ideal concept merely proposes a planning practice which is based upon mutual agreements as a product of interacting resources, visions and potentials in space. The latter would imply a shared decision-making arena which is marked by political accountability on action and transparency on knowledge.

In order to contextualize these thoughts on citizen inclusion to the Dutch planning tradition, we will reflect them to normative classifications upon legitimacy in planning.

Classifying legitimacy
First of all, we would like to take notion of the cornerstone of the Dutch public administrative system: the representative democracy. The legitimacy of this system is ideally to be assured through recurring elections on national, provincial and municipal politicians. Though, in our theoretical review we explained that changing societal tendencies today are widely believed to jeopardize the capacity of the representative democratic system to assure legitimizing practices on spatial urban transformations.\(^\text{75}\) Therefore, an additional concept has been introduced for capturing the deficiencies of the former: the participative democracy.

The participative democracy opens a reframed perspective for the design and management of planning mechanisms towards more direct ways to incorporate citizen voices into the processes on plan and public policy productions. In other words, citizen participation refers to the degree of inclusion of citizen interests within the decision-making arena. In his attempt to capture the meaning of participation, Bailey (2010) noted that participation can be conceived as the degree of power – “empowerment” – is awarded to public organizations or individuals. The following features cover the problems which a more inter-active, participatory-based, planning mechanism tries to resolve (adapted from Edelenbos and Klijn, 2004):

- **Increasing public support**
  By involving actors at an early stage, it is hoped that that the support for decisions will increase, while the use of veto power could decrease.

- **Shaping inter-subjectivity: ambiguity and dynamics**
  Problem definitions and solutions are social constructs and cannot be captured comprehensively. They vary in the course of time as a result of new information, interactions and external developments. By including more actors, a broader scope of the problem aspects can be included in the search for solutions.

- **Democratic legitimacy**

---

\(^{75}\) The legitimacy of the representative democracy is to be found in the degree
By involving more actors, certainly citizens, within a shared decision-making arena a less closed character and more democratic legitimacy on practices can be reached.

Hence, an inclusionary planning practice could result in a more legitimate process and a more suitable project.

Parkinson (2003; in Connelly, 2010) explained that the participatory ideal is that all those affected by a decision should have the opportunity to influence it; yet this is impracticable. Thus, we believe that the participatory model – and its translation into concrete practices – can be best understood as a supplement to the normative - representative – practices.

We noted that the planning process of Spoorzone Delft – conform the ‘area development’ paradigm – is divided in two consecutive phases. In each of those phases, legitimacy is pursued through a different perspective:

- The first phase is the public – public collaboration. This phase reflects the traditional governing principle of a representative democracy. That is, all involved levels of government act as representative bodies of their electorate.
- The second phase is the consecutive governance setting. This phase is formally directed by the OBS, in representation of the municipality. This phase is legitimizing through the notion of a participative democracy. That is, the OBS has the formal responsibility to interact with civil society as well as the private sector for reaching towards satisfying solutions.

Within the scope of this study, we are particularly interested if participation is effective in a way that it increases the legitimacy of decisions. Therefore, we will narrow down our focus towards the capacity of the governance setting to include local interests in decision-making. This collaborative space is highlighted in red in Figure 53.

Our analysis has indicated that the OBS was to direct the planning process in close collaboration to its private counterpart: the OCSD. Though, the OBS too is formally assigned by the municipality to reassure legitimacy by the active involvement of civil society organizations and citizens in the course of decision-making. In particular, the OBS was appointed to direct an integrated process towards a feasible (market coherence) and legitimate (social coherence) outcome within a governance context. This assignment has been translated in several activities in which they forged relations between the project dimensions and civil society. For illustrative purposes, we will elaborate on one of these efforts: ‘Stadsdialoog Delft’.
Fig 53; the decision-making context in relation to the position of civil society and direct citizen involvement (own illustration)

Fig 54; this drawing illustrates the assured power that is awarded to the citizens as consultants (Delft, 2010)
Introduction

‘Stadsdialoog Delft’ – ‘urban dialogue Delft’ – is meant to consult citizens in Delft for the development of design ideas for four locations within the plan area. The conditions within the plan area are bounded by conditions of Busquets’ masterplan.

Scope of the project

The first phase of this undertaking has finalized and published. Within this phase, an online consultation was designed on which visitors could share their ideas in relation to the plan area in terms of text, photographs or drawing. Secondly, a selection of participants has joined an informal workshop to elaborate upon these ideas towards concrete design proposals for the four plan locations.

It has been explicitly noted that the produced information will be transferred to the formal decision-making arena to enrich the information at hand. In fact, the ‘Stadsdialoog Delft’ already is said to have influenced to planners involved in the project. Thus, a certain degree of power has been assured.

Content

Several ideas have been formulated, which are to be treated as criteria for the planners and decision-makers of ‘Spoorzone Delft’. These ideas can be summarized as following:

- Spoorzone Delft should allocate a mix of functions
- Spoorzone Delft should be cohesive and merge to its surroundings
- Spoorzone Delft should be ‘Delft-like’, accessible, without the allocation of high densities

Critical evaluation

It is noticeable that the generated criteria do not directly relate to the existing plan. In particular, they seem to deal with the project location as an undefined spot, which does not relate to the information which is bounded by the formal decision-making arena between the OBS and OCSD. Though, this would not necessarily be an illegitimate approach, as an ‘out-of-the-box’ design session could be a supportive strategy for the manifestation of creativity. Moreover, the explicit comment has been made by the municipal alderman that the knowledge which is produced will be of influence within the formal decision-making arena.

However, at the moment there seems to be a lack of clarity if the produced knowledge will ever reach the formal decision-making arena. From this perspective we share our concerns on the legitimacy of such reassuring participating activities.
The rhetoric on citizen participation: symbolical reassurance?
We have explained in chapter 3.4 that today the Spoorzone plan proposal, conform the masterplan of Busquets, has been rejected as it has induced insuperable conflicts in decision-making. Though, the public today still seems to be ‘seduced’ by the images of Busquets’ vision. Moreover, the public is assured to co-produce knowledge in order to share their design-related ideas in reference to the plan of Busquets. The reality of practice today shows that public informing and consultation activities do not comply with the actual course of decision-making between the public - and private sector.

While assurances on decision-making power are given to the public, there is an absolute uncertainty if and how produced lay-knowledge will be included in the course of decision-making. Based upon these notions, we share our critical doubts if innovative participatory activities, such as the ‘Stadsdialog Delft’ in essence actually could empower the public. At this moment, these activities merely relate to a notion of ‘symbolical reassurance’.

In a more abstract sense, we may conclude that the mechanisms which are to direct citizen involvement do not perform in the spirit of ‘area development’. Instead of the deliberative establishment of a shared decision-making undertaking – under clear conditions – we noticed dichotomy between the formal decision-making arena between the OBS and the OCSD, and an informal decision-making arena between the OBS and the citizens of Delft (Fig 55).

---

**Fig. 55; a governmental regulated separation between decision-making arenas**
**A narrative on public expectations**

We have shared our doubts on the performance of inclusionary planning activities as a way to directly involve citizens in decision-making. Though, we argue that citizen participation should not be a goal in itself but can be best conceived as a consequent of a demanding public voice. Therefore, in this chapter we will take notion of the actual public expectations around the project ‘Spoorzone Delft’. In this, we will draw upon the stories which we have collected through interviews with process managers ‘from above’ and representatives of the voices ‘from below’. The interview reports have been included in the annex.

During our interviews we have questioned our interviewees to classify the strength of participation\(^{76}\) (edelenbos and Klijn, 2004) in the planning process. We related the strength of the participation to the participation ladder:

- Informing:
- Consulting:
- Advising
- Co-producing
- Co-deciding

We found that the bottom-up voices articulate a different perceived perspective than the designers and managers of the process from above;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8; value judgements on the strength of participation during the governance phase (own illustration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘From above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijleveld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘From below’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilms Floet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These outcomes indicate that the bottom-up voices feel less connected to the decision-making process, than the judgments which have been given by the process managers. These results should be treated with care, as the classification itself is not free of ambiguity. For instance, Slagmolen noted that citizens during the decision-making process did not have – and should not have – any power to influence. Though, when in 2000 Delft asked its citizen on how the revenues on the disposal of the stocks in the electrical company South Holland should be spent, the citizens had an enormous democratic power for making the decision to transfer those revenues to ‘Spoorzone Delft’.

---

\(^{76}\) Edelenbos and Klijn (2004) explained that the strength of participation in the planning depends on the *width* and *depth* of citizen participation. The former relates to the degree to which each member of a community is offered the change to participate in each phase of the process. The latter is determined by the degree to which citizens have the opportunity to determine the final outcome of the interactive process.
other hand, Edith Bijleveld noted that the project management always pursued to collect lay-knowledge during public gatherings, the latter was completely rejected by Wilms Floet.

Overall, based upon our interviews, 25 conducted interviews by the Werkplaats Spoorzone Delft (WeSD)\textsuperscript{77} and the results ‘Stadsdialoog Delft’, we perceived a culture in which citizens do not necessarily feel the need to widen (edelenbos and klijn, 2004) their participatory degree within the process. Many citizens claimed too a great degree of trust to their representatives’ politicians and planning experts. Even more, Bijleveld, van der Post and Slagmolen have noted that participation should have its limits as (1) technical experts have the capacity to pose better judgments and (2) citizens mostly act in the spirit of the ‘Not In My Backyard’ syndrome.

Though, being a citizen of Delft as well as a professional in the field of architecture, Willemijn Wilms Floet posed from a professional point of view that the planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ is far too closed and not willing to capture the knowledge which is rooted locally in Delft. She believes the plan could have evolved towards a higher quality if the plan was not being treated as a static blueprint, but would have been considered as a means for debate towards renewal. The latter argument too was posed by Slagmolen, in which he argued upon the deficiencies of the decision-making arena to respond to the dynamics which marks contemporary urban life.

Considering these dynamics, while Busquets’ plan a few years ago was embraced by the public, based upon the results of the ‘stadsdialoog Delft’ we may conclude that the public support base today for such a comprehensive urban development seems to have decreased. We sense that a modest Delft-like development today is preferred above a high urban ambition which is to compete against large urban projects such as ‘the Resident’ in Den Haag and the ‘Kop van Zuid’ in Rotterdam\textsuperscript{78} (fig 56).

![Image](image.png)

Fig. 56; the potential of Spoorzone Delft can be considered from multiple dynamic viewpoints (own illustration).

Indeed, as our analysis on the process indicated, a lack of adaptive capacity of the planning process coherence between participating actors today has resulted into insuperable conflicts. Whatsoever may be the reasons which shape today’s expectations and market forces, it seems obvious that dynamics and uncertainty marks the context of planning. Though, we perceived a planning mechanism which does seem suitable to confront these tendencies in an effective and legitimate way.

\textsuperscript{77} In 2010, the WeSD published ‘leven aan het spoor’ (living along the railway). In this, they presented a dvd which contained 25 interviews which have been conducted with residents which are living along the railway viaduct in Delft. The interviewees have been asked for their value judgments in relation to their living environment along the viaduct, as well as the future urban developmental prospects.
3.6 Inconsistent features for planning performance

In this chapter, we present a summary on inconsistencies within the planning process which evidently has resulted in today’s conflicts. This chapter is meant to specifically allocate the line of arguments which we have posed in the preceding chapters. We noted before that planning is to inter-relate the social cultural dimension to the spatial dimension for the guidance towards collective action. Hence, we have subdivided this chapter into the elements as reflected in fig. 57.

![Fig. 57; own illustration](image)

**Socio- cultural: Decision-making arenas:**

**Public – public decision-making arena**

- The municipality carries all the risks (bestuurlijke uitvoeringsovereenkomstSpoorzone Delft, 2005), while the funding partners at the national level have imposed too many restrictions for the municipality (van der Post, 2010) to adapt the project in the light of governance and social demands.
- Financial variables and their parameters have been made explicit, while the spatial dimension is not made explicit in quantitative – negotiable – terms.
- The ministry of V&W was the most significant as well as critical actor within the collaborative process. As this ministry is formally responsible for the redevelopment of public transport nodes, they are by far the most powerful actor in the process in terms of financial contribution. Though, their interest in the project is very limited as they only concern about the railway tunnel. The area development for them is merely a source of revenues to cover additional costs for the tunnel construction. They demand that the betterments of the area developments should to a large extent be transferred towards the payment of the railway tunnel. However, they do not award any flexibility towards to market in order to optimize plans (bestuurlijke uitvoeringsovereenkomst Spoorzone Delft, 2005).

We could argue that the public-public collaboration does impose strict conditions upon the governance decision-making space, while minimizing the solution space as a result of inflexible plans. Thus, there is a tendency of public control, while the ambition reflects a joint-cooperative process.
Governance arrangement

- The former director of the project claimed that the acceptance of complexity could lead to chaos in decision-making, which evidently leads to delays. She argued that not all voices can be heard and that a strategic line should always be followed. Having said, her approach has often been conceived by others as effective but authorative and inflexible (Bijleveld, 2010).
- The planning environment does not create space for external expert’s views to be incorporated into the process (Wilms Floet, 2010). The process design is far too rigid.

We found that the design of the decision-making arrangement has been well thought-out beforehand. That is, a clear inter-relation between the ambition and requisite resources was translated into a cooperative governance arrangement. Though, we found that meaningful new developments – which are inherent to a collaborative planning approach – could not be dealt with.

Citizen participation

- Symbolically reassuring Platform Spoor. Civil society is not empowered to determine the agenda on what is to be discussed. The top-down determined agenda mainly reflects detailed practical matters, rather than broader discussions on the program and design (Wilms-Floet, 2010).
- Citizens are facing too much bureaucracy which tends to block any opportunity to let the bottom-up voices be heard (Slagmolen, 2010).
- The OBS only considers merely citizens that live directly next to the project area as relevant participants that should be considered as true actors (Bijleveld, 2010). Though, citizens from all over Delft feel affected by this project but are not reflected in the decision-making process.
- The “Stadsdialoog Delft” is formulated by the municipal alderman as a way to involve citizens in the decision-making. She explicitly notes that voices will be incorporated in the process (stadsdialoog Delft, 2010). However, the “stadsdialoog Delft” does not in any way relate to other decision-making arenas: no transfer of information on the process and content.

Planning instruments

Land-use plan

- The land-use plan was formally consolidated in a very early stage, to a large extent in exclusion of collaborating non-public partners. It has been said that the municipal alderman feared too much market-control, which would lead to undesirable developments (van der Post, 2010).
- Nonetheless, modifications to the land-use plan can always be made through a set of legal procedures. Thus, recently it has been aimed to reassess if the current plan meets the interests of collaboration partners. However, the current plan is conceived to be totally non-negotiable due to a lack of explicit variables which could be the object of discussion (van Loon, 2010). Therefore, at the
moment the existing plan tends to be completely rejected which evidently will lead to massive delays.

**Beeldkwaliteitsplan**
- The ‘beeldkwaliteitsplan’ imposes a set of very restrictive regulations upon the design of space, which goes far beyond guidelines and/or negotiable parameters.

**Planners’ conduct**
- The municipal spatial planners largely fail to serve their social context. They tend to impose the outcomes of their professional point of views upon the decision-making arena, within a clear argumentation and a base for negotiation (Bijleveld, 2010).

**Project**

We noted that the current consolidated parameters are conceived to be unsupportive to lead to a feasible project. We found that a lack of inter-action between decision-making arenas resulted in a hierarchy of power within which too narrow and inflexible solution spaces were imposed upon the governance arena. Though, only within the governance arena laid the opportunity for both the market as well as civil society to be actively incorporated into a process of co-production of knowledge towards decisions.

At the moment we know that the current consolidated parameters are considered to be unfeasible. We did not get formal permission to present the latest data in which a feasible alternative has been published. We could only mention that a first exploration on a feasible alternative reflects a project which does not at all comply with the desires of the public and the initial motives for the area development. That is, this alternative reflects a mono-functional area, providing space for merely expensive private sector housing.

Hence, the municipality is challenged to reflect on the flexibility of the negotiable boundaries in order to reach to a feasible as well as societal legitimate project. This reflection implicitly draws upon the question if deliberative public-private collaboration leads to a better outcome, compared to a more traditional way of control and regulation.
Part 4
Conclusions and recommendations
4.1 Conclusions

A dichotomy conceived integrally

'Spoorzone Delft' has been pursued as an integral project. Though, the project in essence is dualistic in its nature: an underground railway tunnel with a regional scope of interests and an aboveground urban area development with an emphasized local scope of interests. The consequent planning challenge to combine project-related interests and resources has been dealt with within a conjuncture of related decision-making arenas. From this perspective, we defined the challenge of planning as a way to provide coherency within and between decision-making arenas towards mutually constructed solutions (fig. 58).

In particular, we found a hierarchical relation – and friction – between the two separate objects in urban space; initially the tunnel construction has been the central object of focus; the area development was merely conceived as a consequent as well as a requisite for a feasible project. Hence, solutions – which became limiting conditions within following decision-making arenas – were at first constructed on the basis of a feasible tunnel construction. While the process evolved further, we found that minor solution spaces remained for plan development on the basis of a feasible and legitimate area development. This limited solution spaces was stressed even further due to the preliminary consolidation of the land-use plan. Thus, the private partners evidently have outspoken their concerns for limited steering power for plan development, which today resulted in conflicts and delays. Even more, in the face of narrow solutions spaces, the ambitioned governance-based interaction with civil society tends to be marginalized (fig. 59).
Based upon this observation we may conclude that ‘Spoorzone Delft’ faced a great degree of public control, in which the course of decisions was mostly determined by political agendas in relation to the railway tunnel as primary object of focus. The centralized planning position of the public authorities seemed logical as the tunnel was to be implemented on the basis of a traditional contracting-out scheme.

Though, the consecutive area development was to be planned in the spirit of the ‘area development’ paradigm (Table 9). This paradigm largely draws upon concepts such as ‘integrality’, ‘mutual-added value’ and ‘synergy’, which is to be achieved through the social interaction for the combination of resources and vision. More concrete, in the context of the ‘area development’ paradigm, Wolting (2006) explained clearly that the public sector should not prescribe solutions, but should award objectives within which collaborative partners can co-produce plans. In this way, the planning outcome is based upon a mutual representation of the values and interests of participating partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity management</th>
<th>Tunnel construction</th>
<th>Area Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power conditions</td>
<td>Inter-level public control</td>
<td>Cross-sectoral dispersed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9; distinctive planning principles (own illustration)
However, we found that too much public control jeopardized governance-based planning operability. We found that steering power was only very limited shared with non-public actors; many conditions were already set in prior decision-making arenas and consolidated in the land-use plan\(^79\). In this, the municipality did not behave conform agreements on collaboration. Former project director Bijleveld (2010) clearly argued against too much public control and hierarchy within this context:

“If we are to potentiate the exclusive qualities of the private sector within the planning process, a proportional degree of decision-making power should be awarded to them”

*(Bijleveld, 2010)*

Hence, we found that ‘relational complexity’ (Healey, 2007) is not self-evident, but can be best understood as the derivative of a governmental choice\(^80\). In the case of Spoorzone Delft, decision-making power was for the most exclusively conserved within the boundaries of the public sector; although the initial ambition showed differently.

