PLACE OF BECOMING

A SPATIAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE ACCOMMODATION OF ASYLUM SEEKERS IN THE NETHERLANDS

BRAM KLATSER
This master thesis is shaped around two notions: 1. that the residence of asylum seekers and refugees in asylum centres in the Netherlands proves to be detrimental to their health and integration prospects. 2. that there seems to be a lack of understanding on how asylum centres are formed and shaped. The main question therefore was: How can a spatial regeneration of the asylum centre contribute to a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers in the Netherlands?

In order to execute the research part, I established a way to examine the spatial organisation of asylum centres. Built on a firm theoretical framework it is described that the primary motivation to accommodate asylum seekers in asylum centres is to execute territorial control, consequently preventing integration and (thus) leaving asylum seekers in limbo. Two spatial concepts are used to describe the expression of this mode of control: the camp and the total institution – both come with significant implications for its inhabitants. With these theoretical notions in mind I researched the form of asylum centres in the Netherlands and the way they are planned. In particular my research was shaped by a case study analysis of asylum centres in Dronten, Winterswijk and Utrecht. It leads to the conclusion that there are major spatial differences between asylum centres which translate in different opportunities and constraints for its inhabitants. It is a consequence of current planning that hardly takes the desperate needs of asylum seekers into account: the anticipated possibility to become rooted again.

In the design part of this thesis I propose an adaptation to the contemporary asylum centre which does take into account these needs. From now on, they can choose their preferred way of life and consequently can find themselves in a village-like, suburban or urban asylum centre. The asylum centre as a more rooted structure in space will allow for an intrinsic relationship between the context and the place of arrival. Together with small reconfigurations of borders and spaces of the asylum centre it offers them public spaces to meet native citizens, to express themselves and to discover their new environment. The asylum centre now turns into a place of becoming.
fig. 1: collage images which represents the accommodation of asylum seekers and refugees, part 1

fig. 2: collage images which represents the accommodation of asylum seekers and refugees, part 2
This thesis is the tangible result of my one year graduation in Urbanism at the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment at Delft University of Technology. Within the framework of the Complex Cities studio I was offered the opportunity to follow my own fascination. The privilege to deeply dive into a topic for one year formed the basics to – in my opinion – a very open and delicate question on how an urban designer and planner could provide alternative ways of working to tackle major (humanitarian) problems concerning today’s European Refugee Crisis. This search for a meaningful contribution effectively structured my graduation project throughout the year and resulted in two major accomplishments: an in depth research of the spatial manifestation of asylum in the Netherlands and a design which re-conceptualises the contemporary asylum centre. I believe that my suggestion ‘a place of becoming’ provides another perspective on the way how we deal with others, with asylum seekers and refugees, in our society - one which reaches out to their intrinsic desire to become rooted again.

Bram Klatser
Delft, June 2016
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RESEARCH INTRODUCTION

motivation / context / problem field / problem statement / research questions / methodology / relevance
The notion that migration flows are intrinsically part of globalisation processes have been a recurring theme in literature on spatial development. Territoriality plays a fundamental role in these processes where migration flows transcend both national and international borders. The relationship between migration and territoriality manifests itself on the level of nations onto the very local level, within the urban fabric. In the book ‘Parrot flew over the IJssel’ of Dutch-Iranian writer Kader Abdollah, this interconnection is beautifully described concerning stories on integration of Iranian refugees in Dutch society. It expresses the time that it takes to understand the environment, both tangible and intangible and that the journey of becoming Dutch, of becoming part of society, is perceived in and through place. My interest in the interrelation between place and integration processes has been amplified after I had read the book of Abdollah. It has formed the incentive to research the contemporary flow of people into the European continent these days.

A sheer part of this flow is caused by what the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) calls the largest refugee crisis that the world has experienced since World War II (UNHCR, 2015b). This crisis is fuelled by a large group of people fleeing war, territorial conflicts or chances of persecution. If they have the opportunity to apply for asylum in Europe, a substantial number decides to do so.

The project takes the Netherlands as a subject where it serves as a model country that experiences an increased influx of asylum seekers on the one hand (fig. 4) and that has established a long standing tradition of receiving immigrants on the other hand.

This particular moment in time has amplified the need for special attention to a group of vulnerable people who are assigned to start at the bottom of society. My motivation for this research and design project is based on the assumption that international migration and applying for asylum in particular, have become an integral part of our common living environment. Attention and planning for a group like this is relevant to the urban planning and design practice because those people are in need to acquire a place within the urban context. In this project I seek to critically review the spatial logic of reception, accommodation and integration of asylum seekers and refugees.

MOTIVATION

The notion that migration flows are intrinsically part of globalisation processes have been a recurring theme in literature on spatial development. Territoriality plays a fundamental role in these processes where migration flows transcend both national and international borders. The relationship between migration and territoriality manifests itself on the level of nations onto the very local level, within the urban fabric. In the book ‘Parrot flew over the IJssel’ of Dutch-Iranian writer Kader Abdollah, this interconnection is beautifully described concerning stories on integration of Iranian refugees in Dutch society. It expresses the time that it takes to understand the environment, both tangible and intangible and that the journey of becoming Dutch, of becoming part of society, is perceived in and through place. My interest in the interrelation between place and integration processes has been amplified after I had read the book of Abdollah. It has formed the incentive to research the contemporary flow of people into the European continent these days.

A sheer part of this flow is caused by what the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) calls the largest refugee crisis that the world has experienced since World War II (UNHCR, 2015b). This crisis is fuelled by a large group of people fleeing war, territorial conflicts or chances of persecution. If they have the opportunity to apply for asylum in Europe, a substantial number decides to do so.

The project takes the Netherlands as a subject where it serves as a model country that experiences an increased influx of asylum seekers on the one hand (fig. 4) and that has established a long standing tradition of receiving immigrants on the other hand.

This particular moment in time has amplified the need for special attention to a group of vulnerable people who are assigned to start at the bottom of society. My motivation for this research and design project is based on the assumption that international migration and applying for asylum in particular, have become an integral part of our common living environment. Attention and planning for a group like this is relevant to the urban planning and design practice because those people are in need to acquire a place within the urban context. In this project I seek to critically review the spatial logic of reception, accommodation and integration of asylum seekers and refugees.

Fig 3: book cover ‘Parrot flew over the IJssel’

Fig 4: asylum requests in the Netherlands (1990-2015)* (edited by author, source: Engbersen et al. (2015))

* From 1990-2006 first and repeated requests are summed. From 2007 on only first asylum requests are represented (source: CBS & INO).
Asia or the Middle East in 2015, of where a majority of them can be reckoned as asylum seekers (source: www.migration.iom.int/europe/). Comparatively, both sources stress the recent increase in irregular border crossings and together indicate the detected and undetected transit routes to Europe composing what is called a European refugee crisis.

In the light of the recent refugee crisis, a vast share of these crossings was made by displaced people, those who aspire to apply for refugee status in (a specific number of) countries within the European Union. To date, applying for asylum in countries of the European Union is always preceded by irregular border crossing as there is hardly a legal way to apply for asylum in the European Union, or in its individual countries (Oudejans, 2011). The story of the recent refugee crisis is a story of the journey of displaced people, irregularly migrating to European countries in particular and claiming a place on its territories by applying for protection and assistance.