In particular, within the conjuncture of decision-making arenas, we found that the municipality has been the sole actor which has been directly represented in each decision-making arena. That is, initially Delft persuaded a “strategy of seduction” (Bijleveld, 2010) in order to acquire the requisite subsidies\(^81\). This phase was followed by the public-private collaborations, in which they were represented by the OBS. We noted that the municipality has been the most dominant actor during these collaborations. Further, the municipality designed a separate arena for the interaction with civil society organizations and citizens. Though, as we pointed out, this arena so far faces the threat of symbolical reassuring activities (fig. 60).

---

\(^79\) Wolting (2006) noted that municipalities tend to prescribe detailed plans in the light of public-private partnerships, which jeopardizes the performance of planning in the context of governance.

\(^80\) Though, the acceptance of complexity is the consequence of a politically recognized mutual added value in cross-sectoral collaboration.

\(^81\) Needham (2007) noted that Dutch municipalities tend to behave as subsidy hunters in order to control the developments within their administrative boundaries.
A fragmented planning process
We noted that the performance of planning is conditioned by the coherency which is shaped within and between the decision-making arenas. That is, coherency on solutions within urban space would be jeopardized if related parallel and consecutive decision-making would not be combined into a cohesive whole. In the face of a wide variety of inter-dependent actors which are located in different arenas, the role of planning seems more important than ever. That is, planners are to enable actors to induce a mutual adjusting process, which exceeds the boundaries of a singular decision-making arena.

Though, facing today’s conflicts, we may conclude that the design and management of planning activities did not perform well. In particular, we concluded before that the persuasion of public control tends to have lead to an inflexible planning process which could not easily adapt to new meaningful developments so far in terms of market fluctuations as well as societal expectations.

Overall, we observed the institutional arrangement – the design of the planning process – as a topical example of an ‘area development’. That is, a range of decision-making arenas have been designed in order to firstly enable the public sector to plan towards an inter-level consent, followed by a decentralized governance landscape in order to forge cross-sectoral relations towards a sectoral synergy. However, we found that socio-cultural processes cannot be merely controlled by means of an institutional arrangement; we witnessed that public authorities largely tend to behave according to traditional principles of power exertion (fig...). That is, behavior of top-down control and regulation tends to jeopardize a cross-sectoral mutual fact-finding process.

Fig. 61; while the design of the planning process sets a joint cooperative governance landscape, the actual behavioral patterns tends to be in favor of a traditional mode of top-down public control and regulation (own illustration).

82 “Area development requires inter-organisational steering capacity as well as connecting agents” (Teisman, 2009)
A Discursive struggle towards an evolved planning operability

We have pointed out that the consolidated – deeply-rooted – Dutch planning tradition tends to be in discursive struggle to adapt to a re-established frame: the ‘area development’ paradigm. Planning under this notion is believed to deal with today’s perceived conditions of cross-sectoral complexity and dynamics in a more efficient, effective and legitimate way. That is, joint-cooperation and the establishment of partnerships have been politically embraced as the alternative to a centralized planning and policy-making practice.

Though, we may conclude that an active collaboration between the state, market and civil society is not self evident, nor can it be technologically imposed by means of a reorganized institutional arrangement. A different planning paradigm – which poses new relations between sectors - requires different attitudes too of all participants. However, as we explained earlier, the value-based behavioral patterns of participants can be conceived as a product of past socio-cultural conditioning, and can only be partially influenced for adapting towards a new context (Klijn and Teisman, 2002; Healey, 2007\(^{83}\)).

Hence, In order to stimulate actors to confront and explore the potential of a cross-sectoral decision-making arrangement, we posed the theoretical-based argument that the practice of planning requires an active – facilitative – involvement within the decision-making process. Thus, planning as urban management today appears to be a suitable concept for designating the role of planning.

However, within our empirical inquiry we found that planners – next to participating actors – too have been engaged to consolidated – traditional - ways of doing. We have explained that in the course of the planning process so far, planners have been largely acting as guardians of their professional bias, rather than facilitators in a process which is designated for the inducements of mutual adjustments. Further, as noted by Bijleveld (2010), planners fail to argue in an understandable way to participants upon their professional views. Hence, we perceived as situation in which planners tend to behave in traditional ways for the deliverance of exclusive – technocratic – solutions based upon professional knowledge, rather than the guidance towards collaboratively-constructed solutions based upon inter-subjective knowledge.

Consequently, we have witnessed a planning process which has been organized as a cross-sectoral decision-making arrangement. Though, due to the behavioral patterns of decision-makers, as well as the planners’ conduct which did not engage to the socio-cultural dynamics of decision-making, cross-sectoral relations so far seemed to be only loosely linked (fig 62).

Thus, we found that hierarchy and centralized decision-making inquiry tend to prevail above a collaborative decision-making practice. Though, this observation does not necessarily mean that ‘area development’ poses an unsuitable planning concept; rather, it means that its current operability cannot confront the challenge to overcome consolidated socio-cultural conditions for reaching towards a meaningful collaboration. ‘Integrality’, ‘mutual-added value’ and ‘learning’ today tend to be theoretical concepts which are difficult to be accomplished in practice.

\(^{83}\) “Governance processes appear to be in performed through routinised practices embedded in powerful social relations and cultural assumptions that seem to hold them in place despite energetic efforts to change them. Yet, they do change.” (Healey, 2007)
Conflict between planning ideology and methodology

The critics we posed to the operability of a collaboration-centred planning discourse raise doubts on the suitability of the ‘area development’ paradigm. For centuries, a centralized top-down planning exercise has performed well in terms producing results for sustaining future urban needs. Initially, through technocratic planning, the Dutch government has been able to provide the conditions within urban space to cope with – and steer the forces which have been induced by the industrial revolution. Further, after the Second World War, planners proposed effective ways to rebuild cities in compliance to future urban needs.

Though, in our view, the critics to a centralized – technocratic – planning discourse seem quite valid in the light of today’s perceived conditions. That is, an increased societal engagement and the incontrollable nature of market forces have lead to a world which cannot be predicted, nor planned from above. Hence, we do believe that a more inter-active way of planning could enhance the legitimacy, efficiency and effectiveness of planning solutions.

In its current manifestation, we witnessed that decision-makers and the involved planners largely preferred the persuasion of ‘control and regulation’ above the acceptance of uncertainty and complexity. Under these rigid behavioral patterns, the process of ‘learning’ will be no more than a meaningless concept.

It is possible to conclude that the process of ‘learning’ itself requires an active will of participants to anticipate their ‘ways of doing’ for the sake of a perceived ‘mutual added value’. Under this notion, we have designated planning as a way to actively manage the process in which learning is to

84 In this, we refer mainly to the disembeddedness of market forces as well as the individualization of society.
manifest. We indicated that the planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ so far failed to perform this task.

It is still unclear if a collaborative planning approach can ever achieve its ideal as prescribed in theory. We cannot take a determinative stance on the basis of a singular case study. Though, if ‘learning’ for the sake of ‘meaningful action’\(^{85}\) is to take place, a first essential step for planners is to provide clarity of purpose and conditions to all involved. Only if the meaning of institutional arrangements and governing concepts are understood and methodological embedded, then actors are actually enabled to behave in the most suitable way, or to choose for a different governing principle.

In the case of ‘Spoorzone Delft’, we found that most failures tend to be provoked by unclear conditions and purpose for collaboration. That is, the role of the private sector as well as civil society involvement has been jeopardized by a mismatch between reassuring promises and actual decision-making power.

---

\(^{85}\) A course of decision-making which makes sense to all involved
4.2 Recommendations on the planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’

Limit complexity for the assurance of a mutual beneficial collaboration
The business case of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ is based upon principles of ‘value capturing’ (Huisman, 2006). Value capturing proposes instruments and methods which are to enable the government to capture future betterments on urban spatial transformation for the payment of spatial interventions which are requisite for the creation of development conditions. Thus, value capturing aims to share costs on non-profitable interventions with the private sector by forging the relation between the production of future revenues and today’s costs.

The private sector has been conditioned by the government to pay 80 million euro - to supplement the business case towards 500 million euro - for the tunnel construction, if they are to develop real estate on top of the tunnel. Hence, the financial return of the development of 1500 homes and 50,000 m2 office space is to cover an additional 80 million euro for the payment of the tunnel. Within the scope of this study, we will not further argue upon the effectiveness and legitimacy of the nature of the business case. Though, we did perceive that the 80 million burden – as a financial-based dependency between the tunnel and area development – heavily affected the planning process.

In particular, we found that the integrality persuasion of the tunnel and area development did not only result in an 80 million euro burden, but above all increased the fragmented nature of the decision-making context. That is, both objects in urban space – the tunnel and area development – have been planned largely in separated arenas, in which especially the area development has been jeopardized by the limiting conditions which have been imposed on the basis of a different object of focus: the railway tunnel. The consequence of this course has been the marginalized opportunity for citizen inclusion as well as the adaptive capacity of the process to respond to market fluctuations.

Hence, in our view, we argue that ‘Spoorzone Delft’ has become too complex and unmanageable by the creation financial-based relations. Our proposal is to alleviate the financial dependency between both spatial objects (fig 63). In this case, alternative ways should be explored to recoup the remaining 80 million euro.

---

86 We promote a greater provincial involvement in terms of an intermediary body between the national government and municipalities, enforced by enhanced financial opportunities. Apart from its medial position, in the light today’s urges on regional competitiveness, we believe the province is the most suitable administrative body to evaluate the regional necessities to a wider (supra-) national perspective. Under this notion, a formalization of the metropolitan ‘Randstad’ level might be a suitable framework to direct focus and appeal to engaged resources.
In a more general sense, we recommend to limit complexity within an integral project to the boundaries that are based upon shared objects of interests within urban space. That is, we believe integrality cannot be controlled and imposed from above, but – in the context of governance – is dynamic interplay of the socio-cultural dynamics from which project boundaries evolve.

At the other hand, in order to prevent too much of a fragmented urban growth, a certain degree of public regulation and control for the assurance of a wider societal interest should be favored above localized interest. However, in the case of a dual project such as ‘Spoorzone Delft’ - hampered by enormous delays - we believe that the costs by far do not outweigh the benefits. Hence, there are no fixed solutions.

**A deliberative area-based governance potential**

If an institutional separation would be established between the planning process of the railway tunnel and the area developments, fewer preconditions would be imposed upon the latter for controlling the solutions. Hence, a more locally based planning operability could be induced which would be less restricted to capture the dynamics on market fluctuations as well as citizens’ expectations.

The masterplan by Busquets’ preliminary posed the area development as a comprehensive entity, which in the end failed to represent a realistic image. A further disentanglement of the planning process into smaller projects would in our view provide a more feasible and legitimate opportunity for Delft to induce a more inclusive and gradual open-ended urban development in continual reflection to what is desirable and feasible in Delft. In this way, projects can evolve on the basis of intensified sectoral relations, instead of coping under the pressure of former imposed conditions.

Though, while we believe this approach might more suitable within today’s planning context, it tends to differ from the rooted ambition of Dutch planning to control and predict by means of comprehensive plans. Yet, we believe this smaller scale type of urbanism can still be located under a wider spatial vision as long as the imposed criteria merely articulate general objectives, rather than detailed plans.
Planning within complex conditions requires sense-making devices

We indicated that the core difficulty on collaborative planning tends to be the rooted persuasion of top-down control and regulation of both decision-makers as well as involved spatial planners. Within our case study we perceived a planning operability which was largely technocratic and authoritative. That is, the produced plans, such as the ‘Beeldkwaliteitsplan’ imposes detailed design criteria, which seems to stress the absence of shared spaces for negotiation. Further, as noted by Bijleveld, van der Post and Slagmolen (2010), the involved planners seem to reject the social-cultural dimension within which plans are constructed. The planners tend to behave in a traditional way in which plans are not operated as means for communication, but rather a means for domination.

Hence, if planning is to perform within complex decision-making conditions, the planning discipline in challenged to evaluate upon its methods and instruments. The rationality of planning as learning through sense-making devices provides a frame through which new methods can be explored.

The concept of strategic planning (Healey, 2007) seems to confront this difficulty. Strategic planning assumes that the design of information could be a device of power within a complex context which is marked by ambiguity. Hence, strategic plans could improve the performance of planning as it has the power to focus attention for shaping coherency towards agreements.

We found that plans within the ‘Spoorzone Delft’ process have been sense-making devices, though, not in each phase. Especially within the boundaries of public-public collaborations we recognized that the regional level of the Randstad provided an effective frame of reference for the collective reflection of interests and potentials. The reason why planning performed well within the public-public collaboration could be because of the embedded Dutch traditional of planning as an inter-level challenge (Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000). That is, inter-level dependency is perceived and recognized by means of a collaborative process. Though, in the phase of governance, we perceived a course of
decision-making within which top-down control tends to reject the recognition of interdependent cross-sectoral relations. Evidently, planning did not perform well in the context of governance.

**Consolidating relations by making knowledge explicit and understandable**

In a context that is marked by a wide variety of viewpoints and interests, we believe a strategic planning approach which merely is to persuade actors by the presentation of seductive images may fail to perform. Hence, in recognition of a planning culture that is largely dominated by values of public control, we propose for a planning operability which is to be more explicit on the variables and parameters which can be negotiated within the regulated public boundaries. That is, a planning operability which sets the solution spaces in understandable ways for participating partners, so that they can become negotiable. Next, in our view planning should not aim to persuade solutions within the solutions spaces, but should merely aim to reveal externalities as a consequence of mutually constructed solutions within the arena\(^{87}\). Hence, we believe if planning could make the consequences of decision-making explicit, decision-makers too will be enabled to learn in order to be explicit on what they really want in perspective to the potential in urban space.

**Summary on recommendations**

Within our line of argumentation, our recommendations consider both the design as well as management of the planning process:

1. **The design of the planning process**
   
   We proposed for a limitation of complexity on relations which are to be dealt with within the decision-making arrangement. In particular, we explained that an organizational separation of the planning process for the railway tunnel and the area development, would reassure a more cross-sectoral inclusive planning process with an adaptive capacity to respond to new developments.

2. **The management of the planning context**
   
   We noted that today’s planning instruments are largely authority-based and do not perform well within complex decision-making arenas. Hence, we proposed for planning instruments which are to manage communication and persuade negotiation within a predetermined solution space.

---

\(^{87}\) ‘The Urban Decision Room’ (van Loon, 2008) largely performs under this perspective. Today, ‘The Urban Decision Room’ has been introduced as planning instrument to resolve conflicts within the governance arena of ‘Spoorzone Delft’. 
4.3 Recommendations for further research

Study for the improvement of linking regional indicative planning activities to formal local decision-making practices
Within our study we indicated that there seems to be a gap between indicative regional planning activities and formal decision-making practices at the local level. The loose relation between both has in the case of ‘Spoorzone Delft’ resulting in too limited solution spaces locally. Though, in consideration of the municipal veto position of power (Needham, 2007), the regional learning-oriented activities might as well fail to perform as a result of unsupportive local political agendas. In other words, we are interested if planning as learning could break the barriers of power.

Study upon the possibilities for the operability of a transferable developments right market under the perspective of urban area developments.
The introduction of a Transferable Development Rights market (TDR) (Janssen-jansen, 2008; Renard, 2007; Micelli, 2002) can be supportive planning instruments to intensified perceived interdependency between the state, market and civil society as a condition for development.

TDR is a widely discussed concept within scientific inquiry. It suggests an alternative planning approach as a response to the unsuitability of authority-based planning instruments in the light of complex decision-making. TDR attempts to ensure inclusive planning, exceeding the consolidated power structures, by making development rights transferable. It attempts to make planning choices less sensitive to externalities, as a direct negotiation between actors within a decision-making arena can be persuaded. For instance, a TDR frame can be engineered in such a way that if a developer wants to add extra gross floor area, it has to negotiate with a participating civil society organization to buy the development rights which are located at the grounds of the latter. In this way, a direct negotiation-based relation can be set between civil society and private developers for reaching towards solutions which are profitable for both.

Hence, a TDR system can be designed to guide decision-making within a preset solution space within a specific plan area. Thus, TDR can be best understood as a collaborative tool which can be located under a wider regulated vision for urban developments. Though, this instrument has been rarely brought to practice in the western European context and is at the moment highly explorative in its nature.

Study on the dichotomy of planning in developing and developed countries; a comparative study upon the adaptive capacity and meaning of general planning principles in the context of divergent planning cultures
By the embracement of the ‘area development’ planning paradigm, we observed that planning increasingly faces a context complexity, dynamics and ambiguity as a result of interdependent power relations. In order to reach towards an understanding and recommendation of ways how planning could operate within this context, we have studied upon generalized planning theories and interpreted them from the perspective of the Dutch context.
Developing countries are even more challenged by dispersed power relations, as they – compared to the Dutch system – tend to have a less comprehensive planning tradition, nor the means to direct public action. Consequently, foreign involvement, fragmented public structures could marginalize the demands and needs of citizens. Hence, planning theories on collaboration and participation might too be of value in such contexts. Though, studies have indicated that those theories largely have evolved in the light of western contexts (Bebeejaun and Vanderhoven, 2010) and cannot simply be adapted to non-western contexts. Hence, we are interested if planning theories can be enriched by a comparable empirical reflection to developed - and developing countries.
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Annex 1a: Interview report E. Bijleveld, 26 – 5 – 2010

Introduction
Edith Bijleveld has been the director of the Spoorzone project for 2 decades. Up until the execution phase she has actively been pushing the momentum. Due to her coming retirement she decided to pass on the flag to a new director in 2008.

Stakeholder and process manager
Mrs. Bijleveld considers herself to be both a representative of the municipal political interest, as well as a facilitator within the multi-actor process. In order to generate the means to get things done it is requisite to actively search for allies in the process. For this purpose, mrs. Bijleveld always pursued a strategy of seduction (verleidings-strategie). By this she refers to the struggle of finding leverage by connecting to existing policy frameworks (adapting in order to generate means) as well as shaping firm social relations in order to enable an effective interactive learning experience. The latter is very much dependent on the strength of the social relationships (trust and commitment). In order to shape and potentiate relations, the content of the project needs to stay alive continuously for decades among the shareholders. Therefore, as the spinning wheel in the project it has been the challenge to present new information on a regular base in order to focus attention.

Further, in order to get things done, mrs. Bijleveld argues the importance to present potential plans along the way which reflect actor’s interest (decision-making in advance), instead of only asking others about their interest and simultaneously try to connect it to others; as a director you need to know the interest of your stakeholders beforehand! For example: the municipality designed the railtrack angle in a way which would satisfy ProRail; they did not wait passively for ProRail to come up with this desire.

Long term engagement with respect to continuity of content
Consistency and continuation of strategy has been the reason why Mrs. Bijleveld chose to manage the project for 20 years. It has been Mrs. Bijleveld’s experience that each social actor (1) puts his own ways of doing into the process and (2) tends to reject the knowledge which has been built before. E.g. the successor of Mrs. Bijleveld hardly took the time to build upon the knowledge that has been build so far. As a result, much of the knowledge that has been produced along the process has vanished. Most managers are too busy to shake hands and are not fully committed to the content of the project.

Decision-oriented dialogue
Mrs. Bijleveld argues that she did not perceived illegitimacy of power exertion. Meaningful collaboration marks the essence of the project. However, dialogue and consensus is good, but in order to keep the momentum alive and strive forward, decisions need to be taken on a regular base. That is, if new social actors may arrive we could not start the whole process all over again. If that would be the way of working: the quality of the project would decrease as actors may lose interest and political directions may vary. Within the dynamics of a long term project, it is impossible to satisfy everyone. Legitimacy should then be safeguarded by involving each actor by listening and interacting.
In other words, in order to produce results within the dynamics and complexity of reality, the strategically planned line should not be deviated too often. Thus, some kind of central leadership seems a necessity.

**Public – Public dependency: National government as ally**
The municipality on its own does not have the means to realize their ambitions. There is a great dependency on especially the national government. And, national government is obliged to take their responsibility on the development of public transport nodes. For this reason, municipalities often behave as subsidy hunters. However, in the case of Project Spoorzone, Mrs. Bijleveld succeeded to build a meaningful relation with the ministry of spatial planning and environment (VROM). Both actors felt the meaning of the relationships and where thus able to communicate effectively. It seems to be a necessity to build social relations in order to produce qualitative satisfying results.

In other words, municipalities should not merely apply for subsidies, but should aim to find allies at the funding partner in order to achieve a greater quality of results (maatwerk).

**Public Private collaboration**
Mrs. Bijleveld believes that the private sector can be a valuable ally in area development instances. Next to the financial advances of public Private collaboration, Mrs. Bijleveld argues that the public sector should potentiate the valuable knowledge that is located at private parties.

However, in order to reach towards effective collaboration the public sector should not behave too dominant (guardian syndrome?). In the present way of working she has perceived a too dominant public sector due to the ‘wethouder’ who was imposing his will to the project. There seems to be a fear to share decision-making power which exceeds the traditional public boundaries. However, if the public sector expects the private sector to carry financial risks and responsibilities, a more collaborative, shared approach should be pursued.

Consequently, in times of economic crisis, the project now seems unstable due to dissatisfied private parties.

**The role of spatial planners/designers**
There are two reasons why Busquets was selected as external spatial planners:

1. The municipal planners do not produce great quality work. Therefore, Busquets was selected for its great designers capacity as well as his ability to focus attention in multi-actor environments.

2. By accepting a renowned designer, a greater social base could be created. This capacity would never be possible for e.g. a post graduate student. However, Mrs. Bijleveld strongly argues that the advanced position of a renowned designer such as Busquets is the product of a great CV on designing in multi-actor environments. For example, she stated that Busquets has a great capacity to listen to others and not to let his ego overrule. In other words, his position of power is legitimate. In this sense, she argued that it is not Busquets ego which puts him in a position of power, but legitimate deserved authority (gezag).

Further, Mrs. Bijleveld elaborated in depth on the perceived arrogance within the Dutch spatial planning culture. In particular she referred to TU Delft graduates for their illegitimate arrogance and
their inappropriate will to dominate the planning process. In fact, she argued that TU Delft planners are not capable to work in a multi-actor environment, moreover, they are probably unaware of the social context in which they are positioned.

In regards to the planning context, she argued that the planning discipline in essence should serve its context, instead of dominate. Planners shouldn’t try to impose their own culture on the process (TU Delft culture??), but should try to combine cultures and values that are intersecting within the process \( \rightarrow \) to safeguard the integrality of the process!

Further, she argued against the method of working of urban designers. The TU Delft students do not seem to be capable to come up with logical arguments for their design choices; Ideas are very divergent and sporadic! If this would be the case, than Mrs. Bijleveld argues that she might as well become a designer herself!

What is more, Designers from the TU Delft do not seem to be capable to incorporate the factor TIME in their choices: what happens after implementation? In this sense she has a very good experience with landscape designers from wageningen University.

**Land ownership**
The municipality reclaimed all grounds within the project boundaries. Parts of the grounds will be given to the developers and ProRail to realize the plans.

Landowners in the area do have the possibility to sell their grounds to the municipality in case they would be afraid to lose any value of their lands. (als ze geen risico willen lopen).

**Participation**
The goals of citizen participation are creating a base of social support as well as enrichment of the project.

Mrs. Bijleveld noted that the citizens of Delft are especially satisfied with the area development, which is one of the elements of the spoorzone Project.

Public sector communication to the public is often characterized by lots of informing (‘zenden, zenden, zenden’). Mrs. Bijleveld argues that the public sector should learn how to listen to the people. She argues that the urban citizens do possess practical knowledge from experience to enrich the content of the project.

Although Mrs. Bijleveld argues that the actual decision-making power lies in the hands of those who have the financial resources at stake, she does emphasize the role lay knowledge from below does have in the actual decision-making arena. However, citizens did not have any means to block the continuation of the project. This is because although many opinions may intersect, only a hand of citizens is actually directly affected by the new developments.

The participation quality in the project can be categorized as “advising” at the participation ladder.

Introduction
Willemijn Wilms Floet is assistant professor at the chair of building typology, faculty of Architecture, Delft University of Technology (DUT). As a researcher and teacher she has studied upon the Spoorzone Delft project for many years. Next, she is also an active member of the ‘Platform Spoor’. The latter is an informal platform that has been launched by the municipality to organize their communicational activities towards and from citizens and civil society organizations.

The (potential) role of the TU Delft within the planning process
Mrs. Wilms Floet acknowledged that the Spoorzone Project is a very interesting case to learn from. The complexity of the project has attracted many students for the sake of their graduation. She noted there are many alternative design solutions which are worthwhile to study. Next to this, the current plan, as how it is in process, still has many design elements which could potentially be studied more intensively, with a greater amount of creative minds. In this, she specifically refers to the following elements:

- A comprehensive study in order to design a specific style for the new building blocks. The current plan tends to become too much of a copy of urban redevelopments elsewhere, whereas Delft has its own very specific historical architectural evolution.
- The size of the building block, which seems to deviate from the Dutch tradition.
- The relation between private and public space; she argues that the current design is loaded with too much semi-public space, due to semi-public corridors through the building blocks, along the main route.
- The design of the recurrence of the historical canal. She argues that this canal should be connected to the water system and should at least allow canoes to pass it.
- The design of the public space, as it is in general still a design in process.

Having said, although the project does offer the faculty an interesting experimental ground to study, she argued that the faculty so far did not actually contribute to the enrichment of the project.

Nonetheless, she argued that this could have been different; the faculty of architecture could potentially be of great support for the content of the project. This could be in the case for the design of alternative solutions as well as an investigation on specific themes. The two following reasons for this lack of mutual enrichment lie underneath:

1. The project is too complex for graduating students to be able to contribute in a way that complements the knowledge that is already produced within the network of formally participating partners.
2. There tends to be a lack of financial means in order to become involved in the project. The university cannot just provide voluntary research. For instance, mrs Wilms Floet referred to an occasion in which the municipality actually requested the faculty to more or less produce a new “beeldkwaliteitsplan”. This type of collaboration could only be possible if there would be a more solid mutually-accepted policy frame between the municipality and the university.
The role of ‘Platform Spoor’ and participation in general

Platform Spoor reflects the municipal ambition to assure the citizens and civil society organizations in Delft that (1) they will be informed properly on the advancements of the project and (2) the interactions and knowledge produced within the Platform can be incorporated into the decision-making process.

However, Mrs. Wilms Floet argued that the platform is a “zoethoudertje”, that is, a symbolical reassurance to avoid conflicts and generate social support. She argued against the selective nature of information that is provided by the OBS (OntwikkelingsBedrijf Spoorzone Delft) in order to be reflected upon within the Platform. Moreover, she noted that those parts of information that do reach the Platform tend to focus on very specific technical subjects, rather than main design challenges. The latter could potentially be enriched within the platform due to the wide range of interpretation that could be given to the subject by conceiving it from multiple perspectives.

In general she argued that the design of the process does not provide any space for citizens and civil society organization to be empowered to participate. She believes the project management should listen more to those which do not participate in the formal decision-making arena. Especially in the city of Delft, which inhabits a great amount of architects and planners, lots could be learned from the environment.

The participation quality in the project can be categorized as “informing” on the participation ladder.

General reflection on content and process

Mrs. Wilms Floet argued that the municipality is trying to control decisions on design solutions too much (detailniveau bestemmingsplan). That is, a greater amount of freedom on the building architecture should be given to architects on a later stage. On the other hand, many decisions which have been incorporated into the “beeldkwaliteitsplan” are in need of a lot more research. A greater emphasis should have been given to drawing street profiles, morphological studies etc.

Although the project is formally categorized as being in the implementation phase, there are still many design challenges, especially on the design of public space.

Mrs. Wilms Floet does not have enough insights in the process in order to reflect upon the distribution of power between the public and private actors. Nonetheless she does not see any indications that the position of power of the Alderman (wethouder) did lead to any decreased commitment by private actors. The project initially was set up in a period of great economical prosperity. It seems therefore logical that the private actors nowadays are a bit more hesitant and demanding.
Annex 1c: Interview report J.G. van der Post, 22 – 10 – 2010

Introduction
Mr. Jan Geert van der Post has been formally involved in the planning process of the project Spoorzone Delft since 2001. He was initiated as a project manager during the period that a long-set ‘dream became a true project’. He became part of a project team that was established within the municipality.

A complex power balance
Spoorzone Delft is very complex project that challenges the managerial capacity of a middle-size city such as Delft. The project is characterized by a complexity of intertwining features which addresses the interests and responsibilities of a divergent amount of actors from different levels and sectors.

The infrastructural feature, in terms of the construction of a railway tunnel, has been the most predominant one since the initiation of the project. The local area development can be conceived as a consequent of this implication; by constructing a railway tunnel, vacant land will arise in midst of the city. Thus, regarding the infrastructural nature of the project, policy frames on different levels and sectors are involved in the decision-making procedure.

First of all there is the ministry of Traffic and Watermanagement (VenW). They contribute significantly to the construction of the tunnel, as they carry the responsibility to expand the Dutch rail tracks if necessary. Despite their financial contribution, the ministry is not willing to carry any responsibilities within the project. Responsibility and management, thus, remains on municipal level. According to mr. van der Post, this is where a problem arises. The ministry is a very powerful actor due to their financial contribution, but they have a very rigid policy framework and are not willing to cooperate effectively with those who manage and carry the risks. A weak level of mutual learning and adjustment between national and municipal level is evident.

Next to the ministry at national level, another powerful actor in the process is ProRail. Although ProRail is commissioned by the ministry of VenW, they do have their own policy frame work, which too tends to be inflexible. Their inflexible behavior could be a result of their monopolistic position. Consequently, a learning-oriented interaction in collaboration with the municipality is affected.

Though there are many other actors in the process, they did not block an effective collaboration because of 2 reasons: (1) they were largely supportive to the project plans as it fits under their own agenda’s or (2) they operated on the base of contracting-out schemes.

A pro-active strategy: information as instrument
In a network of dispersed power relations, in which risks and project management lies on municipal level, a mid-size city such as Delft is challenged to counteract the dominant forces of power from especially the ministry as well as ProRail. In other words, the complex power balance imposes a great challenge to the city of Delft for reaching to multiple policy frames, while assuring the quality of improvements that is ambitioned locally.

For this reason, for the sake of seduction and focusing attention, knowledge was produced in early stages and utilized by the project team in order to gain a position of power. In particular, the project
team invested in learning from past experiences as well as doing lots of technical research-in-advance.

From the former, they learned that large infrastructural projects usually tend to exceed the budget massively because many variables (such as demanding social actors) have not been taken into account (they learned from project 'de Betuwelijn).

**Project organization and management**

The project team ambitioned an integral planning scheme for both the tunnel construction and the urban area developments. In such a construction, the betterments that are gained from the exploitation of grounds and real estate could partly be transferred to the cost of the tunnel construction.

Due to the managerial complexity and the financial risks, the project management was separated from daily politics that marks municipal administration. That is, a separate legal body (bv) was established under the name OntwikkelingsBedrijf Spoorzone Delft (OBS). Although the administration of OBS is completely autonomous, which gives them authority to make decisions on their own; the municipality is 100% stakeholder of this company. Further, public law still remains in the hands of the municipality in order to reflect the outcome of OBS decisions to the public rules and regulations.

Initially, the project team ambitioned the OBS administration to be based on a public-private partnership. This ambition reflected a desire to share powers and responsibilities on both the tunnel construction as well as the area development. Thus, a public-private partnership was never achieved, but the project organization was successfully designed in an integral manner.

Mr. van der Post further argued that the choice for a PPP is very much contextual based. He notes that the main advantage of a PPP is that risks are carried by those actors which also have the capacity to carry them. However, he believes that in PPP-schemes there is a general tendency that private actors do not fully commit to carrying long-term risks as their operability is very much focused on fluctuating market dynamics. He believes this focus sometimes becomes too much of an excuse in order to relinquish from risks and responsibilities (crisis argument).

On the other hand, he also argues that municipal politics sometimes may not award enough power to private developers, which should be a precondition for sharing risks with them. In fact, in the case of Spoorzone he believes that the municipal land-use plan is far too detailed for developers to be able to optimize design decision to meet their feasibility goals.

However, at the moment the opportunity is offered and discussed to legally adapt the land use plan. For this reason, an Urban Decision Room is developed to be used as an instrument in order to structure new inter-actions with the private developers for evaluating and adapting to today's market dynamics. Thus, although the project is categorized to be in the implementation phase, there is (potentially) still much to design and decide.
Public engagement and participation

In general, the OBS aspires to engage the citizen of Delft to the planning process. They have established an informational visitor centre (Delft Bouwt) and organized several public participation gatherings. These attempts mainly have been designed to inform the people and actively built on social support. In few predefined matters, the public was consulted for reflecting on decisions and acquiring lay knowledge.

Next, the municipality established the Platform Spoor in order to structure and combine communicational activities between OBS and civil society organizations. This platform discerns from the public participation gatherings, as access is only given to civil society organizations that represent collective interests of groups that are affected by the project. Within the frame of this platform, information is exchanged interactively. The goal is to inform and to consult on certain practical matters. Individual interests and wider design-related issues are not discussed.

In theory, there is much criticism to be found on participation schemes that are designed and imposed from the top. Those arguments imply that there would never be any kind of actual bottom-up empowerment. Mr. van der Post acknowledges this conceptual conflict on shaping participation. However, he believes that in general the citizens of Delft tend to be satisfied on how they values are treated along the process. Further, in order to concede in the line of this argument, the organizations involved in Platform Spoor will soon be empowered to bring forward topics that are to be discussed themselves.

Mr. van der Post notes that participation should not be a goal in itself and limits should be set. The main reason for this is that citizens tend to act too much in the light of the NIMBY syndrome.

Participation ladder: advising

Urbanism

Mr. van der Post argues that spatial planners tend to neglect the fact that a spatial plan is the product of an enduring social process. He found that planners often tend to valuate plans too much from their own personal subjectivity. Especially in Delft, which inhabits many planners and designers, this has been fairly notable.

However, he does believe that creative designers can add value to the planning process. However, their role could become much more valuable if they would be more conscious of the social context which they serve.

Land ownership (potential means for power exertion)

Initially the land ownership on the project area was divided between private owners (homes), NS Poort (station area) and ProRail (the grounds on which the railtracks is constructed).

The municipality started from 2000 onwards to obtain the grounds in their hands. In most cases this went fluently. Until 2000 this went in terms of a passive strategy; owners were offered the opportunity to sell their lands and real estate to the municipality. From 2002 onwards, the municipality operated in terms of an active strategy; estate agents visited the plots and made a bid on the lands and its real estate on behalf of the municipality. In the end, only 3 owners were expropriated.
Although each landowner could have called upon their right to develop their property independently according to new regulations (zelfrealisatie), none of them had enough lands to be able to do so in a profitable way. Thus even NS Poort felt the need to transfer their grounds to the municipality in order to shape the project collectively.

The housing corporations were up till now not involved in the process. They did not possess any grounds.
Annex 1d: Interview report Dr. Ir. B. Slagmolen, 26 – 10 – 2010

Introduction
The Werkplaats Spoorzone Delft (WeSD) is an independent non-profit organization in Delft. Its organizational goals are very much distinctive from other organizations that are engaged to the process of the urban redevelopment of Spoorzone Delft. Dr. ir. Bert Slagmolen is the chairman of the WeSD (Werkplaats Spoorzone Delft).

A building side as a potential for a creative social platform
The WeSD initially started as an informal debate between many creative individuals that were accommodated in the former Bacinol Building in Delft. These debates reflected a collective search for ways and means to utilize technology and creativity for "creating inspiring social spaces for new relations and interactions". It is the latter which, according to Dr. Slagmolen, which is in need of attention due to an ongoing process of societal individualization. In other words, social life in Delft does not actually reflect a sense of identity and cohesiveness to the extent that is desirable. The high level of rooted creativity and technology in Delft could be a means to counteract this societal tendency.

Dr. Slagmolen argues that urban change is largely accepted – and should – be the derivative of a dynamic society. However, future-oriented vision and action in the public domain should not lead to a denial of urban-social identity and mutual understanding. In his position he argues that the physical building site, that marks the process of urban redevelopment, could serve as a large creative informal podium to express and share feelings and thoughts. In this sense, the project is an instrument to serve a different purpose.

Having said, it is evident that in general an inner-city building side, and its underlying political decision-making process, often tends to be perceived as a black-box to the public. The building side usually is not associated to any kind of creativeness; rather than long-lasting nuisance to the public. However, Dr. Slagmolen argues that the mess of a building side could as well be conceived as a potential source of amusement.

In the light of the latter, those participating in the Bacinol-debates discovered the potential to utilize the Spoorzone building side as a means to reach their collective goals. In order to reach to funding agencies and effective action, the informal debates transformed in 2006 into a formal legal body: the WeSD. Since then, the WeSD conducted a range of creative activities that relate to the building side and those who are affected by it.

Side effect: a higher level of public engagement
Having said that the building is primary conceived as an instrument for wider-societal oriented objectives, the activities conducted by the WeSD undeniably do relate to the Spoorzone project itself. That is, the actions tend to give meaning and/or raise awareness to the quality of the place, which is more than just a anonymous building side. Dr. Slagmolen argues that the positive side-effect could be that citizens become more pro-active and alert regarding change that affects their life. In this sense, we may argue that the WeSD contributes to the municipal’ desire to empower citizens to

88 Cited from http://www.werkplaatspoorzonedelft.nl/english
be engaged, whether positively or negatively, to the project. Nonetheless, this does not imply that the actions raise the social support for the Spoorzone project to a higher level.

In order to reach out effectively to the values and identities of the citizens of Delft, the WeSD always explicitly communicates to the target groups of their actions that they do not relate to the formal decision-making arena.

**Power relations: representation and transparency**

In planning theory, the threat of illegitimate power exertion is widely discussed. In the case of Spoorzone Delft, we could critically question whose interests are, and should be, served. And, who should have the power to decide.

In general, Dr. Slagmolen noted that the legitimacy is found in the Dutch representative democratic capacity of the parliament that initially was the main public body that decided if a railway tunnel would be constructed. Even though ProRail argued that Delft has no priority on their list of projects, a political value-laden urge emerged. In this process, next to the regional infrastructural urge, the local urban problems and opportunities around Delft station were absorbed in the political debate.