Seeking asylum is a distinctive category of world’s migration flows as it happens in an extraordinary way. It is not only characterised by irregular migration but also by the motivations of leaving the place of origin, by the very nature of the concept asylum and by the organisational structure of receiving asylum seekers and refugees and providing them with their needs.

THE BORDERS OF EUROPE

Since the establishment of an open border policy by the name of the Schengen Treaty in 1999, money, people and goods can freely move throughout the European Union’s territory. In geographical sense, national borders subsequently have become obsolete. It has resulted in a resemblance of a single state for international travel purposes with external border controls for travellers entering and exiting the area, and common visas, but with no internal border controls. The latest expansion of the European Union in 2001 in which ten countries joined the economic-political zone, created a new and vast external border. It came by with the establishment of a European Union’s border agency: Frontex, which coordinates national border controls and facilitates a European wide system of security in order to avoid trespassing of the external border.

Legislations established under the Schengen Treaty and policies by its different nation-states perform a visa-based system which determines whether non-European citizens can enter its territory or not, depending on their projected stay. Figure 5 projects the permeability of the Schengen border in respect to your nationality. Illegal border crossing takes place by those nationalities for whom it is hardly possible to obtain a regular visa and therefore take the risk to cross the EU’s external border irregularly (brown coloured countries in figure 5 - and to some degree the red coloured). In this way it is your passport, primarily based on your place of birth, which determines your international mobility.

Frontex detected more than 500,000 illegal border crossings in the first eight months of 2015, compared to 280,000 for all of 2014 (OECD, 2015). According to the International Organisation for Migration, a number of 1,122,907 people have been travelling to Europe through various transit routes across Africa, Asia or the Middle East in 2015, of where a majority of them can be reckoned as asylum seekers (source: www.migration.iom.int/europe/). Comparatively, both sources stress the recent increase in irregular border crossings and together indicate the detected and undetected transit routes to Europe composing what is called a European refugee crisis.
JOURNEY OF THE IRREGULAR MIGRANT

The aspects mentioned in the last paragraph of the previous section can be explained by the journey of the irregular migrant, spatially and institutionally bound to the places or leaving, transit and arrival (King & Lulle, 2016). I will apply these stages to the European context where a share of the world’s displaced people are heading to, irregularly migrating to Europe and hoping to obtain a refugee status. On the left side I moreover explain the terms refugee, asylum seeker and asylee, which will be used throughout this thesis.

Leaving the place of origin

The incentive to undertake an extensive journey to apply for asylum in a specific number of European countries is instigated first and foremost by a need for protection. Jennissen (2011) pointed out that these (future) asylum migrants can find themselves in between a pro-active and responsive position. In a pro-active position they are acquainted or involved in political and economic processes and therefore may anticipate on a incoming crisis whereas in a responsive position migrants take their decision hastily and/or in times of severe threat.

Generally speaking, they are primarily fleeing for armed conflicts and continual violence of human rights; poverty, natural disaster, climate change and economic underdevelopment can also play a role (Jennissen, 2011). Historically the number of people fleeing to a safe place in the nearby region is around 70 to 80% (UNHCR, 2015a). Refugee camps play an important role in the accommodation of those fleeing their country (or region) of origin, providing shelter and a safe place. However, they usually do not provide them with the opportunity to fully participate in local society, prompting the often dangerous journey of these people to Europe. In that sense the second reason to irregularly move to a European country to apply for asylum is instigated by the expectation that their host country will offer them more opportunities to continue their everyday lives.

On the move through territories

This stage concerns the movement itself as to end up in a specific country: a safe place. Figure 9 illustrates the current (2015) movements taken by migrants illegally crossing the external border of the European Union and those of various countries. The most important factor to take in consideration is that the initial European Union country of arrival does not seem to be the country of applying for asylum. Jennissen (2011) pointed out that:

‘The course of action of asylum seekers in respect to the destination country is restrained by the availability of financial means, travel documents and transport options and moreover, frequently dependent on human traffickers’.

Thielemann (2003) has researched the key determinants of an asylum seeker’s choice of host country and extends this argument that:

‘some displaced persons will have little or no choice where they end up applying for asylum, as travel options might be limited or predetermined by existing trafficking routes and forced migrants might be under great time pressure to leave their country which does not give them sufficient time to weigh their options’.

It acknowledges that a constrained, irregular border crossing is part of asylum migration and followed from the strategies of European countries to control their territories (in collaboration), as described earlier.

However, Thielemann (2003) added that ‘other asylum seekers will have more time and the ability to choose where to apply for asylum’ and detected three main factors through extensive research of data from OECD countries. Firstly, legacies of migrant networks can act as a very strong magnet based on colonial histories of some countries and the existence of similar cultural groups or nationalities. Herein, ‘ties with friends of family are likely to prove very strong even in the face of a country’s not so welcoming regime.’

Asylum seeker

a person who submitted an asylum claim for refugee status in another country

Asylee

a collective name to qualify a person who is seeking or has been granted (political) asylum

n.b. term which will be used in this thesis to cover those living in an asylum centre

fig 7: four steps in the journey from irregular migrant to refugee
This is followed by the second main factor: employment opportunities. Countries with greater employment opportunities and with low unemployment levels are favoured. The UNHCR even suggested that a strong job market tends to be the most important determinant of flows for main refugee groups (2011). Less important, though significant, is the evidence that not allowing asylum seekers to work until their application indeed may influence their considerations (Thielemann, 2003).

Thirdly, the perception about the relative liberalness of a particular host country plays a major role. Other perceived factors such as geographical distance prove to be more limited in their effect than the above mentioned. Recent data analyses put forward by the OECD extends the latter argument by reporting that the average distance between destination and origin country has increased by 20% on average in the EU, compared to the inflows received in the early 1990s. Other perceived trends are that asylum seekers are very diverse in terms of country of origin, profile and motivation – more than in previous crises (OECD, 2015).

**Entering a destination country**

As the asylum migrants reach their final destination, travelling is substituted by going through formal procedures upon reception and at profound accommodation. The journey of the asylum migrant can be characterised by waiting; waiting to get acknowledged as a person in need for subsidiary protection i.e. the asylum procedure. These formal procedures in European countries vary heavily.

Nevertheless, in recent years, more and more European countries have distinctively established similar functioning asylum centres to receive and accommodate asylum migrants. Figure 8 illustrates this widespread and expanding spatial phenomenon and moreover indicates the existence of various types of accommodation. It is stated that asylees are accommodated in these centres in regard to their irregular movement and their status of missing a (local) passport and therefore spatially clustered in specific and targeted centres or even in prisons.

**Integration or expulsion**

As their journey continues by waiting on the (final) decision by the host state in the asylum centre, the answer of their asylum application can obviously be twofold. An affirmative answer entails a residence permit (refugee status) for a minimum of three years; a negative answer means expulsion aimed at a return, often instigated by deterrence and/or deportation. Seen in the context of the European Union the asylum acceptance rate per country diverges heavily and historically fluctuates.