Nonetheless, political decisions are always the product of a political debate, where subjectivities intersect. Thus, Dr. Slagmolen argues that a representative democracy should find its legitimacy in the transparency of the decision-making process that is awarded to the public. In this sense, he notes that the decision-making process at times has not reached a fulfilling level of transparency.

Having said, dr. Slagmolen does not speak about any illegitimate exertion of power. He believes that the public-public and public-private power relations have been quite effective in order to reach goals in a legitimate manner.

**A lack of inter-organizational learning**

The context in which long-term planning processes take place tends to be dynamic through time; the context is never stable. Further, the dynamics of the city can hardly be conceptualized as a closed system; there are always external effects. Thus, the policy direction that has been agreed upon should therefore be monitored and evaluated throughout the process in order for the decision-makers to reflect and re-act upon their decisions. However, Dr. Slagmolen argued that monitoring has been lacking throughout the process, whereas externalities can hardly be incorporated into the process.

Dr. Slagmolen further argued that the rigidness of the planning process does relate to the conflicts that mark public-private collaborative efforts. That is, in order to learn and adapt, the inter-action and information exchange between collaborating actors should be transparent and complete. However, there usually tends to be a lack of trust between both sectors as they operate on different grounds (political ambitions vs. profitability).

Next, from a bottom-up perspective, even if information is available, and the power to take action seems to lie in the hands of the public authority, a too complex bureaucratic system makes it almost impossible to act effectively upon it.
Citizen participation and empowerment
In general, Dr. Slagmolen believes that the most citizens in Delft supports the need for this project.

Dr. Slagmolen argued that power to decide should for the most part lie in the hands of representative political powers and technical experts. But, the citizens of Delft should (and actually had) the right to let their voices hear on the question if the project should be accepted or not.

Citizens have not been in the position to actually influence the design process. The design process itself has too a large extent been the product of a political debate, under pressure of market forces. However, on some topics, mainly very practical ones, citizens were informed and sometimes consulted in order to reflect decisions to lay knowledge (toetsen).

Dr. Slagmolen argued that citizens who are directly affected by the project are properly involved in the planning process. In this, I refer to those who directly live at the border of the project area. They are clearly informed on practical matters and in some cases there is an interaction between the OBS and citizens. However, citizens which do not directly live at the border of the project area generally feel affected, but are not recognized and treated that way.

Platform Spoor can be conceived as a satisfying initiative and the Platform does have some power to influence. The topics that are discussed also very much relate to practical matters.

Urbanism
Dr. Slagmolen explicitly notes that he is not an expert in spatial planning. However, he feels that the plan, as how it is presented by Busquets, does not very much potentiate to the unique identity of Delft: a city of knowledge.

Further, he argues that planners have only that much space that is awarded to them by the actual decision-makers. Financial feasibility is the main criteria.

Dr. Slagmolen agrees upon my analysis that in many cases planners might not effectively anticipate to the context in which planning takes place. In this he argues that the spatial planning discipline is subject to multiple conceptual understandings, planners should be aware of this. It should be a choice, rather than a coincidence, on what kind of planning approach is set in a specific context.

Reflection on WeSD
Dr. Slagmolen is partly satisfied with the operability of the WeSD. He believes that WeSD brought many creative ideas into practice. However, the most challenging and unique ideas did not come to being. He was hoping for funding partners that showed more guts, as these actions could really show the identity of Delft in a positive manner.

Further notes
Spoorzone Delft as communicated by OBS:

1. Many front doors (referring to the complex context of an inner-city project)
2. Social support
3. WeSD as a unique initiative
4. A complex internal organization
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1 globalization and shifting power relations

A neo-liberal shift
From the early 1980’s we have witnessed a global socio-political tendency which criticized governmental initiated and steered interventions in territorial developments. This critical stance has been provoked by a widely accepted belief concerning the inefficient and ineffective capacities of the public sector to (re)act to societal challenges. Instead, a positive valuation has been awarded to the efficiency-based nature of free market forces in order to drive towards optimal social solutions within societies (Miccieri, 2002). These socio-political beliefs lead to the construction of neo-liberal policies. These policies provoked an increasing transfer of steering power from the public towards the private sector. Overall these policies were aimed to support the operability of free market forces. By doing so, the state challenged itself to redefine its role within society.

Subsequently, technological development in the ICT sector by that time lead to the age of digitalization (Sassen, 2000). Thence, private corporations became not only politically enabled, as but also technically capable, to adjust their operating strategies in order to pursue efficiency objectives in a more optimal manner. Thus, technical developments within the light of a neo-liberal political system had shaped the frame conditions for a post-Fordist productive system. That is, the emergence of a globally dispersed market dynamic. In this, emerging global corporations distributed their value chains over the globe in order to pursue their organizational goals in a more efficient manner. Thus, the dispersion of their wealth into localities, in terms of socio-economic growth, can be conceived selective, for being subject to - and dependent on biased corporate strategies.

Although these post-fordist dynamics have been induced by the modified strategies of private corporations, the initiative for change has been provoked by the socially-induced neo-liberal storm which altered the social context and power position of private corporations.

Economical disembeddedness
Consequently, we have observed an intensive integration of geographical dispersed activities. This is marked by a dramatically intensified flow of people, goods and services between a dynamic set of (urban) nodal points around the globe. Thus, the geographical dispersal of economical activities tends to strengthen the cross-border city-to-city transactions and networks (Sassen, 2000). This phenomenon marks the concept of globalization. Conceiving from this perspective, it seems that globalization stresses the inter-state systems in which economical processes traditionally were embedded. That is, economical dynamics increasingly tend to have become disembedded from the geographical context in which they operate. The operating international corporate strategies have become less dependable on the geographical contexts in which they operate. Instead, the intervening geographical context, including its embedded governance structures, can be conceived as variable within the corporate strategy formulation. Thus, we notice that some urban localities seem to be of greater value for private investments than others.

89 Steering power can be best described as the ability an organization has to steer its context as well as its own operability within that context. (De Leeuw, 2002)
90 A geographical dispersal of corporate value chains
91 Conceptualized through policies of privatization, deregulation, digitalization and the opening up of economies.
Urban fragmentation and the face of new spatial orders

As argued previously, the new dynamic does operate within a network perspective and thus seems to pass over the logics of traditional state boundaries. Therefore, local economical opportunity tends to be subject to global dynamics instead of being merely enclosed and in control by public authorities within administrative boundaries. Thus, the urban economical position is subject to the selective choice for private investment locations. It has been widely argued that these new dynamics on economical growth do not evidently induce wealth dispersion over the urban region. Socio-economical fragmentation, manifested by socio-spatial fragmentation can thus be marked as a counter effect of the emerged global economical system (Burgess, 2002).

It seems that neo-liberal policies and its evolving societal effects have weakened the traditional assumption of society and its market as being understood holistically integrated within a geographical context. In this, “place” can be conceived in a geographically hierarchical manner, such as a district within a city, a city within a region, and a region within a nation. Instead, due to an increased corporate competence to effectively pursue their own biased interests within a boundless territory, the potential arose for corporations to extend their context in a physically selective manner in order to operate only at those places which seem to be most valuable to their optimalization strategies.

In fact, as social (inter)actions seem to have become more independent from a physical geography, the conceptual understanding of the word ‘context’ now has been challenged in its meaning. A more appropriate understanding of context might be found when conceiving it from a more sociological viewpoint, defining the pattern of social interactions. By doing so, it seems best to comprehend “context” within the light of a social relational understanding (Healey, 2007). Within this conception of context, it can be argued that context in which a global private corporation acts consists out of a network of inter-connected localities.

Based on the former, it is possible to say that neo-liberal policies contributed to the emergence of a new global order, which can be best understood as a selective, but intensive globally dispersed network of social relations supported by power. In order to evaluate the societal legitimacy of this process which we may call globalization induced by neo-liberalism, its societal effects should be measured conform the intended philosophy of neo-liberalism. That is, the redistribution of power between the sectors of society, in particular a liberalized market dynamic, should lead to social optimal solutions in development processes. Thus, the effect of neo-liberal policy changes, leading to a greater stake of private interests in steering power relations, in the face of a certain geographical context should lead to a greater competence to act, react or interact within that context in order to tackle societal challenges more efficient as well as more effective. However, the latter does seem critical as the correlation between the emerged powerful private corporations and the geographically bounded places in which they intervene tends to have decreased.

Following posed problems, the question arises if newly emerged functional patterns on spatial behavior, induced by shifting in power relations, can produce responsive outcomes in order to tackle societal challenges effectively within the urban region.
2 New governance concepts

New beliefs in territorial development approaches
In the previous chapter, it has been argued that globalization has resulted into a redistribution of power amongst private actors of society. Consequently, large private corporations became enabled to pursue their interests by means of corporate strategies which are based upon their view on the world and the position they take in it. These strategies led to a geographically disembedded market operability, positioned in a dynamic global network of flows and urban nodes, instead of being demarcated by traditional administrative (urban) boundaries. In this chapter I will elaborate onto the position and beliefs of public authorities in regards to the managerial approaches for their territories within contemporary conditions.

In recognition of a new global economical order, exceeding traditional administrative boundaries, European city regions now acknowledge that the productive use of their regional, social, cultural and environmental assets is a key to their survival for being able to capture the necessary values in order to sustain their territories. In other words, the development opportunity within urban regions seems to be recognized by governmental authorities to be dependable on macro-level market forces, instead of governmental choice. By accepting this belief, cities tend to distract from their 'strong state' tradition, characterized by government-led interventions for shaping their territorial futures (L. Albrechts et. al, 2003). This believe is merely based upon the assumption that the dynamics which are reflected upon the territory, cannot inclusively be enclosed, grasped and controlled by a central (public) actor. However, many still argue that in the Dutch case, public authorities still pursue exclusive malleability of the urban region (Klein et al, 2002). The practical value of the former arguments, based upon theoretical concepts, will therefore become clear when reflecting them on empirical contextual-bound cases.

It is nonetheless possible to argue that the traditional political systems which govern urban areas seem to have lost some of their exclusive right for control over their territories (A. Mandanipour et. al, 2001). In other words, as a result of reshaped power relations, provoking cross border economical dynamics, the traditional conception and exercise of governmental power does not anymore seem to be appropriate to (re)act to the challenges it faces within its social context. This argument is based upon the assumption that society itself is interdependently connected and reshaped by its power structures which exceed traditional administrative boundaries.

Complexity, dynamics and uncertainty challenges public steering competence
Thus, a greater variety of social actors have increased in their power to act within their relational context, as a result of a neoliberal resource distribution and production. Moreover, emerging powerful private actors are positioned in different social networks, crossing over administrative and cultural boundaries. It is therefore possible to say that localities increasingly face a diverging set of social stakeholders, based on their position to exercise power and their preference to exercise that power on that particular locality. The former does imply that (1) urban development processes have

---

92 A position of power is always correlated to possession of resources as well as the ability to apply those resources within a social context. (de Leeuw, 2002). Resources can be for example consisting out of financial capital, (access to) information, and persuasive power. In the light Neoliberalism, it is possible to say that private corporations have become more powerful, for the emergence of economies of scale (financial capital) as well as a increasing access to global economical opportunities (information).
become more complex due to a redistribution and division of interests and potential means (2) have become more uncertain and dynamic, due to a greater subjection to a macro level market trends. Therefore, traditional unitary and top down governmental steered approaches in urban development seem to be imposed by the challenged to include a greater degree of pluralism in order to preserve, or regain its steering capacities.

In other words, public authorities seem to have become more dependent from other actors’ resources for steering urban developments. Thus, the fate of localities tends to have become more vulnerable in time and place, as they are being subject to exogenous macro level dynamic forces which cannot be steered through exclusive governmental control. Having stated the former, consequently local land-use exploitation seems to be more directly exposed to the operation of market-forces driven by macro-level trends. Market forces are social forces, initiated by powerful private actor that pursuing individual or organizational interest\(^\text{93}\). Following this conception, it is possible to say that determinative decisions in regards of the use of land are to a greater extent made by private developers/landowners, thus serving the interest of a selected set of individuals, instead of the interest of society\(^\text{94}\) (Oxley, 2004).

However, cities are not just passive territories subject to a higher force. Instead, cities themselves are significant actors in the international market for the creation of economic opportunities. Moreover, a free market cannot operate efficiently without formal legislation and restriction of public authorities (Needham, 2005). It seems therefore convenient to argue that public authorities themselves are able to increase their competitiveness on the global market, and by doing so, increase their competence to exercise influence within a multi actor network environment. Thus, as public authorities can be significant stakeholders within the operability of their territorial developments, the opportunity arises to modify the operation of market forces towards the interest of society (Oxley, 2004). This argument suggests that the governmental bureaucratic body\(^\text{95}\) is to a certain extent able to produce policies which can potentiate exogenous trends in respect to endogenous qualities in order to increase the welfare of society. In this, welfare of society is determined by the well-being of the members of society as a group, instead of the individual (Oxley, 2004). Following this line of reasoning, it is possible to say that public representatives do have the capacity to serve society by means of a deliberative course of action, within the conditions of a complex, dynamic and uncertain social network. That is, the ability to serve society as a whole, instead of facilitating the objectives of a selective set of individuals.

\(^{93}\) In the contrary, legitimate public intervention within a democratic society in essence should represent society, instead of pursuing exclusive interests. The legitimacy of this system is structurally being safeguarded as the members of the social context (within administrative boundaries) are able to choose their representatives through formal passive citizenship (Oosten, 2005). From this viewpoint, it is understandable that initially governmental involvement in societal processes have decreased as a result of exogenous neo-liberal pressure.

\(^{94}\) Society can be comprehended as the sum of all individuals upon the territory (Oxley, 2004).

\(^{95}\) The rendition of national, regional and local governments, as well as the horizontal governmental departments.
Conclusive remarks

It is widely recognized that globalization has increased the complexity, dynamics and uncertainty of urban developments. Its nature does reflect a decreased competence of central steering power, which traditionally has been allotted to public representative authorities. Instead, a consequent redistribution of power among a selective set of diverse actors which are positioned in different relational social contexts, challenges the fate of urban localities.

In particular, neoliberal policies have increased the position of large private corporations to persuasively reflect their biased interests onto urban areas. In this, it seems that the prosperity of urban areas tends to have become subjected to private interests, instead of being subject to exclusive representative public control. The increased decision-making complexity due to the influx of market dynamics and increasing individualism is represented in figure 01. It is argued by the Jonge (2007) that these societal evolvements towards individualism and ‘consumentism’ have been witnessed in many developed countries.

![Figure 01: The (inter)organizational system approach (adaptation from de Jonge, 2007)](image)

Based on these observations, it can be strongly argued that contemporary evolved framing conditions for urban development require an effective recognition of the interdependent relationship between public and private actors. This, however, does only seem to make sense if a continual ambition for achieving collective goals will be politically desirable. If not, the ambition should be lowered and ambiguity should inevitably be accepted. Assuming the former, public authorities, as formal representatives of society, are challenged to find new ways and means to govern their territories. In respect to the concept of democracy, it seems logical to conclude that urban authorities are challenged to steer towards a state of action that potentiates contemporary conditions in favor of societal values, identities and images. That is, (1) exploring and creating possibilities for the active inclusion of social interests by means of representation or participation, as well as (2) the reactive sharing of betterments to prevent increasing socio-economical disparities due to an unequal distribution of wealth.
3 Consequences of globalization

Miscorrelation between neo-liberal policy ambition and implementation effects
In the former chapter I have argued that public authorities continually define and shape global markets (Savitch and Kantor, 2003), as market forces can only function within a public framework of rules and regulations. Thus, in a globalizing world, the position of power of the public sector has changed, yet not disappeared. However, its operability is subjected to the societal evolvements initiated by both exogenous trends as endogenous adaptation. In this chapter I will further elaborate upon the actual societal effects of globalization.

Following this line of reasoning, it seems logical to conclude that the emergence of a global market influence in territorial developments has been provoked by a politically embrace of the neo-liberalism philosophies. In this, neo-liberal theories proposed a public sector to be a coordinating and facilitating force, rather than an intervening force (Burgess et. al, 1997). The underlying philosophy on Neo liberal policies does reflect a belief in which liberal market processes are able to effectively produce outcomes which are in coherency with inclusive societal interests. However, the actual effects of neo-liberal policy implementation within societies, did lead to an intensive process of globalization. Consequently, the initial assumption of a liberal, but embedded market within a geographically bounded social context can be rejected. Instead, a disembedded macro level market dynamic has emerged and is being steered and followed by global private corporations. The empirical effect of this observation has been the weak correlation between corporate choices, public value capturing and wealth dispersion among the urban region.

Thus, it has been widely recognized that the global integration of dispersed activities (Sassen, 2000) tends to fragment the city at its local scale. In this, urban fragmentation is defined as “a spatial phenomenon that results from the act of breaking up, breaking off from, or disjoints the pre-existing form and structure of the city and systems of cities” (Burgess, 2002). Indeed, this phenomenon seems to point out that intense processes of globalization do not spread welfare evenly over the urban region, as socio-spatial disparities seem to increase. In fact, many have argued that economical growth in essence increases social disparities (Savitch and Kantor, 2003). It seems logical to conclude that a free-market concept which tends to become disembedded from its local context, will not enable everyone to capture as well as to share the values of newly emerged market forces. The latter can be best understood for the discrepancy between the complex co-existence of diverging goals by predominant (private) actors. In this, these actors behave in different relational contexts which do not co-align with the actual geographically bounded context in which the urban region is located.

Thus, socio-spatial disparities seem to arise between localities which can capitalize their territorial assets and localities which cannot. Considering from this perspective, it is possible to say that socio-economical prosperity within a locality tend to become subjected to the economical value of the physical and non-physical assets the locality has within the international dynamic marketplace.
**Regional vision construction for (re)gaining regional social wealth dispersion**

In recognition of the social threats of marginalization and fragmentation within increasing urban complex power relations (Burgess, 2002), a politically desire for a more coherent spatial logic has emerged. Thus, by the end of the 1990’s in Europe efforts have been underway in planning to shift from a project focus, aimed at capitalized urban nodes within the international market, towards a wider territorial focus by means of the production of (comprehensive) (sub)regional strategies (L. Albrechts, et Al. 2007). The logics behind this shift can be interpreted as an increasing public insight that (a facilitation of) liberal market forces cannot serve society within the urban region holistically. Instead, it seems increasingly to be recognized that the different sectors of society do have their own competences, which cannot be adopted by a single public actor. That is, the social environment in which steering competence lies is not anymore solely rooted within the traditional bureaucratic public structures subject to a democratic constitutional society. Yet, it is shaped by a trans-sectoral, multi-level environment in which resources for power are dispersed. Thus, the managerial complexity for regaining steering competence on territorial development is subject to the construction of sustainable inter-dependent connections between those powerful actors in order to achieve some sort of collaborative framework in which collective meaning on societal wealth can be produced.