Nevertheless, in all countries where the ones who received a (temporary) residence permit are considered to actively participate in their new country – mostly qualified by obtaining language skills and labour. New countrymen are to a certain extent helped by governments, NGOs and other volunteers in order to obtain housing, language skills and labour. The systems and the responsibilities in each country of the European Union also differ profoundly here.
Of the incoming group of asylum seekers not much data is collected or published – only general information about nationality, age and gender can be found. Asylum seekers have different cultural backgrounds and come from a variety of countries. In 2015, the vast share of the asylum seekers came from Syria and Eritrea. In figure 11 it is demonstrated that there is a number of nationalities which historically seen apply for asylum in the Netherlands over longer time periods, such as Iranians or Somalians. In general, asylum seekers are mostly in between 18 and 45 years old and there is a fifty-fifty ratio between singles – mostly male – and families. Children make up fifteen to twenty percent of the total number of asylum seekers. Of this group, a major part consists out of unaccompanied minors i.e. children who came to the Netherlands without their parents (COA, 2015).

Asylum centres

Profile of asylees in the Netherlands

In 2015 a total number of 43,090 asylum requests have been lodged to the Dutch Immigration and Naturalisation Office (IND); figure 10 sets out these numbers in historical perspective. The IND executes the assessment of asylum applications as a governmental executive organisation accountable to the national Minister of Security and Justice, and determines whether the asylum claim is substantiated and covered by the Geneva Convention. Eighty percent of the total 20,465 asylum requests handled (!) was followed by an affirmative answer from the IND (see fig. 12) Historical numbers demonstrate that more than half of the asylum seekers are granted protection and eligible to obtain Dutch citizenship (Grütters, 2003). Recent projections of the Dutch Office of Statistics (CBS) are even based on the presupposition that three out of four asylum seekers will be granted protection (Van Duin, Stoeldraijer, Nicolaas, Ooijevaar, & Sprangers, 2015). Of the incoming group of asylum seekers not much data is collected or published – only general information about nationality, age and gender can be found. Asylum seekers have different cultural backgrounds and come from a variety of countries. In 2015, the vast share of the asylum seekers came from Syria and Eritrea. In figure 11 it is demonstrated that there is a number of nationalities which historically seen apply for asylum in the Netherlands over longer time periods, such as Iranians or Somalians. In general, asylum seekers are mostly in between 18 and 45 years old and there is a fifty-fifty ratio between singles – mostly male – and families. Children make up fifteen to twenty percent of the total number of asylum seekers. Of this group, a major part consists out of unaccompanied minors i.e. children who came to the Netherlands without their parents (COA, 2015).
Asylum centres in the Netherlands fulfill several roles nowadays: they are not only used to receive asylum seekers in anticipation of their asylum application, but first and foremost they are used to accommodate those pending on the verdict of their request. In addition, a substantial number of people house in asylum centres who have obtained a residence permit (refugee status) and are awaiting or trying to obtain their own accommodation. At last, there are a few detention centres which provide limited stay for rejected asylum seekers awaiting return to their home country. By the end of 2015, a number of 48,360 people were accommodated in asylum centres. More than a third of these inhabitants have been granted permission to stay in the Netherlands via a residence permit (refugee status) for three or five years. The fact that not only asylum seekers live in asylum centres is the main reason why I use the term ‘asylee’ throughout this thesis.

The reception and accommodation of asylum seekers is a task of the ‘Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers’ (COA) – working as an administrative body of the Ministry of Security and Justice. Nowadays, a complete system of targeted accommodation has been established to execute this task. The increased influx of asylum seekers in recent years (2014, 2015) required short-term action to be endorsed by the COA. It involved the opening of new asylum centres and temporary accommodation. During the year 2015, the system worked as is illustrated in figure 14:

- Reception centres (COL), where asylum seekers need to register themselves. Asylum seekers only stay here for a maximum of three nights;
- Emergency centres, where after administration, asylum seekers reside a maximum of 72 hours and thereafter move to the next location. This could last for a couple of weeks. Contrary to other centres the municipality is responsible for the accommodation and the asylum seekers here;
- Temporary centres, where asylum seekers stay could take up to half a year. The general asylum procedure to assess the asylum application has not started yet in these two phases;
- Process reception centres (POL), in the vicinity of a COL, where asylum seekers are being prepared for the asylum procedure. Asylum seekers stay here for about three or four weeks;
- Asylum centres (AZC) where asylum seekers are waiting on their verdict or where permit holders (refugees) are waiting to obtain a house (for which the COA together with municipalities is seeking places for). Asylum seekers stay here for a maximum of six months. However, in reality it can take up to a year or even several years;
- Detention centres (VBL & GLO) where rejected asylum seekers are detained and prepared for their return. They must report their presence on a daily basis here;
- Regular housing, where permit holders are scattered over the country on the basis of a social distribution model determined by the number of permit holders municipalities need to accommodate each year. It means that established ties and preferences of the asylum seeker are hardly taken into account as permit holders can end up anywhere. Permit holders can deny their offered place but consequently lose the housing arrangement of the COA. In practice, it proves to be very difficult for permit holders to arrange housing themselves. (Geuijen, 2015; Michon, 2003; COA, 2015).

By the end of 2015 there were a number of 85 places where asylees were accommodated (emergency centres excluded). From here on I will use asylum centres as a frame for all these places of accommodation. Figure 15 shows the distribution of asylum centres over the Dutch territory with centres of different capacity. The large bullets indicate accommodation of 750 people or more, medium size bulletcs in between 300 and 750 people, and small ones under 300 people. White filled bullets mark new places of accommodation established in 2015. Overlapping bullets indicate a multiple function. For instance, POL location Ter Apel is also

---

**Table 1: Total occupation of asylum centres in the Netherlands (2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>1-6</th>
<th>1-7</th>
<th>1-8</th>
<th>1-9</th>
<th>1-10</th>
<th>1-11</th>
<th>1-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23,150</td>
<td>24,860</td>
<td>26,910</td>
<td>31,190</td>
<td>37,030</td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td>48,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which permit holders</td>
<td>11,910</td>
<td>11,940</td>
<td>12,330</td>
<td>12,430</td>
<td>14,090</td>
<td>15,690</td>
<td>15,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** COA
Fig. 14: Asylum system in the Netherlands in place and time

Fig. 15: Asylum centres in the Netherlands (2015) including temporary centres used to relieve the burden on asylum centres; asylum seekers might stay for half a year here.
used for the accommodation of asylum seekers (AZC) and rejected asylum seekers (VBL).

Asylees do not have a say in where they end up and several compulsory transfers seem to be standard for the inhabitants of asylum centres. Apart from the transfer from one asylum centre to the other corresponding to the function of that particular centre, asylees experience more than two transfers during their stay (Jennissen, 2011). Furthermore, asylees are not often inscribed in municipal registers instigated by the assumption that their stay is only ever temporary. This limits their mobility as one needs registration to join sport clubs for instance.

Also, adult asylum seekers are not entitled to follow education and hardly can obtain a regular job, constrained by various rules from the national government (Geuijen, 2015). In recent years more and more research had been carried out which focussed on the position of asylees in the Netherlands. Main fields of interest were the physical situation (health) and the participation in society with a mere focus on labour. From a sociological and economical perspective it is shown that the journey from the irregular migrant to refugee in the European context is linked to refugee in the European context is linked to the spatial expression of asylum in the form of targeted accommodation. It addressed that the institutionalization of the asylum via the accommodation and detention of asylum seekers have become a widespread phenomenon throughout the Schengen territory.

Korac (2003) approved this statement by arguing that ’a prolonged stay at asylum centres and how those accommodated are ’managed’ in the centres […] clearly do not facilitate the integration of those confined to them’. A stay longer than six months can lead to feelings of hospitalisation where the likelihood of taking initiative disappear (Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken, 2013; Michon, 2003; Vluchtelingwerk Nederland, 2014). Jennissen (2011) also concluded that opportunities to integrate in Dutch society are constrained. Among other indicators, the relatively low employment rate of refugees in the Netherlands may indicate that indeed the residence in the asylum centre is correlated to this fact (Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken, 2013).

The impact of the asylum centre
As stated above, the asylum centre can have a very deep impact on the lives of asylees. In conceptual sense the asylum centre form the link between irregular migrants and refugees. The in-between situation is spatially and conceptually expressed through the accommodation, its house rules and the length of the stay. Generally speaking, asylees reside about one or two years in asylum centres (see figure 16).

In recent years more and more research had been carried out which focussed on the position of asylees in the Netherlands. Main fields of interest were the physical situation (health) and the participation in society with a mere focus on labour. From a sociological and economical perspective it is shown that the journey from the irregular migrant to refugee in the European context is linked to the spatial expression of asylum in the form of targeted accommodation. It addressed that the institutionalization of the asylum via the accommodation and detention of asylum seekers have become a widespread phenomenon throughout the Schengen territory.

Korac (2003) approved this statement by arguing that ’a prolonged stay at asylum centres and how those accommodated are ’managed’ in the centres […] clearly do not facilitate the integration of those confined to them’. A stay longer than six months can lead to feelings of hospitalisation where the likelihood of taking initiative disappear (Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken, 2013; Michon, 2003; Vluchtelingwerk Nederland, 2014). Jennissen (2011) also concluded that opportunities to integrate in Dutch society are constrained. Among other indicators, the relatively low employment rate of refugees in the Netherlands may indicate that indeed the residence in the asylum centre is correlated to this fact (Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken, 2013).

Next to consequences for the quality of life and the integration of refugees, the stay in an asylum centre comes with health related problems such as high levels of stress, leading to high costs for medical care (Geuijen, 2015). Laban et. al (2008) found out that primarily the (long) asylum procedure and post-migration stressors can explain the increased prevalence of mental disorders by asylum seekers, rather than the traumas retained from experiences form their journey or former living situation. The researchers moreover reckon that there is probably no other group where social-spatial conditions have such a clear impact on health and functioning.

The analysis of the international context also has shown that the journey from the irregular migrant to refugee in the European context is linked through the spatial expression of asylum in the form of targeted accommodation. It addressed that the institutionalization of the asylum via the accommodation and detention of asylum seekers have become a widespread phenomenon throughout the Schengen territory.

In respect to their status as migrants which irregularly crossed border to apply for asylum, asylum seekers are clustered in asylum centres during their procedure. By divers range of authors it is argued that the asylum centre as place of arrival comes with detrimental effects in regard to the health situation of asylees and their possible future integration process. Whereas in recent years refugee camps have become a spatial entity being researched from a spatial viewpoint more and more – related to conflict regions – the asylum centre has received little attention within the domain of spatial planning and design (urbanism).

The understanding of the role that space plays is lacking, mainly on scale of the centre itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 jan ’10</th>
<th>2 jan ’10</th>
<th>1 jan ’11</th>
<th>2 jan ’11</th>
<th>1 jan ’12</th>
<th>2 jan ’12</th>
<th>1 jan ’13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 mind</td>
<td>3.466</td>
<td>2.773</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>1.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 mind</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>3.335</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 mind</td>
<td>4.416</td>
<td>4.736</td>
<td>3.772</td>
<td>3.445</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 jaar</td>
<td>5.444</td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td>4.639</td>
<td>4.534</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>2.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 jaar</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>2.304</td>
<td>2.158</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 jaar</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 jaar</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 jaar</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fig. 16: asylees duration of stay in Dutch asylum centres edited by author, source: Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken, 2013

PROBLEM STATEMENT
Followed from the analysis of the European and Dutch context in irregular migration and asylum, the journey upon arrival in a destination country seem to be founded on unclear normative foundations of European and national policies. It is characterized by the fact that there is hardly a legal and established way of applying for asylum in European countries, moreover in those not bordering the Schengen zone. It includes border controls, tailor-made asylum procedures and distinctive places of accommodation.

The understanding of the role that space plays is lacking, mainly on scale of the centre itself.
With these two notions in mind, I became interested in the strategies used to accommodate asylees in the Netherlands and in what seems the spatial form of these strategies: the asylum centre. I wanted to know what the interest and the role of the nation state is in the provision of specific asylum centres and how its inhabitants are affected by the spatial organisation of these places. I therefore seek to develop a sophisticated overview of the way how asylums are organised from a spatial planning and design point of view, working through various scale levels. Similar to the beginning of this thesis, this is carried out within the perspectives of the (Dutch) nation state and the asylee.

With an understanding of both perspectives and the knowledge of how asylum centres are designed, I subsequently aim to develop a more humane accommodation for asylum seekers by means of design. Making it more humane in the sense that the contemporary asylum centre proved to produce detrimental effects for its inhabitants - as was addressed in the problem field - , and that spatial interventions could improve their situation. The research question is therefore as followed (next page):

**PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

With these two notions in mind, I became interested in the strategies used to accommodate asylees in the Netherlands and in what seems the spatial form of these strategies: the asylum centre. I wanted to know what the interest and the role of the nation state is in the provision of specific asylum centres and how its inhabitants are affected by the spatial organisation of these places. I therefore seek to develop a sophisticated overview of the way how asylums are organised from a spatial planning and design point of view, working through various scale levels. Similar to the beginning of this thesis, this is carried out within the perspectives of the (Dutch) nation state and the asylee.

With an understanding of both perspectives and the knowledge of how asylum centres are designed, I subsequently aim to develop a more humane accommodation for asylum seekers by means of design. Making it more humane in the sense that the contemporary asylum centre proved to produce detrimental effects for its inhabitants - as was addressed in the problem field - , and that spatial interventions could improve their situation. The research question is therefore as followed (next page):

**RESEARCH QUESTION**

*How can a spatial regeneration of the asylum centre contribute to a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers in the Netherlands?*

**SUB QUESTIONS**

**Q1** What are the motivations of nation states to cluster asylum seekers in asylum centres?

**Q2** What is the spatial manifestation of asylum centres in the Netherlands?

**Q3** What is the conceptual form of the asylum centre and how is this reflected in Dutch asylum centres?

**Q4** What is the impact of the form of the asylum centre on its inhabitants?

**Q5** Where do the opportunities lie to provide a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers?
The research approach for this thesis can best be described as an exploratory case study. The search for a well-defined problem is inherently part of this thesis and it is structured by a further examination of the perspectives of clustering asylum seekers in distinctive accommodation. It can as well be reckoned as exploratory, because the objective to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the spatial side of asylum requires the search for key elements in the planning and design; it enables that research results do not necessarily follow up but often should be seen next to each other.