Without elaborating any further at this stage on the explicit (variety of) motives for a governance shift, it can be stated that the revival to construct a regional spatial logic attempts to construct a frame of geographical context in which relational based investments can be made and potentiated. In other words, within the conditions of complex power relations (sub)regional strategies can be understood as a tool to add meaning to the urban region in relation to its cross-boundary position within its relational social network. By doing so, regional impacts, multi-dimensional opportunities and a correlation between investments can more easily and directly be included into governance processes. These changing efforts revive a well-developed capacity in many parts of Europe for pursuing public accountability in urban interventions. For example, the concept of the Dutch metropolitan area, which is called “the Randstad”, can be comprehended as a framework for reference to which sectoral potentials can be reflected, yet being integrated into a wider social vision. By doing so, a new spatial coherency can be pursued in order to oppose urban fragmentation that would lead to social disparities.

The following chapter will elaborate further on the concept of social legitimacy and public accountability within a democratic society. This chapter will be followed by a comprehensive study to markets as social construction and an abstract search for the role of spatial planning within these conditions.
power, legitimacy and change within a democracy society

Socially-induced structural change in power relations
In the previous chapter, it has been described that predominant powers which are capable to impel territorial developments, have dispersed significantly in recent decades. They have become more complex and dynamic and seem to bestow a greater level of uncertainty to the course of territorial developments. Therefore, the interrelation between the accountability of steering powers and societal justice has become more ambiguous, compared to the traditional conception of central public steering force.

Further, I have posed the argument that neo liberal policies resulted in a more powerful private sector in relation to the public sector. In building this argument, the implicit conclusion has been that there is an urge for new territorial governance approaches, requiring an innovation of the traditional decision-making approaches in urban developments.

The logics behind that conclusion do reflect an urge to (re)gain the managerial competence to steer the course of territorial development towards a societal justifiable direction. That is, to discover and develop approaches which are more appropriate for contemporary conditions (Healey, 1997). As “good” and “bad” policies are conceptual products of subjective perception, this chapter will elaborate onto the vulnerabilities of democracy within changing conditions. That is, the critical correlation between authority, responsibility and societal legitimacy. In this, I will (1) revise concepts of accountability and social legitimacy within a democratic society and (2) reflect those upon contemporary complex urban governance challenges.

It has been argued by van Oosten (2005) that a laborious course of policy making can be blamed to an incompetence of (1) steering power or (2) process management within a governance approach. Indeed, in my theory building I have argued that globalization processes have lead to a redistribution of power among actors within a relational social network. Consequently, interdependent relationships of dispersed resources have emerged. Thus, we may conclude that steering powers tend to have become dispersed and therefore policy-making practices are in need for an adaptation of managerial approaches in order to fulfill its role in a more complex environment.

The inducements of structural change can logically be reflected back to the actual operability of a democratic system. Van Oosten stresses the fact that a recognized civilian mistrust in the existing bureaucratic public structures from the 1970’s initially has started a process of a changing role of the public sector within society. In this, its role has evolved from the modern conception of the welfare state, which has to secure the well-being of citizens, to the post-modern conception of the enabling state, creating a framework for interaction and negotiation between actors in society (Stein, 2005). Evidently, neo liberal philosophies emerged, followed by a professional search for new models of policy-making approaches applicable within a complex decision-making arena96. In fact, within the line of this search, I previously introduced the revival regional urban strategies in policy-making processes as a tool for the creation of conceptual coherence from the 1990’s onwards. Yet, we may conclude that bottom-up influence of citizens within a democratic constitutional state has initiated.

96 Arenas can be characterised by a specific set of actors within an organizational arrangement to which decisions are made (Klijn and Teisman, 2002)
the process of change. However, their representative governmental powers have absorbed and conceptualized these influences into new ideas leading to a change in territorial governance approaches.

Power and authority
Following this line of thought, it seems supportive to elaborate on the actual meaning of authority in relation to social justice, within the conceptual framework of a democratic society. De Leeuw (2002) clearly distinguishes the conceptual meaning of power from the conceptual meaning of authority. Yet, they are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, power is a necessity for authority; however, a position of power does not evidently imply authority. As elaborated in the previous chapter, a position of power is always obtained through the application of resources; one’s ability to steer itself and its social context is subject to the resources one can apply. The same can be argued for sectors and organizations. The concept of power, thus, also incorporates a sense of effectiveness and efficiency: the application of resources defines the level of competence to pursue interests within a predefined social context.

Authority can be best described as legitimate power. That is, undisputed power which is being awarded by the members of the social system (de Leeuw, 2002). Within this frame of reference, the social system does consist out of all legal citizens within the democratic society. Then, legitimate power is determined by the faith citizens have in their formal public institutions (van Oosten, 2005). It can therefore be concluded that authority can only be assigned to governmental powers, for their subordination to the constitutional law. The logical, but contestable, consequence then states that formal public institutions and political powers carry the responsibility to represent the public interest.

Representative democracy and participative democracy
Within the traditional concept of a representative democracy, it can be stated that political power has been assigned by citizens, which are (1) being reduced in their power towards the position of formal voters in periodic elections and (2) being rewarded a formal position as consumers within a welfare state (Oosten, 2005). However, the former implies a reality in which the state is sovereign.97 Ironically, the neoliberal policy choice of the state, in which civilians are legitimately being represented by their authorities, has increased the vulnerability of the state in its sovereignty. That is, as long as governmental powers themselves govern the construction of future policies, the course of development can be considered legitimate to citizens. However, the distribution of power among sectors of society assumes that policy is now being developed in a more complex organizational network that exceeds the boundaries of the bureaucratic system of the state. (Klijn and Tijsman, 2002). Thus, as newly emerged powerful actors do not carry a formal degree of responsibility to citizens, it seems critical if the implementation of those policies still can be considered legitimate to the affected citizens, which are part of the democratic society.

The former implies that the conceptual idea of a representative democracy might not be a legitimate model of democracy within the face of complex power relations. In order to strengthen this argument, I will now elaborate onto the meaning of a representative democracy. This concept can be considered to be a theoretical model of democracy. As implied before, the model states that the power to take decisions on public policy is transferred to representatives of the state. The role of

---

97 The state as organized bureaucratic system which is competent to govern itself.
citizens within this concept is passive\textsuperscript{98}, except during elections. Next to passive citizenships, the main model characteristics can be found in a strict division of responsibilities, jurisdiction and resources between actors in society. As stated, the driving assumption does reflect a sovereign state, for being a competent and legitimate system. Having stated the former, it seems logical to comprehend that the successful operability and continuity of this theoretical model within real life practice is dependent on undisputable trust of citizens in their representatives. Hence, the bottom up activation of civil society from the 1970’s has increased the vulnerability of this concept. A preconditioned passive citizenship did not seem to be accepted anymore and authorities were threatened in their status of legitimacy.

A different, and perhaps a more striking theoretical model of democracy within contemporary conditions, is the concept of a participative democracy. In the contrary to the former model, this concept drives on active citizenship. The main characteristics of a participative democracy are horizontal collaboration, subsidiarity\textsuperscript{99}, an active civil society and the influx of private organizations in policy-making processes. In this model legitimacy can be assured by means of active inclusion and the interconnections of interests.

Both models are based upon a different perspective to which social legitimacy on territorial governance approaches can be evaluated. The former does reflect a more traditional conception of a democratic state as a competent bureaucratic system. The latter might be supportive in the search for new approaches in urban development for the understanding of social legitimacy within contextual conditions which have evolved towards a more complex level. Nonetheless, both models are theoretical and therefore do not prescribe reality. However, the definition and distinction of these models can provide (1) a conceptual frame to analyze the actual model of the Dutch society which is further being elaborated on in chapter ... as well as (2) support the evaluation of the empirical study which will be assessed in part two of this thesis. Due to the dynamics of changing contextual conditions it might be presumed that reality reflects a hybrid between the traditional model as well as the participative model. If so, the empirical findings therefore may clarify the character of the interrelation between both operating models within the Dutch governance culture on territorial developments.

Conclusion
In this chapter I have provided insights into two outmost theoretical models on actor position and legitimacy in democratic decision-making processes.

In the next chapter I will elaborate onto the actual believed logics of a liberal market dynamic in relation to societal wealth from a rational socio-economical perspective. By doing so, greater insights can be gained into the deliberative and reflective social beliefs which lie at the base of the neoliberal policy constructions that initiated a more complex social context to which territorial developments tend to be subjected. Subsequently, by means of the constructed viewpoints based on societal beliefs and managerial consequences, I will then elaborate onto the contemporary role of the spatial planner as communicative and facilitative manager for creating selective learning frameworks for interaction and negotiation between actors in society (Faludi, 2000, Stein, 2005). From there, I will

\textsuperscript{98} Passive citizenship, which is the counterpart of active citizenship.

\textsuperscript{99} Subsidiarity does reflect a belief that central governments should only perform task which cannot be performed by lower levels of government.
reflect these findings onto the actual institutional character of the Dutch model of society. Thus, the content of this chapter can provide a frame to which latter chapters can be reflected, when considering the social legitimacy of the posed arguments and beliefs.

5 Markets, multi-level complexity and externalities

In the former chapter, social relational positions have been reflected to power structures within the frame of a democratic society. Within the borders of this frame it has been described that evolving societal discourses have lead to structural change; as argued by Healey (1997), humans are reflective beings and have choices about what to accept of their structured, social embeddedness, and what to reject. Consequently, an evolved, structural dispersion of power among sectors of society have set the frame conditions that led to a disembedded market dynamic crossing the traditional administrative borders in which society is formally organized. This chapter will (1) elaborate deeper onto actual supportive beliefs of a societal-steering liberal market and (2) evaluate its evolving consequences in relation to social justice.

Markets as social constructions

Markets can be best comprehended as social constructions in which production, goods and services are distributed between individuals. They are based upon communicative practices leading to collective agreements between individuals driven by self-interest. As the individual is the best judge of his or her well-being (Oxley, 2004), the influx of a liberal market rationale into the territorial development discourse seems to make sense for its deliberative nature in respect to individual values. It seems obvious that this belief does reject the legitimacy of a representative democracy in its purest sense, for the structural inability of public representatives to grasp the multitude of the individual values of those which ought to be represented. Instead, the neo-liberal philosophy seems to promote the concept of a participate democracy.

However, when conceiving a liberal market operability as a legitimate concept in territorial governance approaches, one should critically assess to what extent each individual does have access to the marketplace in which interests are being developed and agreements are set. Secondly, the credibility of this concept is stressed even more by the competence of each participant to actually pursue its interest to a satisfying level. Within the contemporary division of resources among actors in society it can be conveniently argued that inequality does exist between the individuals of society. In order to deepen out these conditions, I will first introduce the concept of a perfectly competitive economy.

The enabling state: supporting “A perfectly competitive economy”

In many socio-economical theoretical contributions it has been argued that a perfectly competitive economy should be based upon conditions that offer the freedom of (1) information and (2) inclusion (Oxley, 2004). This implies that each individual would be able to pursue self-interest as efficient as possible. Having stated that markets are social constructions, its operability can be best comprehended as arena in which a set of individuals can interact freely in order to pursue self-interest. For this reason, the organization of economies is often praised for its efficient ability to allocate goods and services within a social context.

Thus, as economies are based upon efficiency, it seems logical to suggest that there is no need for governments to become involved in the process in which welfare is distributed. Following this line of
reasoning, it seems either logical to argue that a perfectly competitive economy has the capacity to connect efficiency to social equity and justice. In this, equity is stated as each individual has (1) the freedom of choice to consider his valuations on fairness and justice effectively and (2) to be in the position to conceptualize these values in a rational manner in order to consider its resources at stake in relation to its interests.

The former arguments would imply that the concept of a perfectly competitive economy is both achievable as well as desirable in order to attain an optimal welfare to society most effectively and efficiently. Indeed, these beliefs did bring out the widely accepted global trend on neo-liberal policies in the early 1980’s. In this, national states have been mainly focused on the construction of regulatory framework in order enable the determination of formalized property rights. By doing so, public policies aimed to support the concept of a perfectly competitive economy, as highly developed market processes can only operate if the rules of the game are set (Needham, 2005). Following this line of reasoning, it seems convenient to conclude that public intervening activities, which can be described as authority-based activities aimed to correct market failures (Micelli, 2002), lost their meaning in the light of the neo-liberalism beliefs. Indeed, it has been supported in theories that the Dutch planning authorities in the 1980’s transformed their role from public interventionist towards the efficient release of development sites in response to market signals (Needham, 2006). In this, it can be noticed that the public authorities themselves started to behave as private actors subject to market forces\(^\text{100}\).

**Critical notes on the concept of a perfectly competitive economy: externalities**

The concept of a perfectly competitive economy suggests that efficiency-based market forces are actually able to maximize social welfare, in terms of a socially legitimate distribution of wealth on society. However, structural changes in the manifestation of power relations, in particular, the disembeddedness of market forces put the former arguments under critical pressure. That is, within the traditional concept of the marketplace, it seems to be assumed that participants in the market are position within an equal position of power, perceiving from a shared context and being able to choose rationally. However, assuming a network perspective in which power manifests, the argument can be posed that interrelated actors are actually connected to very diverse contexts from which they developed their own view on the world as well as potentially having access to different sources of information.

Thus, the complex conditions that shape the marketplace in which actors interrelate, might restrict each actor’s competence to understand the complex environment in which they are positioned. The variety of dimensions which are at hand within the relational network can be conceived to complex. Therefore the rationality of selection and choice is likely to be limited. Hence, the effects of those choices might then become unpredictable as well. Based on the former, we may conclude that the freedom of (undistorted) information is a precondition for the concept of a perfectly competitive economy. Next to other resources, such time, access and financial capital, information can therefore be comprehended as a source of power (Forrester, 1989). As we live in a world of limited time and poor information, it seems that the concept of a perfectly competitive economy should merely be treated as a theoretical model which can serve its purpose to selectively focus attention towards considerations of empirical cases.

\(^{100}\) A further elaboration onto the Dutch planning practice will be presented further on in the paper.
Having posed the problem that resources are unequally distributed among actors in relational networks, it seems that the presumed concept of ‘market success’ is challenged by the concept of ‘market failure’. In this, market failure states an unequal distribution of wealth as a result of economical growth. Market failure may arise when external costs, whether positive or negative, affect external interests which have not been (effectively) internalized in the actual market transaction in which a course of action on the territory has been determined. In other words, the externality problem can be best comprehended as imperative costs or benefits that are bestowed on individuals which are not reflected in decision-making processes (Oxley, 2004).

**Market-place negotiation and policy-making negotiation**

Having reached this stage, it seems crucial to highlight the great similarity between the decision-making process within a market-place negotiation and a within a policy-making negotiation. Both processes can be described as goal-oriented processes which are based upon agreement between social actors. The structural difference lies in the fact that actors within a market transaction process have different goals. Then, the negotiation goal concerns the consideration between the use value and the exchange value of a commodity. In the contrary, in collaborative policy-making processes the actors pursue a common goal which are based upon a mutual interests (van Loon, 2010). Nonetheless, the restrictive notions on decision-making processes on market transactions, which have been presented in this chapter, can be directly transferred to the problemacy of policy-making arenas. This can be justified due to the relational character of both processes, potentially affecting a wider social context: externalities.

**The image of reality as determinative for governance complexity**

Following I will present a fictional illustration in order to highlight the complex relationship between the internal decision-making process and externalities. In this illustration, the vulnerability of democracy in relation to complex decision-making processes is under pressure due to the stressed conception of social legitimacy to which democratic processes are subject.
Illustration – urban transformation and complex social externalities

At the border of a certain municipality, a private developer has applied for a building permit to construct an amusement park on former agricultural lands. The local government can be best comprehended as representative authority for its citizens. It is thus the governments’ obligation to evaluate if the developer’s application is in coherency with the social legitimate criteria which have been absorbed in the local land-use plan. However, in practice, Dutch spatial planning is often recognized to be development-led, instead of plan-lead (Needham, 2006). This concept states that municipal governments have the ability to deviate from the existing land use plan in order to respond to emerging development opportunities, in respect to their citizens. A non-restrictive consideration on development opportunities in relation to benefits is therefore argued to be crucial by the municipal executive powers. Thus, the local governmen should consider if the developer’s potential investment would satisfy all possible affected parties. However, a comprehensive understanding whose values are actually being served by this new development seems highly complex. In other words, the problem arises when considering who actually is positively or negatively affected from a potential market-transaction. Does it satisfy the farmer who might be expropriated, but compensated, from his land? Does it satisfy all potential tourists visiting, as well as all citizens who might profit in terms of increased job opportunities? Does it satisfy all potential tourists visiting, as well as all citizens who might profit in terms of increased job opportunities? Does it satisfy the neighboring residents who possibly will lose their outlook onto the municipal’s greenbelt? When considering, it seems convenient to understand that the way external actors can be affected by a possible course of action on the territory is depends on their subjective values, identities and images. Perhaps, this complexity is partly recognized by the government as they argue for institutional flexibility to consider freely at each development opportunity, if its impact would be in coherency with all values and identities that are related to a territorial transformation.

Following the former illustration, we may acknowledge that the complexity within the decision-making arena evidently is not directly dependent on the actual complexity of the implementing social context. Instead, the decision-making complexity is solely being determined by the goals that have been set within the arena, derived from the image of reality which is subjectively being absorbed. For example, if the goals reflect a high environmental ambition, then environmental damage in terms of externalities would be reduced. Thus, the greater the ambition has been set within the decision-making arena, the more complex the decision-making process will be and thus, the greater the managerial efforts will be in order to operate the process.
Figure 1 represents the influx of complexity into a bounded inter-organizational decision-making arena. In this, it can be noticed that the driving goals are determinative for the actual complexity of the process. First of all, the goal-setting procedure, as directive concept for action, is dependent on the resources which are at hand among the social actors inside the decision-making arena. Thus, as the process evolves, resource availability may fluctuate and goals can be dynamic. Secondly, the goals that are conceptualized within the arena are based upon the conceptualized image of reality (complexity of context). That is, the context which is being considered as outset situation within the arena is not reality, but a (simplified) image of reality, adapted to the ambition/goals which are being set. Thirdly, the greater the diversity of interests are being included and related into the decision-making arena, the greater the managerial effort will be to converse a complex set of interests and means to achievable solutions. In other words, the managerial complexity is being subjected to the interaction and negotiation between the individuals and/or groups within the arena.

Externalities in relation to territorial decision-making accountability
However, when bounding the complex challenge of decision-making processes on territorial developments merely as an internal challenge that aims to steer towards satisfying solutions within an arena of diverse interests, we face the threat to oversee the initial meaning of such arenas. That is, a deliberative communicative approach to fulfill societal demands and needs by means of connecting dispersed resources and interests. Therefore, in the face of democratic accountability, the process can only be considered socially legitimate if (1) externalities are effectively being considered into the decision-making arena by means of a holistic representation of interests or (2) the institutional public framework in which those arena’s are positioned are able to stabilize and regulate the consequential externalities. Having elaborated on the complex nature of relational decision-making arenas, it may be concluded that externalities cannot ever be included in a holistic manner. Thus, a socially legitimate discourse on territorial conceptualizations within decision making.
arena’s may only be achievable if the arena’s internal practice can be held responsible to those which are not directly included into this process.