The methodological line of approach for this thesis can best be explained by analysing the main research question: How can a spatial regeneration of the asylum centre contribute to a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers in the Netherlands? It mainly consists of two parts: a spatial regeneration of the asylum centre, meaning the establishment of a sophisticated understanding of the form(s) of the contemporary asylum centre; and the way how this could contribute to a more humane accommodation, meaning the creation of a design. This thesis is primarily focused on the perspective of the nation state, which provides stays in asylum centres, and the perspective of the asylee, living in asylum centres. It inquires the normative sides of the asylum centre via observation (see ‘generation’). The comprehension part is finalised with a literature review on the assumed impact of the form on its inhabitants – i.e. seen from the perspective of the asylee – which results in an expansion of the problems addressed in the problem field of this thesis.

Generation

The analytic component of this thesis is covered by the generation part. Here the knowledge from the comprehension part is tested and the form of asylum centres in the Netherlands is analysed. First, it briefly examines with policy documents and my own observation the way how asylum centres are planned. Then a case study will be carried out on the basis of the framework established in ‘comprehension’. Methods of research are (consequently) the analysis of policy documents, site visits, typo-morphological analysis and small informal interviews with inhabitants. I aim to identify similarities and differences between asylum centres and to determine spatial elements which are essential in understanding how asylum centres are organised.

Regeneration

In the regeneration part of this thesis I aim to provide the form of the asylum centre and the assumed impact of this form on its inhabitants. As mentioned before, there is no such thing as an asylum (centre) typology, meaning that I have educated myself with works from other disciplines such as social and political geography, philosophy and sociology to understand the form asylum centres. The comprehension part consists of three sections. In the first section I will review the motivations of nation states to cluster asylum seekers in distinctive accommodation. Subsequently, I will build up a framework to analyse its specific form. Through a conceptualisation of its form, I aim to establish ways to analyse the contemporary asylum centre via observation (see ‘generation’). The comprehension part is finalised with a literature review on the assumed impact of the form on its inhabitants – i.e. seen from the perspective of the asylee – which results in an expansion of the problems addressed in the problem field of this thesis.

Fig. 17: scheme of research approach

An more human accommodation of asylum seekers by of design. It is important to realise that the comprehension and generation part of this thesis are merely used to develop a sophisticated understanding of the way how asylum is organised from a spatial viewpoint, in conjunction with the first research objective. As the previous chapters alone will not provide a theoretical or analytical basis of know-how to (re)design an asylum centre, the generation part is consequently a personal translation of the knowledge into a concrete proposal. By research-by-design I will work on the redesign of the case studies from the generation part, revealing where the opportunities lie to envision this.
how this space is organised is hereby altered. As the
obstacles that come with the process of gradual
adaptation, attention and planning for a group like this
is relevant for the urban planning and design practice
because they are in need for support to acquire a place
within the socio-spatial context. Also, the UNHCR
(United Nations Refugee Agency) and the ECRC
(European Council on Refugees and Exile) stress the
importance of the search for adequate solutions for the
reception of asylum seekers and the establishment of a
vision regarding the long-term integration of refugees.

As described in the problem field, research from the
social sciences has demonstrated that the position of
asylees is unfavourable in respect to their health
condition and a preparation for Dutch society. To
date, however, there is hardly a comprehensive
understanding of the socio-spatial strategies to receive
and accommodate asylum seekers in the Netherlands.
Linking the place of asylum and the institution of
asylum can give a meaningful insight in the often
canonical arguments to cluster asylum migrants in
specific places. It might also contribute to an increased
awareness of the way how we deal with the coming of
a group of strangers in society.

Academic relevance
The starting point of this thesis stems from the belief
that the opportunities for asylees can be improved. To
date, there is hardly an overview or understanding of
how the spatial aspects of asylum centres influence the
deprived situation of its inhabitants. As followed from
the project objectives, this thesis aims to contribute to
a comprehensive and increasing understanding of the
way how asylum is organised from a spatial planning
and design point of view including the rationale
behind the clustering of asylees - i.e. combining the
socio-spatial context with the political context.

Within the domain of urbanism the concept of
inclusive cities is of key interest for the planning and
design of sustainable living environments. Inclusive
cities represent a desirable spatial context where there
is place for all groups in society. This graduation
thesis specifically focuses on the socio-spatial context
of asylees on the Dutch territory. In the fields of
European politics, (inter)national law and geography
a substantial number of research is carried out into
the policies to accommodate this very diverse group.
However, in the urban planning and design practice
this thematic has not received a lot of attention yet.
And if so, its focus lies on the planning and design on
smart short-term solutions.

Through a concern about spatial quality and spatial
development this project investigates the spatial
implications of strategies to receive and accommodate
asylees. It adheres to the notion that giving asylum is
intrinsically part of the socio-spatial reality of a
country like the Netherlands. In other words, it is
not thought of as a temporary composition, but as a
permanent condition in the socio-spatial reality. In the
introduction and the problem field it was shown that
current (unintended outcomes of) strategies are highly
spatial.

The contribution of this project in the urban planning
and design discipline lies in the idea that not only space
is (re)produced by its constitutional context but also
vice versa. In other words, spaces become places under
constant influence of human behaviour and whether it
concerns planning/design or usage, the relation with
how this space is organised is hereby altered. As the
legal framework for asylees appears to be ultimately
framed by the nation-state, it is therefore interesting
to see how spatial regeneration of the asylum centre
can influence how this system could work differently.

Link to the Urbanism research programme
The Complex Cities research programme of the
TU Delft aims to 'investigate the role of Urbanism in
complex situations (...) in the context of
internationalisation' and to 'acknowledge and
emphasize relations among design, planning and
politics'. Its researchers 'share an interest in the role
that Urbanism has in resolving problems under
complex spatial and societal circumstances and in the
context of internationalisation'. It provides three main
graduation studios in the form of inclusive, global
and happy cities. Although my project is not covered
by any of these specifically, it addresses and also
investigates the (potential) role of Urbanism in the
very political and complex nature of the asylum centre
in the Netherlands facing an internationalisation of
fleeting. It furthermore touches upon the very own
way of planning centres, where architects or urban
planners are rarely involved.

Furthermore, the specific interest in social sciences of
the research programme can be linked to my project
which touches upon the complexity of integration, in
relation to space. The project therefore adheres to the
concept of inclusiveness, so vital for the integration of
newcomers.