Having argued that the public sector is the only institution which formally carries societal responsibility, it seems appropriate to argue that a public sector needs to fulfill its role not only as facilitator of communicative processes, but also as mediator in order safeguard the balance between the actual social life and the image of reality which is being conversed into the decision-making arena. In other words, the public sector should take responsibility not to let emerging persuasive power structures overwhelm the initial purpose of communicative approaches: to increase the public’s competence to reflect on their context in order to inter-actively define their understanding about what is good or wrong. As argued by Healey (1997): “there is not one single correct way of reasoning – powerful interests just make it appear like that”.

**Complex externalities and a public incompetence to reassure**

Whatsoever, due to the intensified dynamics, complexity and uncertainty in territorial developments, it seems possible to say that the notion of externalities have increased in their unpredictability. This argument is based upon the notion that multi-level dynamics have provoked a greater inter-dependency between different localities, while the actual governance landscapes that aim to intervene, and therefore directly or indirectly affect these localities, do not seem to enable every individual affected to participate, or to be represented equally in the decision-making process. Within a globalizing world, characterized by inter-dependencies that crosses traditional jurisdictional boundaries, it seems that even a public sector is being challenged in its role as representative of the people. That is, the organization of the public bureaucratic system is based upon traditional administrative boundaries, while contemporary complexities and dynamics tend to operate within a relational network perspective. Then, what are we to do if this new dynamic does seem to pass over the initial meaning to which public bureaucratic organizations of state are being designed?

---

**Illustration - multi-level complexity and externalities**

The regeneration of inner-city districts in the Randstad, might increase the competitiveness of the Randstad metropolitan area in relation to other metropolitan areas. E.g. if the Randstad is able to provide higher quality residential areas to highly educated expats, the demand for private investments on the Dutch territory might increase. Thus, its exchange value will rise and the supply and demand balance for land on the global market will adjust.

Consequently, other metropolitan areas might feel the urge to respond in a similar manner as they might feel affected by the Dutch spatial policies; they are externally affected. At the other hand, a regeneration of inner city areas might also lead to the phenomenon of gentrification as a result of land value and real estate augmentation. Although at a different scale, the local citizens in those areas are also externally affected due to a policy which is aimed for others to benefit from.
Following the former example, it is indeed recognizable that urban authorities seem to have lost some of the exclusive control over their territories (A. Mandanipour et. al, 2001) as a result of inter-regional interdependencies.

However, it should be stated that an inter-relationship only affects public policy construction if this inter-relationship is indeed considered to create dependencies. Following the schematic representation of the inter-organizational system approach, it is indeed recognizable that the definition of the social (relational) context, the image of reality, is dependent on the selective choices which are being made in the decision-making arena. Those choices are subject to the subjective considerations in regards to what is being valued. Again, the problem is posed whose values are being included within this process.

**Public authorities: reassuring competent or one-dimensional ambition?**

It has been concluded by Savitch and Kantor (2003) that urban authorities often have a large variety of choices in their policy construction. This notion implies indeed that decision-making arena’s do raise the opportunity to effectively negotiate in order to develop a collaborative agreement between diverse social groups. However, in their study they simultaneously concluded that the concept of economical interdependency seem to be deeply embedded into the cognitive value patterns of public authorities. Thus, however a large variety of choice might be available, the usual path public authorities choose to follow for their territorial developments tends to be selling off the territorial assets in favor of large private actors. After analyzing a large variety of territorial governance approaches from cities around the world, they concluded that many urban authorities seem to justify their one-dimensional choices by the argument that it is better to have economical growth that increases social disparities, instead of having no growth at all.

In recognition of the unbalanced correlation between economical growth and societal wealth, we may conclude that urban authorities may not be capable to recognize externalities comprehensively on their policies. Moreover, they might intentionally foreground some values, while backgrounding others in order to justify their choices. The former can be expounded, though not justified, by the fact that public representatives which participate in territorial decision-making arenas also consist out of social actors which perceive the world from their limited perspective. Changing power relations, thus, might alter the perception of public authorities in regards to their beliefs about ‘good’ or ‘bad’ policies. From here, again we may conclude that the inclusion of values within decision-making arenas is dependent on the power actors have to participate. Thus, both the concepts of a representative- as well as a participative democracy are being challenged by the problems posed in this chapter.
Conclusion

The performance of the concept of a ‘perfectly competitive economy’ within urban governance approaches might have a deliberative effect on society for its effective inclusion of values within conversion processes. However, I have introduced the counteracting concept of externalities. Externalities arise when effects (whether positive or negative) are bestowed upon individuals whose values have not been effectively recognized within the governance process. Based upon the contemporary complex and dynamic conditions in which localities are positioned, I have distinguished two typical causes on externalities:

1. Externalities as a result of power imbalances. Power can be exercised when resources are applied within social processes and resources thus seem to be unevenly distributed amongst society. Thus the unbalanced nature of power challenges the deliberative effect social interactions may have. Further, as a result of changing power relations, it seems to be stressed if society can be represented or empowered to participate within decision-making processes by their public representatives. The latter too does consist out of social beings which are subjected to - and limited by power relations.

2. Externalities as a result of complex contextual interdependencies. The contemporary dynamics to which localities are subjected seem to be crossing over their traditional administrative boundaries. In particular, globalization tends to redistribute power relations among actors which increasingly seem to be more disembedded from geographical contexts. Thus, due to the physically dispersed nature of power, a greater interdependency between localities seems to arise for its subjection to complex multi-level and multi-sectoral power relations. The externality problem then may arise as a result of a vertically cohesive incompetence of the public sector to manage the process of societal representation and/or empowerment.

The conclusions which have been made in this chapter are embedded into academically discourses, yet not derived from a specific model of society\(^{101}\). Nevertheless, it has been argued that there are pressures for the convergence of certain aspects on planning systems (Healey and Williams, 1993)\(^{102}\). These pressures do reflect the presence of common challenges of urban societies around the world. In particular: the concept of economical competitiveness in relation to social justice. These conclusions, then, might help academics and professionals in the field of spatial planning to gain a better understanding of the problems which come to light facing contemporary societal conditions.

---

\(^{101}\) Model of society is a generalization of the diverse values and practices that shape relationships between the state, the market and citizens in particular places. (Nadin and Stead, 2008)

\(^{102}\) Drawn from Nadin and Stead, 2008
6 The power of information: Planning as selective guiding principle

In the former chapter I have argued that the reassuring competence of the public sector has decreased within the contemporary conditions on territorial decision-making processes due to both (1) a transfer of power to other sectors in society and (2) a limited rational competent base from which they act as social beings themselves. In fact, it is the societal recognition of the latter which provoked the postmodern conception of the former: the state in its facilitating role for creating a framework for the interaction and negotiation between individuals and groups. The post-modern operability on territorial decision-making processes thus relies on the collaborative capacity of the social beings within the arena in terms of their commitment, resources and knowledge (Stein, 2005). Further, the societal legitimacy of the outcome of such processes can only be assured if externally affected citizens are being included, or at least represented within that arena. Thus, we may conclude that the state’s role in territorial governance processes is subjected not only to a technical facilitation of interactive processes, but above all to a great moral responsibility manifested through value judgments of governance practices. This responsibility seems to be challenged by a thin line between participative democratizing practices and a discourse of illegitimate authority.

In this chapter I will elaborate deeper onto the subjectivities and rationality of choices which are being made in territorial decision-making arenas bounded by power. By doing, I will present the concept of bounded rationality and elaborate onto the power of information. From that perspective I will introduce an abstract definition on the role of the public sector planner.

The purpose of interactive decision-making arena’s

Decision-making practices on territorial developments are intended to discover, understand and solve problems which are believed to be at hand within the present situation of a social context. Following the post-modern conception of the welfare state, it has been noticeable that these decision-making practices have become more complex due to the existence of a greater variety of involved actors. Although all these actors have their subjective individual, or their organizational interests, the resources to achieve those interests are recognized to be dispersed over the field of powerful actors. It is the latter which allots the character of social interdependency to the decision-making actors. Therefore, due to the increasingly complex character of the decision-making process, its operability cannot be conceived as a static process in which resources are evidently being connected to resources. Instead, in order to achieve collective satisfying solutions within the highly complex social situation, interests and resources are ambitioned to develop in a dynamic manner during the decision-making process. In order to underpin this argument, I will firstly introduce two sociological concepts which can be supportive to comprehend social interactive behavior.

Methodological Individualism and the actor’s viewpoint

The first concept is called methodological individualism103. This concept prescribed the thought that a collaborative group of people does not form an independent entity, but does consist out of a collection of individuals which choose to work together by producing a product for another group of individuals (van Loon, 20..). This concept indeed can be applied to multi-actor governance landscapes in which action for a specific social context are being designed.

---

103 Developed in the field of economic theory of political decision-making processes, explicitly elaborated on by van den Doel (1978).
The concept of the actor’s viewpoint builds upon the former concept. This concept prescribes the view that individual interests are dynamic and designable within a social interactive process. The interests to which decisions are being taken are thus not the sum of static individual interest, but the product of the interplay of a complex set of evolving interests. The decision-making practice can thus serve a role for regaining collective meaning within societal conditions in which social views and powers seem to have become more complex and divergent.

**Optimalization, bounded rationality and the power of information**

The former concept of the actors’ viewpoint implies that decision-making practices are goal-oriented actions. Further, it also implies that individuals do not have the capacity to comprehend contexts and their position within it in a holistic manner. It therefore seems too simple to conclude that individual actors challenge within a collaborative decision-making process is to reflect their interest to a collective and objective worldview. As argued by Mandanipour (2001); “The reality of the world is always perceived by us, humans, in imperfect ways, structured by our limited perceptual capacity and the histories and positions from which we are perceiving”. The view of the world therefore seems subject to individual’s perception. The latter implies that not only social interest, but also contextual understandings are dynamic. Thus, the image of reality which is being conceptualized in decision-making arena is subject to the information which is present and supplied within the process.

Building upon the view that humans are imperfect beings, we may argue that individuals and groups cannot drive their behavioral choices on comprehensive rational motives. Thus, it seems that solutions as outcome of social interactive processes can never reach the level of the optimal social solutions. In this, I define the optimal social solution as the best possible solution for the social context on the problem within the ‘hard’ objective limits of the budget. However, there is no ‘best’ solution for a problem, as the qualitative nature of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ are matters of opinion. This again reminds me to Patsy Healey (1997) who adds that the most powerful interests in society usually make their self-centered choices appear to be the best solution possible. In fact, the definition of the problem itself is subject to the perception of the social actors which are included into the decision-making process. However, when the societal legitimacy of the decision-making arena is assumed, it is possible to restrict our thoughts for now onto the actual decision-making practices: an internal view.

Within these boundaries, the optimal solution can be defined as the best possible within the socially produced solution space (van Loon, 20..). The solution space is framed by a set of (dynamic) criteria which are being delivered by the involved actors. Thus, as the collaborative consensus-based decision-making process evolves, the solution space is expected to become narrower which eventually might lead to the optimal solution, based on each actor’s interests. However, it is possible to distinguish two types of limiting variables which might reject the view that an internal optimal could be achieved.

1. **External limiting variables**

External variables are (potentially) conditions which vary under pressure of organizational changes instead of integral decision-making evolvements.

These variables may show as time limits and budget limits, which are undeniable features of decision-making processes. Although time and budget are resources which can fluctuate as the process evolves, it cannot automatically be presumed that each participant within the process also is the direct manager of its resources of time and budget. These actors are not
individual powers, but they often are representatives of a (public, private or nongovernmental) organization. That is, they operate within the frames of their own history and regime. These potential barriers do not tend to be tackled effectively within internal decision-making processes, as these processes are merely aimed to converge the interests of the direct participants in the processes. A lack of these resources might restrict the exploitation of available resources which are necessary to achieve an actual optimal. Further, top-down normative public regulations might restrict the flexibility of the decision-making arena in order to dynamically shape the optimum104.

2. Internal limiting variables
Internal variables are dependent on the nature of the involved social actors and their relational position. They are based upon the limits which emerge due to an imperfect way of behavior. That is, the incompetence of social actors to act in a rational manner. In order to structure this thought, I will now present three complex layers which bound the rational competence of human beings. These layers have been adapted from J. Forrester (1989):

A. Bounded rationality 1: cognitive limits
This layer reflects the perceptual boundaries of social actors; the world can be conceived in many different ways. Thus, (1) if perception is bounded and (2) choice is subject to perception, then we may conclude that an optimal solution is never possible due to the subjective nature of its construction. A successful solution, then, might be better comprehended in terms of its level of satisfaction.

B. Bounded rationality 2: Social differentiation
As territorial conversion processes are products of collaborative practices, instead of individual conceptualizations, the nature of cognitive limits can be further expanded to the level of social differentiation between actors. That is, each actor does rely on its own relationally perceived context from which qualitative and quantitative information are absorbed for constructing a view on the world. Thus, in order to effectively and durably achieve consensus-based solutions, the management of decision-making arenas should incorporate the nature of the wider social network from which the internal decision-making process is constructed. The effective operability of decision-making arenas is therefore highly contextual bound, subject to domain demarcations and (established) organizational values patterns (Klein and Teisman, 2002). Thus, information is not solely imperfect (cognitive limits), it is also diffused among actors (de Vries, 2002) and subject to many interpretations.

Indeed, as argued before, the purpose of the collaborative process is to reshape and converge existing perceptions towards a collective view in order to give meaning to the problem and its potential solutions. However, the critical question arises if evolving perceptions in specific multi-sectoral governance landscapes do really

104 This argument does not imply that a greater flexibility is desired. In fact, restrictive public regulations should serve its purpose for preventing illegitimate practices. However, the actual judgment of the former should depend on the structure of the situation. That is, the normative character of the decision-making arena should depend on the contextual bound level of complexity and boundedness present.
possess the persuasive power to transform traditional role conceptions of sectors and organizations. It is the latter which defines the actual synergizing inter‐organizational potential for achieving durable results from the internally conceptualized solutions.

C. Bounded rationality 3: Pluralist conflict
Although many theories on collaborative decision‐making approaches often seem to assume a natural and sufficient base of willingness and trust between social actors. In practice, “decision‐makers face opposition and suspicion from other actors, as well as intermittent support” (Forrester, 1989). It therefore seems to be too naive to presume that social actors naturally behave on transparency and mutual trust. Social Internal activities such as intensively building up mutual trust, sharing success and the creation of an overall feeling of purpose and satisfaction (Stein, 2005), therefore seems to be a crucial factor to construct leverage within decision‐making practices.

These layers all emphasize the social nature of decision‐making practices within relationally constructed contexts and the need to effectively recognize and act upon their consequences in order to reach to the most satisfying collaborative solutions. Further, these layers reject a position of the planning subject as an objective rational‐comprehensive practice (de Vries, 2002)
Especially within the conception of the post modern welfare state, which tends to be characterized by an intensive intermingling of cross‐boundary and cross‐cultural processes, these insights seem to be crucial to comprehend the framing contexts and limits in which technical processes may manifest.

In fact, it is the social nature of these practices which does shape legitimate arguments to reject optimization pursuing strategies in practice. In the furthering of this thesis, I will therefore label legitimate solutions as solutions which are satisfying to the decision‐making actors while being the produced in a democratically constructed public framework.

In the course of this reasoning it is possible to say that information is a resource as it does have the power to serve as guiding principle to focus attention and shape converged meaning within a relationally constructed social arena. The transfer of information offers the potential to transform traditional ways of thinking and thus might deliberate a course of action which is based upon the collective exploration of opportunities within a context instead of on restrictive predefined doctrines.

The dispersion of information may thus contribute to a process of learning. Learning is concerned with gaining a better understanding of a context and the way how decision‐makers are positioned in that context (Faludi, 2000). This understanding should incorporate the decision‐making arenas’ relative position to culture, economical base, environmental state, social processes and formal structures. That is, intervening activities into complex societies should take an integral stance to its context in order to safeguard its legitimate societal value.

However, when recognizing information as a source of power that could steer the decision‐making process, a gently position should be taken to the legitimate exercise of it. As information does have
the capacity to transform interests, its exercise could possibly be misused in order to manipulate and potentiate dispersed resources to pursue individual needs.

Illustration – The Bijlmermeer; persuasion through selective information influx

The initiative
The Bijlmermeer is a city district located in the south-eastern district of Amsterdam. The urban development initiative of this Dutch polder took place in the 1960’s. During that period national urban development authorities adopted a normative belief that new developments should be dispersed by means of the construction of new towns. However, the municipality of Amsterdam, as dominant actor in the field, rejected that trend and continued to promote more traditional strategies of urban expansions. By means of those strategies the city attempted to retain the higher purchasing groups of society within its municipal administrative borders (Healey, 2007). In the course of the former, in the 1960’s the development attention focused upon the Bijlmermeer, a polder landscape, located at the south-eastern administrative borders of the city. After formal municipal annexations, the Bijlmermeer became part of the Amsterdam municipal territory and the planning process was initiated.

The post-war planning context
In post-war period, the urban planning and design discipline generally was conceived as a technical problem-solving practice, following the idea of being doctors of space.

The contextual framework in which this discipline at that time operated was merely formed by the international modern movement. This movement prescribed a vision of how urban life should be, based upon spatial deterministic ideas of societal malleability.

Secondly, scientific research by that time was absorbed into the discipline: the positivistic approach. Positivism prescribes the idea that social reality can be comprehend in a holistic manner by means of scientific survey. Mainly urban developmental studies then were aimed to prove that utopian visions were legitimately constructed. Legitimately in this sense, thus, means the level of scientific underpinnings a statement has. (de Vries, 2002). However, many contributions have criticized positivism for its selective nature. That is, the so called objective information is always a product of a biased selection data (Healey, 2007, de Vries, 2002).
**The planning process**
In the course of the formerly defined disciplinary context, the planning process of the Bijlmermeer indeed has been induced by a combination of a modern utopian doctrine underpinned by a positivistic approach. Indeed, the decision-making actors within the process aimed to construct the ideal society at the drawing table, underpinned by many scientific studies on its qualities. Further, the decision-making process has been very isolated from the public all the way. Indeed, legitimacy within the modern conception of a democratic society did not rely upon public opinion, rather on specialist discourses.

**Implementation**
The disastrous impact assessment of the plan after implementation does exceed the framework of this analysis. However, it can be noted that the public did not only reject the plan, but simultaneous to implementation, a greater societal movement took place in Holland, which can be best described as the societal evolvement from a modern state to a post-modern state characterized by an active civil society. It is the latter which even worsened the failure of the Bijlmermeer.

**Thematic evaluation**
The planning process of the Bijlmermeer reveals the persuasive power of information. In a period in which positivism was widely accepted, scientific information was exercised in order to diverge steering resources for pursuing subjective utopian beliefs.

Preparatory to the next chapter, it can be argued that the nature of the planning discipline incorporates an ethical challenge for its power to affect social welfare and justice by means of the (selective) use of information.
7 public sector spatial planning: a techno-social power in complex systems

In the former chapters I have argued that societal dynamics have become more complex in the previous decades. In this, I have implicitly distinguished (1) the social perception of space from the (2) arenas in which conceptions of space are produced. It is the latter in which territorial development processes are produced within a frame of beliefs, social relations, institutional structures and power relations. Further, I have argued that the legitimacy of a constitutional democratic state within territorial developmental practices lies in the connection between both. In the course of this argument, it is the public sector which carries the responsibility to safeguard the legitimacy of territorial governance processes.