Societal relevance
This research and design project adheres to a
vulnerable group of people in claim for a place in a
society unknown to them. Regarding the constant
uncertainties that come with their journey
and the obstacles that come with the process of gradual
adaptation, attention and planning for a group like this
is relevant for the urban planning and design practice
because they are in need for support to acquire a place
within the socio-spatial context. Also, the UNHCR
(United Nations Refugee Agency) and the ECRC
(European Council on Refugees and Exile) stress the
importance of the search for adequate solutions for the
reception of asylum seekers and the establishment of a
vision regarding the long-term integration of refugees.

As described in the problem field, research from the
social sciences has demonstrated that the position of
asylees is unfavourable in respect to their health
condition and a preparation for Dutch society. To
date, however, there is hardly a comprehensive
understanding of the socio-spatial strategies to receive
and accommodate asylum seekers in the Netherlands.
Linking the place of asylum and the institution of
asylum can give a meaningful insight in the often
canonical arguments to cluster asylum migrants in
specific places. It might also contribute to an increased
awareness of the way how we deal with the coming of
a group of strangers in society.

Academic relevance
The starting point of this thesis stems from the belief
that the opportunities for asylees can be improved. To
date, there is hardly an overview or understanding of
how the spatial aspects of asylum centres influence the
deprived situation of its inhabitants. As followed from
the project objectives, this thesis aims to contribute to
a comprehensive and increasing understanding of the
way how asylum is organised from a spatial planning
and design point of view including the rationale
behind the clustering of asylees - i.e. combining the
socio-spatial context with the political context.

Within the domain of urbanism the concept of
inclusive cities is of key interest for the planning and
design of sustainable living environments. Inclusive
cities represent a desirable spatial context where there
is place for all groups in society. This graduation
thesis specifically focuses on the socio-spatial context
of asylees on the Dutch territory. In the fields of
European politics, (inter)national law and geography
a substantial number of research is carried out into
the policies to accommodate this very diverse group.
However, in the urban planning and design practice
this thematic has not received a lot of attention yet.
And if so, its focus lies on the planning and design on
smart short-term solutions.

Through a concern about spatial quality and spatial
development this project investigates the spatial
implications of strategies to receive and accommodate
asylees. It adheres to the notion that giving asylum is
intrinsically part of the socio-spatial reality of a
country like the Netherlands. In other words, it is
not thought of as a temporary composition, but as a
permanent condition in the socio-spatial reality. In the
introduction and the problem field it was shown that
current (unintended outcomes of) strategies are highly
spatial.

The contribution of this project in the urban planning
and design discipline lies in the idea that not only space
is (re)produced by its constitutional context but also
vice versa. In other words, spaces become places under
constant influence of human behaviour and whether it
concerns planning/design or usage, the relation with
how this space is organised is hereby altered. As the
legal framework for asylees appears to be ultimately
framed by the nation-state, it is therefore interesting
to see how spatial regeneration of the asylum centre
can influence how this system could work differently.

Link to the Urbanism research programme
The Complex Cities research programme of the
TU Delft aims to 'investigate the role of Urbanism in
complex situations (...) in the context of
internationalisation' and to 'acknowledge and
emphasize relations among design, planning and
politics'. Its researchers 'share an interest in the role
that Urbanism has in resolving problems under
complex spatial and societal circumstances and in the
context of internationalisation'. It provides three main
graduation studios in the form of inclusive, global
and happy cities. Although my project is not covered
by any of these specifically, it addresses and also
investigates the (potential) role of Urbanism in the
very political and complex nature of the asylum centre
in the Netherlands facing an internationalisation of
fleeting. It furthermore touches upon the very own
way of planning centres, where architects or urban
planners are rarely involved.

Furthermore, the specific interest in social sciences of
the research programme can be linked to my project
which touches upon the complexity of integration, in
relation to space. The project therefore adheres to the
concept of inclusiveness, so vital for the integration of
newcomers.

(RELEVANCE)

The asylum centre has become part of the Dutch
landscape, as recent decades have proven, instigated by
using asylum centres as a way to control immigration
by the nation state. The difference between a refugee
camp and an asylum centre is that today one should be
allowed to talk about the future of the asylum centre,
because it has become part of our society, of our home
territories, compared to a refugee camp, as Dadaab in
Kenia – constructed in 1992 and currently housing
329.811 people – where it is almost forbidden to talk
about permanence. Furthermore, historical numbers
demonstrate that more than half of the asylum seekers
is granted protection and following the possibility to
obtain Dutch citizenship (Grütters, 2003). Recent
projections of the Dutch Office of Statistics (CBS)
are even based on the presupposition that three out of
four asylum seekers will be granted protection (Van
Duin, Stoeldraijer, Nicolaas, Ooijevaar, & Sprangers,
2015).

Furthermore, the specific interest in social sciences of
the research programme can be linked to my project
which touches upon the complexity of integration, in
relation to space. The project therefore adheres to the
concept of inclusiveness, so vital for the integration of
newcomers.

(Darling, 2011): ‘demands both a focus on addressing the ways in
which asylum is conditioned as an issue of security
and threat and a concern with working on the more
everyday activities, performances and practices which
recreate the marginality of asylum seekers’
COMPREHENSION

Motivations of nation states to cluster asylum seekers / conceptualisation of asylum centres / assumed impact of form on its inhabitants / conclusions
MOTIVATIONS OF NATION STATES TO CLUSTER ASYLUM SEEKERS

In the following chapter I inquire the normative perspectives on asylum and asylees from a governmental viewpoint. I try to seek an answer on the question what the motivations are to accommodate asylum seekers (asylees) in asylum centres.

Background of refugee protection

In 1951 the Convention of Geneva was constituted, giving a legal and political basis for the right of protection. At the time, it aimed to protect displaced people on the European continent in the aftermath of the World War II which was accompanied with forced migrations and enormous exodus of people. In 1967 its scope was expanded as the problem of displacement spread around the world and The New York amendment ensured a worldwide protocol for displaced people by a definition of the term refugee:

“a person who is outside his or her country of nationality or habitual residence, has a well-founded fear of being persecuted because of his or her race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion; and is unable or unwilling to avail him – or herself of the protection of that country, or to return there, for fear of persecution” (UNHCR, 2011)

The right to be granted protection has been recorded in this convention and protocol and instigated that those applying for protection are called asylum seekers and that those granted this protection are called refugees. The protocol covers both political constructs and defines whether he/she is a refugee and the kind of legal protection, other assistance and social rights asylum seekers and refugees are entitled to receive. It also defines their obligations to host countries and specifies certain categories of people, such as war criminals, who do not qualify for refugee status. Nowadays, among more than 140 countries – including the Netherlands – have signed the convention and therefore committed to give asylum for those fleeing persecution (UNHCR, 2011).

Protecting refugees is therefore a primarily responsibility of nation states and it requires that states designate central authority with relevant expertise and knowledge to assess applications, ensure that procedural safeguards are available at all stages of the process and permit appeals or reviews of initial decisions. It moreover contained other rights including ‘the right to housing’, ‘the right to freedom of movement within the territory’ and ‘the right to work’ (UNHCR, 2011). Each country nevertheless has the freedom to interpret these legislations. For instance, in most countries the right to work is received after in most countries the right to work is received after

The right to asylum established in the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol in order to ensure that the rights of refugees are respected and protected (UNHCR, 2011). The construction of refugee camps can be seen as a threat to nationally cohesively ordered space and identity, since the other is now inside.”

In contrary, the arrival of asylum seekers is more and more conceived as a security issue of national order.

Categorization & selective openness

In the problem field it was shown that the Schengen Treaty created one vast external border of the European Union and a common territory where since then moving freely through its territory became possible. However, this territory is not accompanied with a common and European Union wide immigration policy and every country carries out its own legislations. It moreover means that, although a few successful attempts to harmonize nation states asylum systems, every country interpret the legislations that come with the 1951 Convention in its very own way. It therefore can cause discrepancies between nation states in the sense that the other country is prepared to give a specific asylum seeker a protection and another one is not.

The Treaty of Dublin has been established to prevent an applicant from submitting applications in multiple Member States. It furthermore stated that the first country of arrival is responsible for the asylum request. As a consequence, this has resulted in a tension between the Geneva Convention and emerging territories. It has created a competition among (some) EU member states to discourage asylum seekers to apply for protection in their country. This has only been amplified by the contemporary wave of people seeking asylum in Europe fleeing current hot beds in the world. Moreover, the capability to control its physical border, under responsibility of the nation states at the frontiers of the EU (Schengen Zone) and the FRONTEX (European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders), has proven to be very difficult and therefore increases the above mentioned tension even more. In this respect, it is interesting to know how the territorial borders of nation states are governed with the knowledge that the geographical border has become obsolete.

Van Houtum & Van Naerssen (2002) and Darling (2011) argued that territorial borders are still used as key strategies to objectify space. Moreover, that it has in many senses assumed even greater significance to the nation-state. It is shown that the Netherlands, as other (western) European countries, govern their borders to attract beneficial foreign economic resources, securing safety (terrorism threats) and preventing abundant immigration. It also means that a constant reframing of immigration policies takes place in response to these perceived threats or advantages. On the basis of categorization, the Dutch state wields a kind of selective openness in order to determine whether newcomers might be beneficial or a possible burden. Only those who are seen as beneficial, such as high skilled workers or seasonal, agricultural workers, are able to apply for a (temporary) residence permit. Tailor-made policies have been established to attract specifically high skilled workers, entrepreneurs or students which are seen as advantageous for Dutch society (van Houtum & Van Naerssen, 2002). The Dutch Immigration and Naturalisation Office (IND) accounts for these immigration policies and illustrates this by mentioning that ‘a migrant who is able and is willing to contribute to the Dutch economy, culture or academia, can get easier access to the Netherlands’ (IND Immigratie, n.d.). In contrary, the arrival of asylum seekers is more and more conceived as a security issue of national order.

The right to asylum established in the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol nevertheless used to form an exception to the ability to control the entrance of ‘the other’ or the grant to access its territory. The irregular arrivals of asylum seekers into the territory of the host country here must not be seen as a criminal offense according to the Convention and they should be offered initial protection in both physical and non-physical (juridical, educational
etc.) sense by those seeking it. By the words of Van Houtum & Van Naerssen (2002) the tension between the economic immigrants that are invited and the immigrants seeking (economic or political) asylum is rising:

“what is produced as a template for admission will eventually be reproduced by those who wish to enter, thereby making the arbitrary line between economic and political asylum even thinner.”

Since the number of asylum seekers applying for asylum has grown in Europe since the 1980s, the role of asylum as a political construct thus has evolved, as perfectly described in an analysis of Oudejans (2011):

“Refugee protection has suffered a tremendous set-back, as the emphasis shifted from protection to immigration control. Under the pretext of combating and containing ‘illegal’ immigration, states have resorted to the means of immigration control in order to prevent the unauthorized entry of asylum seekers and/or prevent the illegal stay of rejected asylum seekers. The corollary thereof is that refugee protection more and more translates as an issue of immigration control.”

Asylum therefore has become part of increased categorization of people and one of the faces of the seemingly ongoing competition among EU member states to discourage asylum seekers to apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life. Asylum centres are places of clustering for those that apply for refugee status and its aim is to postpone Dutch asylum seekers in their daily life.
CONCEPTUALISATION OF ASYLUM CENTRES

Now I have established a firm theoretical background on the motivations to cluster asylum seekers in asylum centres, this chapter is used to build up a framework to analyse the specific form of the asylum centre as a mode of territorial control. As there is no such thing as an asylum centre typology, the form of the asylum centre is explained by two key concepts: camps and total institutions. The aim of this chapter is to substitute the spatial analysis of the following case studies (in ‘generation’).

‘A camp is an extraterritorial enclave on national territory, a locus of exclusion and concentration.’ (De Cauter, 2001)

‘A total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life’ (Goffman (1963) as cited in (Van der Horst, 2004))

The camp

The establishment of asylum centres in European context and the form which was/is given to these places occurred as a consequence of displacement. The asylum centre can be characterized camp as it gave spatial arrangement to displacement in the form of clustering those seeking protection, in this case asylum seekers (Oudejans, 2011).

According to De Cauter & Dehaene (2008) the asylum centre displays a camp situation in which disintegration of society into the state of exception – not (yet) belonging to the national order – becomes the rule. In legal sense asylum seekers do not belong to the host country nor to the place where they come from:

‘the fact that he is neither here nor there but nowhere, materializes into the nowhere of the camp’ (Oudejans, 2011, pp. 60, 61)

It makes the asylum centre a non-place in optima forma which breaks down any political relationship between territory and people, becoming the form of localization for those who do not belong (Petti, 2012).

“The birth of the camp calls into question the very idea of the city as a democratic space. If the political representation of a citizen is to be found in the public space, what is found in the camp is its inverse, the place in which a citizen is stripped of his or her political rights, reduced to bare life. In this sense, the camp represents a sort of anti-city.” (Petti, 2015)

This bare life means that asylum seekers do not have political agency and are in a vulnerable position. It creates a suspension of the private and public sphere, an inherent feature in any city space (de Cauter & Dehaene, 2008). The sovereign state (the nation state) here ‘creates bare life in order to defend the security, health, and well-being of society – treating [asylum seekers] as potential enemies and outsiders for sustaining its sovereignty’ where they ‘are excluded from their society and political being’ (Bedir, 2014). The camp as means to execute control over the entrance of asylum seekers into a nation-state is therefore utterly spatial and excludes people by inclusion.

The camp is for the inhabitant as well as for the sovereign also a transient space. The transient and extraordinary or exceptional element of the asylum centre follows the lines of encampment. Although asylum centres and refugee camps are both manifestations of a camp it can be argued that they partially differ in their evolving nature. Refugee camps mostly come under the face of the UNHCR whereas asylum centres are managed by sovereign nation states. And although many refugee camps exist for many years, the shift from the management of camps in the name of emergency towards the political recognition of their enduring reality does not take place (Agier, 2002).

Opposed to that, the asylum system (in Europe) comes with the opportunity to obtain a proper house and almost the same level of rights that natives are disposed of. It offers a future so desired by asylum seekers whereas refugee camps often do not offer that speck on the horizon, nor a place which you can call your own and are merely spaces of pure waiting without a subject (Agier, 2002).