However, due to a decreased public competence to steer and an increasing ambiguity of relational governance landscapes, the public sector is challenged in its ways how to judge and safeguard democratizing practices. That is, resources to steer developments seem to have dispersed over complex relational social networks and governance landscapes, thus, tend to operate within a more complex, dynamic and uncertain context compared to the enclosed and comprehensive traditional bureaucratic public system.

In this chapter I will present an abstract definition and elaboration onto the role of the public sector spatial planner within post-modern societal conditions. In particular, I will consider its role in perspective to the face of democracy as well as its position of power.

Role conception 1: Planning as technical problem solving practice

Inter-sectoral Decision-making arenas in complex environments can be comprehended as tools for gaining understanding on contexts and problems in the broadest possible sense. When initiating territorial development processes from such a collaborative base, integral solutions may be designed in order to steer towards a legitimate image of the future.

In the course of the former, the role of the planner can be comprehend as communicative manager and technical facilitator in order to enable the interactive goal-oriented decision-making process in order to get leverage to achieve satisfying and durable solutions in which traditional disciplinary borders are crosses and integrated. That is, the design and persuasion of solutions in which the economical, social and environmental dimensions can be integrated and conversed to durable policy constructions.

Having stated the former, the critical question arises to what extent planners can influence practices which are bounded by interests subject to power. If planners do not have a position of power, how can their roles be comprehended for exercising influence in order to enable a process in which initial interests of social actors can develop collaboratively?

Having posed this problem, it seems convenient to firstly imagine a complex multi-actor territorial decision-making practice without any form of management. Having argued previously, the nature of such practices reflects interdependent relationships. Therefore, it seems convenient to argue that there is no single actor which is in the position of power to steer the process in a traditional central
However, without any sort of steering no single collaborative evolvement could take place and the purpose of such governance arenas could immediately be rejected.

Figure 02. Centralized steering and intrinsic steering

Having reached this level, a clear definition of steering seems to be a necessity; within an (inter) organizational system approach, steering means goals oriented influence (van Loon e.a., 2007). Thus, steering might as well be dispersed, as long as it induces goal-oriented evolvements. The latter usually is called intrinsic steering, as counterpart to central steering (de Leeuw, 2002) (figure 02). Within the context of territorial governance processes, the goal then is the collectively conceptualized product of interests.

In this process, the spatial planner can effectively and efficiently facilitate intrinsic steering. In the course of the previous research, we can argue that the planners mean resource for exercising power is information. The planner, as manager of the governance process, is professionally competent to (1) lead to the collaborative process by means of making explicit, interpreting, combining and selecting the information which is available within the arena and (2) presenting the consequences and alternatives of conceptualized information into design solutions. By doing so, the planner is able to influence actors' perception upon the situation, is able to shape relationships based upon shared interests and can focus attention upon consequential external effects and potentialities. In fact, as the planner as manager is expected to have insights into the relational network in which the decision-making arena is embedded, other potential sources of interest might be addressed, or even consciously be rejected, in order to modify the scarcity of resources which is available.

Thus, we may conceive the role of the planners within complex decision-making processes as technical experts and communicative medium for being “the ‘gatekeeper’ of information and access.

105 In this argument it is presumed that the territorial governance ambition is not lowered due to an increased social complexity. In the contrary, the initial goal of a multi actor governance approach reflects a high ambition in territorial developments by means of potentiating the greatest amount of (dispersed) resources.
Role conception 2: Planning as regulator of externalities

As stated previously, within this thesis I will restrict myself to the conception of the public sector spatial planner. When considering the planner’s role from the perspective of the public sector’s interest, it seems that our former description on the planner job is insufficient. In fact, being a representative of the public sector it can be argued that the planners challenge is to safeguard the inclusion of the public interest within the conversion process which internally takes place in the decision-making process. Based on this line of thought, it is often being argued that the role of the planner is to regulate externalities (Micelli, 2002). Thus, within the course of the decision-making processes, (1) the planner can use its role as informational manager and designer to make external effects explicit and (2) to behave as a social actor in the process with its own organizational interests. Societal legitimacy then could be safeguarded if these interests are the undistorted products of democratic public practices.

However, as the decision-making process evolves, all internal interests evolve. The planner is not an objective external regulator of the process, but a social actor participating in the process. Further, due to the increasing social complexity within the process, it is not likely that planners are in the position of power to provoke great collective shifts in behavior. Instead, as the decision-making process evolves it can be expected that mutual adjustments between actors will only take place step by step. Hence, it is highly questionable if the planner’s evolving interest within the process can be conceived as socially legitimate. In other words, as the environment in which the planning practice operates is of highly pluralistic nature, the critical question arises if public sector spatial planners can represent the public interests while being absorbed as actors decision-making arenas.

![Figure 03: Legitimate public representation within a pluralist decision-making environment](Adapted from van den Doelen 1978, van Loon, 1998)

Figure 03 exposes the complexity of societal legitimacy for the critical correlation between public representations, while participating in a pluralist decision-making environment. It seems highly questionable if public interests can be expected to be represented within a decision-making arena.
The contextual-bound nature of this question is (1) reflected by the actual interests which are effectively being incorporated within the arena and (2) dependent on the macro level sectoral policy frameworks to which the arena is subject.

**Planning: ethical challenge within bounded contexts**

Following former conceptions it can be argued that the actual role and position of the spatial planner is highly contextual bound. Societal powers have become more dispersed and their individual or collective potential has become vaguer as the application of resources is dependent to social values. Nonetheless, although social powers have become more complex, space will always remain a scarcity to which interests can be reflected. The role of the public sector spatial planners then tends to be redefined for connecting resources by converging social interests within a framed perspective of a political ideology. In particular, within a governance landscape on territorial developments, planners are confronted to guide the process by means of integrating context, content, actors and resources, while maintaining a legitimate attitude to society. The latter does imply regulation of externalities in the process as well as the value-laden incorporation of political ideologies.

If planners fail to integrate the dynamic variables of context, actors, resources and content, as shown in figure 04, in their practice, then their practice will be ineffective and illegitimate. John Forrester has put such a planning position most effective: “ignoring the opportunities and dangers of an organizational setting is like walking across a busy intersection with one’s eyes closed” (Forrester, 1989). Indeed, we again recognize the communicative as well as technical role planners should fulfill. The central element in this is the production and transfer of (selective) information. Further, the societal responsible frame in which the public sector planner is supposed to operate does imply that planners should not only integrate variables, but, by doing, should give direction by judging actor’s interests in order to maintain a coherent attitude to society. Public sector planners, thus, operate from a biased perspective which is conceived legitimate due their representational position to society.
Thus, the amount of actors, the degree of resource dispersion and the image of reality which represents context are all elements which define the level of complexity for managing territorial processes. However, within contemporary societal complexity, the consequence of globalization, it seems to be beneficial to incorporate an increasing degree of complexity within territorial governance approaches in order to be competent to tackle societal challenges and pursue integral opportunities. Thus, as long as the benefits outreach the costs of collaborative governance approaches in terms of mutual added value (Klein and Teisman, 2002), cross-sectoral collaboration tends to be embraced by policy-makers and in scientific contributions on territorial governance approaches.

Thus, in recognition of a great interdependent relationship between actors, planning might add a valuable role by means of increasing the actor’s competence to consider their relational position to other actors as well as to society. By doing so, actors may be enabled to reshape their frame of reference\textsuperscript{106} collectively and initiate a process of consensus-building towards a socially legitimate direction for contextual action. That is, a consensus-building process guided by the selective frame of information production, managed by the planner. If context, power relations and legitimacy can be integrated and developed in decision-making arenas, planning can fulfill its role by increasing the internal (actors) capacity to conceptualize satisfying solutions, as well as the external social base of support (regulating externalities).

\textsuperscript{106} ‘Frame reflection’ (de Vries, 2002)
In a more concrete sense, the following figure does portray the social construction of complex decision-making processes concerning the object of space. It seems convenient to argue that the actual planning approach is highly contextual bound as actors vary as well as their biased sectoral policy frameworks. The traditional domain demarcations and distinctive value patterns between sectors thus seem to hamper and precondition the effectiveness of specific governance arenas (Klein and Teisman, 2002). As urban development processes often tend to be long-lasting, engagement, mutual trust and transparency between actors seem to be crucial. Thus, the decision-making process within a cross-sectoral arena should not solely be aimed to design solutions and structures based upon objective facts and means, but should incorporate the value patterns of social actors. That is, the effectiveness and sustainability of a mutual-learning process is dependent on the transformative power influx into organizational values. A collaborative approach only leads to lasting results if established sectoral patterns of thinking and acting can be transformed.
Figure 05. Consensus building within a relational social network (adapted from Rooy, 2009)

8 Strategies: conceptual frameworks for (collective) sense-making

I the previous chapter I have elaborated on the potential role(s) of spatial planning in society. From there, it is possible to say that planning is concerned with the process of mutual learning within a complex environment, while enforcing an accountable attitude to societal interest by means of value judgments. In order to fulfil this role, I have argued that planners have a position of power by means of the control of information.

In the next chapter I will zoom in further towards a less abstract level of planning resources. In particular, I will highlight the strategic planning approach. Beforehand, in this chapter I will elaborate upon the meaning of strategies in a general sense.
The practical conversion of values into focused concepts
Generally, strategies are concerned with the creation of a conceptual framework in which objectives of individuals, organizations or areas can be realized (Peter Roberts, et. Al, 2000). Thus, strategies can be considered as instrument to focus attention upon (commonly) determined potentialities and possibilities, which operate as referential and mobilizing framework for focused action.

Following this line of thought, it seems logical to conclude that strategic frameworks tend to have a persuasive and convincing leverage for individuals as well as for organizations. In both cases the framed conceptualization, defined as potentials and possibilities for the persuasion of objectives, are in direct consistency with the values of the one(s) which have preceded them.

**Illustration - Strategic planning on individuals' objectives**

A certain individual might set out a strategy for the achievement of a world record in sports. This objective can be considered to be a conceptualization of his values which tell him that an outstanding physical condition will deliver the ultimate quality of life. Thus, from this conceptualized objective a framework may be set from which focused actions in time can be determined in coherence with the overall objective can be derived. Thus, the impacts of his actions can always be evaluated in inter-subjective consistency with his objectives, as they are derived from his own valuations. Moreover, the strategy itself is always flexible to adjust in case of changing personal values and therefore will not limit the efficiency for the overall persuasion of quality of live.

In the matter of organizations a similar logics can be applied, as organizations can be comprehended as organized groups of individuals that in essence pursue common goal(s).

Persuasive frameworks for action and reflection
Thus, strategic frameworks can be described as organized principles in which a selection of values, images and identities are being conceptualized into a meaningful whole. By doing so, the strategic frame provides “conceptual coherence, a direction for action, a basis for persuasion, and a framework for the collection and analysis of data” (Healey, 2007). Having illustrated the notion of strategies in contexts in which the selective construction of its discursive frame seems to be in convenient coherency with the values and images of the ones that are preceding them, the next chapters will relate the concept of strategy-making processes to the higher social complexities that exists in urban areas.
9 Shifting sense in urban strategy-formation processes in the late 20th century

Having introduced and illustrated the general purpose of strategies the former section, this section will elaborate onto the logics and meaning of the tradition of strategy-making processes in the European planning practice in relation to its societal frame-conditions.

In theories, it has been widely argued that the spatial planning discourse throughout the 19th and 20th century was dominated by positivism and utopianism. Positivism stands for the belief that objective knowledge can be obtained through acquiring data. Utopianism in spatial planning reflects the concept in which social dynamics are directly linked to physical form. Further, many theorists have drawn upon the controversial argument that planners in the 19th and 20th century conceived space as clearly bounded containers (Burgess, 2004), in which the belief was adopted that people and firms were largely ‘rooted’ within a place (Demateis, 1994).

Following this preconditioned conception on spatial planning, the production of a strategy tends to operate within a spatial deterministic modus. That is, the conceptual framework which has the power to mobilize and focus forces towards strategic action has been based upon one-dimensional spatial causalities, rather than the subjectivities of social values of the ones that will be affected.

From the 1960’s onwards, we witnessed the influx of social sciences into the planning discourse. Its conception tended to embrace the idea that the urban region is created and continuously being reshaped by a complex set of overlapping and intersecting social relations, understood in different ways, by different people (Healey, 2007). Thus, a single perspective on the urban territories, from which critical potentialities for determinative action are being discovered, did not seem legitimate anymore. The socio-spatial processes upon the territory were conceived to be too complex and dynamic to be comprehended by a deterministic experts view.

Subsequently, in the 1970’s, it became empirically evident that the top-down routines of practice were no longer publicly accepted for its inability to recognize the conjuncture of social values of society. The former was expressed by means of the rise of a bottom-up demanding voice. A new conception of planning tended to become embedded within the planning discourse. That is, a conception that is based upon the requirement to enable participants to be included in the planning process and to give voice to the subjectivities of their values.

10 strategic planning in contemporary multi-relational societies

From the 1980, neo-liberal agenda’s started to operate parallel to the left-winged oriented social-democratic agenda’s. As a result, a new global market order emerged which is inter-dependently related to the fate of localities. This process, which relates to globalization, has been further elaborated on in the top section. In this, I have argued that public authorities seem to have lost some of their control over their territories as a result of globalization (A. Mandanipour et. al, 2001). The conjuncture of endogenous and exogenous forces seems to increased in complexity.

As territories now seems to be faced by emerging multi-level complexity and increasing dynamics, it seems convenient to conceive places as temporal nodal points that exist within the flows of people, goods, and information. (A. Mandanipour, 2001). From this line of argumentation, these nodal points can been comprehended as “geographical spaces transected by very many webs of relations that
Weave across, in and around each other, generating nodes of activity and identifiable places with distinctive social and physical qualities” (P. Healey, 2007).

As stated in section 1.2, by the end of the 1990’s efforts have been underway in planning to shift from a project focus, towards a wider territorial focus by means of the production of comprehensive strategies. Having argued that territories nowadays can be best understood within a multi-relational conception, in which a multitude of social use values are intermingling, the purpose of territorial strategies can be interpreted for the creating of a collective sense. That is, to conceptualize socially constructed norms in terms of objectives and visions, in order to set out actions which are collectively believed to serve the complexity of subjective use values upon the territory. From this perspective, strategic planning can be understood as effective instrument to provoke public action in coherency to societal forces.

However, power relations upon the urban territories have shifted as a result of a general belief that economical competitiveness is a precondition for social prosperity upon the territory. Therefore, trans-national private actors evidently have become dominant stakeholders in the determination of territorial developments. Further, globalization has enabled private actors to choose their investment locations based upon efficiency criteria, in which geographical proximity seems to have become less determinative for their selections. Thus, it might be stated that urban nodal points have become subject to a predominant exchange value for private sectoral allocations, to which societal use values are subjective. This exchange value of place is thus determined by the criteria for economical competitiveness.

In short, use values can be best comprehended within a relational and multi-dimensional view upon territorial subjectivities, in which the quality of life of all individuals of society is the main criteria for its determination. Next to this, exchange values are determined by a one-dimensional view upon the territories, by means of economical competitiveness. As argued, the latter also implies an unbalanced satisfaction of use values, as economical growth is in its very essence increases social disparities (Savitch and Kantor, 2003).

Therefore, it might be assumable to conceive the public sector within a democratic regime to act in coherency with society, which is bounded by territorial use-values. However, exchange values, which are bounded by the narrow conception of economical competitiveness, are believed to be a necessity for territorial developments. Following this line of reasoning, I argue that strategy-making processes, in which critical possibilities and potentialities are discovered, are very much subject to a tension between wider senses of use values versus a narrow conception of exchange values.

Thus, as power relations have changed, in which capacities for the representation of values are determined, a critical notion in strategy-making processes is whose values are including in discursive frames bounded by the adoption of critical potentialities and possibilities?

As “The social processes through which these frame are produced are deeply affected by the institutional context in which they are located” (Healey, 2007), it seems convenient to conclude that strategy making processes cannot be evaluated in exclusion of the model of society in which they take place. Thus, the following sections will narrow this problem down further towards inclusive as well as sharing capacities of spatial strategies in relation to the Dutch model of society.
11 Consensus ambition within the Dutch planning culture
In the preceding chapters I have presented (1) the social conditions in which territorial development practices take place and (2) defined the (potential) position of spatial planners within these social conditions. From this chapter onwards, I will narrow this theoretical contribution down towards the actual Dutch planning culture in coherence to the model of society.

A deeply rooted spatial malleability ambition within consensus-based frameworks
The ambition to act collectively and to pursue consensus within the course of action, is rooted deeply in the Dutch spatial planning tradition (Needham, 2007). The persistence to organize public action originates particularly from historical land-reclamation activities which have been considered crucial to be tackled collectively through public organization. In this, landowners recognized their land as being a potential capital asset, from which they defined their common goal: increasing the value of their asset. In order to achieve these goals waterboards\textsuperscript{107} have been constructed, investments were done by public powers and engineering works have been implemented (Needham 2007). Indeed, without collaborative public conceptualizations in spatial planning activities by mean of the formulation and communication of common goals, there would not even be livable land to a great extent!

Collective consensus building or centralized public domination?
The industrial revolution, initiated around 1850, was a technical manifestation of an evolved societal dynamic. A dominant discourse of progression and a liberal society was widely being adopted (van der Woud, 2009). However, at the start of the 20th century the negative consequences of the industrial revolution manifested spatially and were absorbed by public policy makers. A liberal market was believed to fail in its production of societal welfare. Thus, the public sector transformed its regulative framework on territorial developments in order to safeguard societal interests\textsuperscript{108} (Rooy, 2009). A firm base on sectoral role conceptions was being set. For the public sector, this role conception reflected hierarchical spatial malleability.

A deeper establishment of this conception was provoked in the post world-war 2 reconstruction period. The public focus aimed to produce large quantities of urban areas, which from the early 1960 was ambitioned to be positioned within the qualitative conceptual boundaries of the Randstad metropolitan area. In this, the purpose of a spatial plan was conceived as specialist-induced blueprints of the future, rather than their previously argued purpose of tools for communication and deliberation.

Thus, although planning does have a vast tradition in the production of (comprehensive) plans, it seems that the societal conditions in which these plans are constructed have adjusted. Central malleability does not anymore seem to be attainable. In post-modern society, spatial plans tend to serve as a means for communication in order to defend and negotiate sectoral interests as well as to find leverage onto diverging objectives which are reflected upon the organization of space. Although the majority of produced spatial plans do not have any legal status, they very much reveal the multiple values which are perceived upon the territory as well as the great ambition to conceive an (inclusive) common sense in the production of meaning of place. That is, the ambition to identify, acknowledge and resolve the conflicts which continuously arise within the complexity of social life as

\textsuperscript{107} In Dutch: “Waterschappen” or “Hoogheemraadschappen”

\textsuperscript{108} For example, the initiation of the
reflected upon the urban and rural territorial potentialities. This explicit identification and active consideration of the territorial complexity, in which consensus between a multitude of voices are being pursued, is defined by Maarten Hajer (2001) as Cultural Planning.

Based on the former, it is possible to say that the Dutch planning tradition has evolved from a consensus-based approach. In the early days of land reclamations practices, it was recognized that a collaborative approach would be fruitful for its mutual added value. However, this social recognition on collaboration has initiated the construction of formal power structures on territorial development, to which power is transferred. Paradoxically, the role conceptions which have been dominant since the 20th century in public spatial planning, does seem to reject a collaborative approach in favor of central malleability beliefs.

Therefore, it has been written in theories that the public sector seems to be subjected to a ‘guardian syndrome’, while private forces are subject to a ‘commercial syndrome’. It has been argued by Teisman (2002) that this principal division between value systems often leads to ineffective multi-sectoral decision-making processes on territorial developments. As argued by him: both patterns cannot be merged, in fact, they are mutually exclusive. Within a society in which comprehensive planning seems to be deeply embedded, the critical question arises if the outcomes of Dutch planning discourses are (effectively) being absorbed and/or interpreted into formal policy constructions. That is, do collective actions result in focused collective outcomes?

12 Decentralization and inter-local unification
In the former chapter I have elaborated on the Dutch planning culture in which I have highlighted the paradoxical co-existence between a collaborative consensus building ambition and a centrally steered malleability value pattern. In this chapter I will continue by describing how this Dutch planning culture is conceptualized into a formal bureaucratic organization. By doing so, the normative Dutch territorial planning practice can be critically evaluated in the light of its actual organization in relation to contemporary challenges.

A comprehensive planning system
The Dutch state is generally described as being a ‘decentralized unitary state’ (Needham, 2006). This phrase implies a state in which decision-making powers are distributed from the higher to the local levels, while a macro scale coherency is being maintained. In concrete, the formal responsibilities and statutory powers are located at public bodies at three different levels. That is, the national government, the provincial government and the municipal government together have the statutory task to ensure that living conditions and the environment are protected and improved as formally stated by article 21 of the Dutch constitution. In this, each governmental body has its own prescribed responsibility. Thus, on each jurisdictional level spatial plans are being produced which reflect the aims on how the land should be organized from the perspective and values that are conceptualized by the public agency operating on that specific level. Hence, as planning takes place at all three different levels, the Dutch planning system is often being conceived comprehensive (Faludi, 2000). Thus, the concept of a ‘decentralized unitary state’ suggests that the Dutch planning system

109 Spatial planning system: “a set of territorial governance arrangements that seek to shape generic term to describe the ensemble patterns of spatial development in certain places” (Nadin and Stead, 2008)
pursues a horizontal and vertical integration of policies across sectors and jurisdictions (Nadin and Stead, 2008).

The following virtual illustration clearly demonstrates how complex a vertical coherency between those levels in practice could be:

Illustration - multi-level complexity

A certain municipality might be interested to develop housing upon rural grounds in order to revitalize its demographic municipal structure. However, the province would believe it would serve the public interest if that territory would be restricted for development by ordaining it as a national park. Considered from the paradigmatic concept of the spatial economic logics, the national government might prefer to designate those grounds to the construction of a new highway, in order to generate growth and attract foreign investment.

A comprehensive ambition of horizontal and vertical coordination and integration of policy might suggest that planners are in the position of power to control developments in the most rational manner. That is, to comprehend context in the widest possible sense by integrating knowledge at different levels in order to steer towards rational optimal solutions. The former illustration, however, describes a situation in which different meaning is produced at different levels: there are no fixed and rationally optimal solutions as they are conceptual outcomes of value-laden processes. Further, a flawless vertical and horizontal integration of policies seems to be challenges as public actors alone usually do not have the means to construct their policies in isolation. Instead, they are often constructed in multi-actor environments, subject to a variety of interests. In the previous chapters I have in depth elaborated on the fact that policy construction is subject to the inter-subjective meaning (Hillier, 2001) which is created by a selective set of included actors. There are no fixed objective solutions, as the object of space is conceptualized differently by different actors, being subject to subjective ideologies.

Thus, within conditions in which territories are becoming increasingly subjected to complex governance arenas, the public sector is challenged how to position and organize the normative frames in which those arenas can operate in order to safeguard a legitimate course of development on their grounds.

Thus, as planning practices take place at different levels, the collectively produced meaning, subject to (relational) social networks, resources and the (organization of the) decision-making process might be expected to vary from level to level. However, all these planning processes are subject to space as an object of scarcity. The transformative potential of the latter seems to be increased in its complexity and pluralism if a greater amount of interests are absorbed in not only one, but in different decision-making approaches on different levels concerning the same object. The actual persuasion of a vertical coherency in planning then seems to become highly complex in managerial terms, hence, imposes a great threat to the attainability of article 21 of the Dutch constitution. Having elaborated onto the complexity of multi-level planning, it seems convenient to argue that a degree of complementary power should exist between those levels in order to define the logics of
the Dutch planning system from a social legitimate perspective. By doing so, we can distinguish the potential of meaning produced on different levels (knowledge production) as well as the synergizing capacity subject to communication and interpretation between those levels (knowledge transfer).

**Indicative plans and learning for increasing transformative potential and legitimacy**

Previously in this thesis I have argued that the Dutch society has become more heterogeneous in the preceding decades. This process has lead to a greater disparity of societal values as well as a greater complexity, dynamic and uncertainty of territorial development processes. The latter is a consequence of the social nature and dispersing relations to which plan production is subject. Thus, due to a greater involvement of diverging social interests in plan production, planning is often comprehended for producing collective meaning and transform societal value (Teisman, 2009). Further, in the light of a network perspective on social relations, it seems that territorial potential and threat increasingly tend to cross the traditional jurisdictional boundaries. Thus, while multi-level planning in practice might increase managerial complexity, as argued in the former section, the essence of a multi-level approach does seem crucial in the light of recognized interdependent relations between territories. Therefore, in this section I will further elaborate on the actual roles and responsibilities of different planning levels in order to tackle the main logics of the system within contemporary societal conditions.

As I stated in the former section, in the Netherlands spatial plans are being produced at different levels. These plans, however, do not serve the same purpose (at least in theory) and possess the same formal legal status. The primary essence behind the Dutch decentralized planning system is the legal formalization that decisions which have been taken on lower levels are always subject to approval of higher level authorities. However, the reality within the routines of practice reveals a much more complex relation between different jurisdictional levels.

First of all, at the municipal level the local land-use plan (bestemmingsplan) is produced. The municipal land use plan reflects to a certain extent the municipal desires on (1) how its land within its jurisdiction is used and (2) by what kind of physical form these activities are expressed. This plan usually has a detailed character and covers relatively small areas within the municipal jurisdictional boundaries. This plan is the only Dutch spatial plan which is legally binding. That is, each physical development initiative which takes place in the Netherlands needs to be granted a building permit. The building permit allotment procedure is subject to the criteria that have been set in the local land use plan, or its allotment is explicitly granted a deviation from the local land-use plan by the municipal government. Thus, municipalities have an advantage on higher administrative levels as they have direct steering power to ensure that what is built conforms to what it wants to be built (Needham, 2006). As Healey has argued: “planning requires giving voice, ear and respect to all participants and their values, images and identities” (Healey, 1992), it seems, in a way, logical that direct steering powers are exclusively awarded to the lowest level of government. That is, municipal powers might be most appropriate to recognize and include local values into the planning process.

However, a wider sense of place seems to increase in significance as inter-regional complexities and dependencies are increasing as a result of globalization. Furthermore, municipal board often tends to act according to the Not In My Backyard (NIMBY) effect (Needham, 2006). NIMBY is a conceptual term which is often used in spatial planning to indicate that people do want to profit from a certain development, as long as they are not affected by its possible negative consequences. Thus, in
municipal planning processes, certain societal demands might be neglected, if public response would disadvantage the general municipal planning strategy in disadvantage. It seems therefore highly questionable if municipal planning processes do have the capacity and willingness to consider the use of their grounds in the light of higher level political ambitions and societal challenges.

**NIMBY: A6 – A9 connection**

For decades the discussion is forth going in relation to the A6 – A9 road connection. This connection is aimed to ease the daily commuter congestion traveling from Almere to Amsterdam.

However, a great amount of bottom up civil society groups object to these developments, as it would damage the natural landscapes of the Naardermeer. In this, the Naardermeer can be considered as the ‘backyard’.

From this perspective, it can be argued that a decentralized planning approach might be deliberative for its local conceptualization capacity in line with bottom-up interests, while facing the threat of narrow conceptions by means of a highly selective inclusion of wider societal challenges. It therefore seems logically to argue that municipal planning arenas should be empowered to act in a responsible manner to society in a wider sense and should be held accountable by a higher authoritative power if they would act differently.

Having stated that the municipal land-use plan is the only legally binding spatial plan in Holland, I will now elaborate further onto the meaning of spatial plans which are produced at the provincial and national level.

At the provincial level the so called *streekplan* is produced. The province always has to give or withhold approval to municipal land use plans. By doing so, they refer to the criteria which have been set in the *streekplan*. However, the *streekplan* is an indicative plan which implies that provinces can base their decisions on other terms which might as well deviate from the *streekplan*. However, the *streekplan* does offer the opportunity (1) to fulfill a guiding role along the process in which the municipal land use plan is constructed and (2) to facilitate effective mutual discussion between both planning levels. As long as an agreement is set between the province and municipality, the local land use plan can evolve freely until it is formally approved. Hence, the indicative nature of the *streekplan* raises the opportunity to connect bottom-up initiative and economical potential to a greater strategic vision for regional development. Especially in conditions in which the economical potential seem to vary strongly from locality to locality and in which steering power increasingly is being transferred from public to private actors, a strong vertical coherency in public conceptions seems crucial to safeguard the legitimacy of meaning which increasingly tends to be created in diffuse multi-sectoral governance arenas.
In producing their *streekplan* provinces are not subject to national control (Faludi, 2000). However, the national government is always in the position of power to intervene in lower level planning procedures in order to safeguard national concerns. Hence, similar to the relation between province and municipality, the indicative nature of the provincial *streekplan* also enables conditions for mutual discussions between the provincial and national level of planning.

At the national level policy ambitions in regards to the use of space are articulated into the *Nota Ruimte*. This plan again is very indicative in its nature, and does serve its purpose to facilitate mutual discussion on different levels. Furthermore, two other roles can be assigned to the *Nota Ruimte*.

(1) To reflect an integration of governmental department policies horizontally in a cohesive document in which the object of space is the binding element. Thus, the *Nota Ruimte* does not only facilitate vertical public communication, but also horizontal communication.

(2) The *Nota Ruimte* can also be conceived as a seductive instrument in order to create a social base of support by demystifying the actual planning decisions which are being taken on lower levels of government. The *Nota Ruimte* can fulfill this role for it is this document which is (inter)nationally most recognized for reflecting the Dutch belief on how space should be organized (Needham, 2006).

Based on the former we may acknowledge that the indicative nature of spatial plans which are being produced at different levels is crucial for public policy-makers in order to improve the collective public understanding of present and future problems. That is, a legitimate mutual process within the public structures aimed to conceptualize meaning on the organization and use of space.

Having elaborated on the role of planning for increasing inter-level knowledge production, the critical question remains if the actual municipal policy outcomes in regards to the spatial organization of their grounds are guided by the former. The NIMBY effect in a way seems to stress the effectiveness of multi-level public learning processes. It seems that the predominant position of power that is structurally assigned to municipalities creates a barrier for state sovereignty in order to tackle societal challenges. For this reason, the latest *Nota Ruimte* does promote the decentralization of spatial policy making towards the local level, while new adjustments in the legal Spatial Planning Act enables national and provincial powers to intervene more forcefully when higher level interests are at stake (Needham, 2006. Nadin and Stead, 2008). This structural change immediately implies that the potential of mutual learning and consensus-building is subject to power structures and therefore should be positioned into structural regulative frameworks. The construction of regulatory frameworks in which social interactive processes can take place is thus dependent on the conditions in which they are located. For example, if a national planning culture is characterized by municipalities which fail to cooperate with higher levels of government, a structural change in regulations in terms of power transfer to higher levels of government can change the status quo may increase the effectiveness of mutual discussion. The actual municipal planning approaches in the Dutch society will be further elaborated in the next chapter. However, regulative frameworks might paradoxically as well be restrictive to effective interactive learning-processes. Thus, a reflective stance on regulative frameworks should always be maintained in the light of cultural changes.
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110 Legitimacy is presumed to be safeguarded as public – public processes operate within the frame of a democratic constitutional state
From this chapter we may conclude that indicative plans may serve as guiding principle to promote a more cohesive vertical and horizontal integration of spatial policies in the face of legitimacy. However, I have argued that the actual power relations between levels of government might restrict an effective mutual learning process. If this would be the case, then a restructuring of the regulative frame in which public-public processes take place might be required.

**Municipal planning culture: illegitimate or deliberative?**

Having elaborated on the role indicative plans fulfill in public-public policy-making practices, I will now further elaborate on the actual planning approaches of the Dutch municipalities.

Municipal planning agencies are obliged to act under the explicitly defined restrictions of the ‘general Act relating to the actions of public bodies’\(^1\). In this, legal protection for societal engagement is formalized in terms of general principles in which public agencies are expected to act, as well as formalized procedures in statutory spatial plan making. Thus, the planning process that defines the conceptual frame in which the municipal land-use plan is produced seems to be subject to societal legal protection in order to ensure the societal legitimacy of the plan. Society in this sense can be defined by all individual within the municipal jurisdiction.

However, evidence has showed that most municipal executive powers consider the land-use plan too restrictive (Needham, 2006) and therefore often ineffective to regulate the organization of their grounds. This argument is based upon the nature of the land-use plan as regulative instrument. That is, the municipal land use plan reflects the predefined criteria to which the building permits applications should be tested. Hence, it would be incorrect to consider the land use plan as an actual blueprint of the future. It would be better to comprehend it as a spatially reflected set of limiting criteria within which each developer and landowners has the freedom to choose his own developments. The land use plan therefore merely enables municipal planners to facilitate private developer’s and landowners’ initiatives passively by measuring their initiatives to the land use plan. This culturally bound conception on the Dutch planning operability is (inter)nationally known as passive planning\(^2\). For this reason, the Dutch spatial planning system is often labeled to be a limitative imperative system (Needham, 2006). This classification refers to the systematic character that each development needs to take place within the boundaries of a limited set of static criteria (imperatives). The former does describe the main logics of the structural position of power municipal planners have. The actual planning processes which take place within these structures however often do reveal a more development oriented planning approach and a desire to reshape the Dutch culture of planning. A further elaboration on these processes will be presented in the next chapter.

Hence, due to the dissatisfaction municipal executive boards have with a passive planning approach, based upon restriction, they often tend to deviate from the letter of the law. However, if the formal rules of the planning system are to be trespassed, the logical inter-level planning organization immediately seems to become less effective. That is, if municipalities are in the end in the position of power to decide in exclusion on how their land is being organized, all proceeding procedures of multi-level mutual discussion tend to lose their mutual values and thus may be perceived as costly long-lasting formal procedures by all actors involved and might result in a reduced commitment of actors to learn. Further, as formal public normative regulations and procedures can be neglected, it
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1\(^1\) Algmene Wet Bestuursrecht, AWB  
2\(^2\) In Dutch: toelatingsplanologie
seems disputable if the actual planning approaches still can reflect legitimacy by being coherent to the ‘general Act relating to public bodies’. Nonetheless, in recognition of the actual processes within contemporary societal conditions and the friction between established normative structures, a critical reflective attitude should be assigned to meaning and effectiveness of the regulative framework which initially has been designed to safeguard the societal legitimacy of planning practices.

Having argued on the static character of the land use plan, it needs to be said that deviations or modifications of this plan can always be formally arranged. However, such formal procedures often tend to be long-lasting due to the inflexible bureaucratic nature of the public planning system. A deviation needs a higher administrative level approval and a land-use plan modification needs a very comprehensive procedure. Therefore, it has been evident that municipalities often try to neglect these legal imperatives. As stated by Needham (2006), there are roughly three types of attitudes why public authorities neglect their formal regulations:

1. The municipality wants to make things happen pro-actively, instead of maintaining a restrictive stance towards its territory. This could for example be the case when a municipal executive board decides to enter into agreement with a commercial developer, as municipalities usually choose for one dimensional growth strategies in order to attract investments (Savitich and Kantor, 2003). However, a flexible position seems to be a necessity in order to establish the proper conditions for a negotiation process.

2. A habit of tolerating breaches of the law\textsuperscript{113}. This is the case when a municipality does not take effective action to ensure that the regulations are followed. For example this has been the shocking reality in Enschede. In May 2000 many people lost their lives because a fireworks factory, which was located in the town, exploded

3. Arrogance of public officials. Municipalities generally argue that the letter of the law might be restricting their obligation to act within the spirit of the law. Moreover, by doing so, it is often justified by public officials for stating that they know what is best for the people and therefore may decide which rules to apply and which to ignore.

Based on the former, it seems evident that municipal executive boards tend to neglect their formal regulative obligations in order to pursue their own political interests, which are often directed towards economical growth. This does not automatically imply that their approach is ineffective within contemporary societal conditions in which planning operates, it might as well be argued that the structure of the planning system is not anymore appropriate for effective public sector planning. Nonetheless, if formal responsibilities, which are subject to the norms of a democratic society, are to be trespassed, how can public authorities then ever be held accountable for their practices in relation to societal legitimacy?

\textsuperscript{113} In dutch: Gedoogbeleid
Based on the former, we can at least assign two structural problems of the system for increasing friction between the planning system, its environment and legitimate accountability.

1. The normative Dutch planning system is designed for a passive planning operability. The effective operability of a passive planning approach does presume (1) predictability and (2) malleability. However the former presumption can be challenged as contemporary societal conditions tend to have a limited predictability for its complex nature and its subjection to macro level forces. The latter presumption of malleability can be refused due to the shift in power relations on territorial developments, which increasingly tend to cross over the border of the public sector.

2. The inflexible bureaucratic nature of the planning system tends to be inappropriate to support an effective planning approach within dynamic societal conditions. Although regulative frameworks seem crucial in order to safeguard legitimate authority and democratizing practices, a critical reflective position should be taken to the actual structure of the system in relation to the role of planning within contemporary societal conditions.

Previously I have elaborated on the value of mutual learning in public planning practices. The structural hindrances of assumptions which seem to have lost their meaning in contemporary conditions as well as the inflexible nature of the planning system seem to be a threat to the actual learning competence which could potentially evolve between levels of government. This does however not imply that municipalities reject multi-level collaboration. Instead, it merely implies that the normative frameworks in which multi level learning processes could potentially take place do not seem to be appropriate for a planning approach which is facing an environment in which power is dispersed and flexibility and pro-activity are conceived as necessity.

It therefore seems convenient to argue that a public planning framework within complex societal conditions should not only promote public – public collaboration, but should also incorporate the reality of practice in which public – private decision-making practices increasingly tend to be crucial to solve integral problems which relate to the organization of space. If the latter would be neglected, traditional sector demarcations would stress the legitimacy and effectivity of public – private decision-making practices for the cooperative barriers between multi-level learning and the influx of knowledge into actual action-oriented decentralized decision-making practices.
Annex 3: Formal and informal documents on the planning process of ‘Spoorzone Delft’
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