This brief but profound description of asylum centres hereby contributes to a first understanding of its conceptual nature. It raises questions on the way how the asylum centre is spatially organised. Namely, it comes with the question how the exclusion by inclusion is organised and moreover, how it relates to its surroundings. How is the border between these two ‘worlds’ expressed? What forms of exchange (people, production etc.) exist between them? What is the spatial model of accommodation in asylum centres? Is there one?

As mentioned before, the asylum centre can be considered as a place to put of belonging. But at the
1. All activities take place within the limits of the institution, where individuals tend to sleep, play, work, and entertain and where there is an overall rationale behind the design of the organization. These activities are physically separated from those who are not part of the institution.

2. The total institution is a separate entity, an independent world where the social engagement of the individual with the outside world is limited and in some cases non-existent.

3. The place given to the work of those individuals who are institutionalized is the institution itself. In these cases work is not aimed at earning income, as all the basic needs are covered within the institution. The motivation behind working is mostly a recreational motivation, to pass the time.

4. The lack of employment leads to a general feeling of boredom or, as Goffman refers to it, “omnipresence of boredom.” There might not be enough work for the residents or there simply is no motivation to take part in any activity.

5. There is a separation between those living in the institution and those working for it. The separation between the inmates and the staff is marked and mobility between groups is nearly non-existent.

The manifestation of total institutions as separate entities in socio-spatial reality can come with different patterns of accessibility. Prisons as well as elderly homes are defined as total institutions. The mobility of prisoners and to a lesser extent its visitors, are highly restricted whereas the residents of an elderly home can freely move in and out. Michon (2003) argued that among the various types of total institutions worked out by Goffman, both functional as descriptive, asylum centres are:

• designed for asylum seekers seen as needy and compliant people; this is expressed by providing them with basic needs and their dependency of it
• institutions that have been established in order to better carry out the assessment of asylum applications and who derive their raison d’être of this instrumental function; this is the perspective of the nation state as described in the previous chapter
• places with a certain coercive nature as the residence is compulsory; this is invoked by the fact that length of stay is unknown for a resident

Here, (communal) spaces are furthermore kept apolitical and acultural (also irreligious). In this sense its residents are required to conform to a regime with its own particular rules and regulations, stripped of the dignity of self-determination and constantly aware of the possibility of sanctions if they fail to comply (Tsai, 2010).
The characterisation of asylum centres as camps and total institutions raised questions about form. The conceptualisation of the asylum centre is hence finalised with a translation of these questions into a set of spatial principles. The result is a set of concrete aspects which can be used to analyse different asylum centres in the Netherlands (case study). All together the spatial principles have to be understood as a hypothesis on how to analyse the functioning of asylum centres. I briefly dwell upon each of the spatial principles here:

**Spatial principles**

The relation between asylum centre and its surroundings on large scale

Spatial means which defines border between asylum centre and surroundings

Spatial means which defines accessibility

The organisation of spaces determined by separation between inhabitants and staff and control over inhabitants’ spaces by the latter group

Possible transience of the asylum centre expressed in materiality and type of building(s)

Relation between asylum centre and its surroundings by means of usage of functions by asylees outside the asylum centre, by means of level of activity within and outside the asylum centre & by means of proximity of (vivid) public spaces

The arrangement of privacy on the basis of Habraken’s concept of territorial depth defined as a measuring of ‘the number of boundary crossings needed to move from the outer space to the innermost territory’; revealing the bordering of spaces and its vernacular character according to Habraken (2000)

Organization of spaces defined by separation between inhabitants and staff and control over inhabitants’ spaces by the latter group

fig. 19: conceptualization of asylum centres as camps and total institutions translated into spatial principles for analysis
various literature works (Geuijen, 2015; Laruina & Ghorashi 2016; Michon, 2003). Michon (2003) added that larger asylum centres even amplify the process of hospitalisation.

Asylum centre as camps and total institutions entails a normalisation of the residents’ situation. It means that asylees in these centres are not seen as valuable individuals with their own talents, cultural differences and habits, but as people to be transferred back to their country or as people in a certain stage of their asylum procedure. This results in a very limited opportunity for self-expression and inhabitants therefore also may encounter a loss of cultural identity. As both forms also involve a merging - or even a suspension - of private and public spheres, as activities are often performed in shared spaces for instance, privacy of inhabitants is often impeded.

Before finalising this chapter, it has to be understood that the assumed impact of the form of asylum centres on its residents might not often be caused by its form but rather is expressed by its form. For instance, legal restrictions set up by nation states make it difficult for asylees to obtain a regular job. This leads to a situation where inhabitants execute small jobs in asylum centres and thus contribute to the asylum centre as total institution.

Nonetheless, the question of how it is organised in practice is still unanswered. The next part of this thesis therefore investigates the spatial form of asylum centres in the Netherlands.
GENERATION

institutional setting and planning of asylum centres / case studies: Dronten / Winterswijk / Utrecht / comparison of cases
Asylum centres in the Netherlands fall under the responsibility of the COA, the Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers (COA). It functions as an independent administrative body which gives account for its operations to the Ministry of Security and Justice. The assessment of asylum applications is executed by the Dutch Immigration and Naturalisation Office (IND), a governmental executive organisation accountable to the national Minister of Security and Justice, which determines whether the asylum claim is substantiated and covered by the Geneva Convention.

The relationship between the COA, IND and the asylee is illustrated in figures 20 & 21. It is shown that the claim of the asylum seeker is directed towards the IND as part of the Ministry of Justice. The arrival and accommodation of asylum seekers and the outflow of permit holders (those with a refugee status) and rejected asylum seekers on the other hand fall under the responsibility of the COA. Its role is defined as to ‘ensure in a professional manner that people in a vulnerable position are accommodated and supported in a safe and liveable environment in a manner that ensures that the reception of aliens remains controllable for politicians and society and enables us to give account for our acts’ (COA, 2015a).

In practice, the main tasks of the COA can be divided along two lines. A managerial one: the COA as a planning body keeping up its accommodation stock and taking care of the flows of people. A caring and controlling one: the COA as an organisation responsible for the daily life of asylum seekers within the asylum centres. The first task is most relevant in this part of the research.

The mantra which is used to conceive the accommodation is ‘sober but humane’, setting the standard on minimum, comparable to Dutch citizens entitled to social security (Geuijen, 2015).

The policies plan ‘Ruimtelijk Programma van Eisen Opvanglocaties’ of the COA established by Wender (2012) contains a number of spatial requirements for new asylum centres. I encountered that spatial demands for the various types of asylum centres do not differ substantially. All should be accommodated with interior spaces for COA and IND employees and with living and communal units for the inhabitants. Most important demand is that asylum centres should be able to accommodate a minimum of 400 people up to a maximum of 1500. Other requirements are often instigated by having a degree of (territorial) control: asylum centres need to be fenced and have one safeguarded and central entrance and exit with a 24/h security desk. The exterior space needs to be open and clear in order to control the safety level, or when not possible, surveillance cameras need to be put up.

Only few spatial demands are directed towards the needs of the inhabitants. Moreover, these demands are often called ‘guidelines’ which indicates that there is room for interpretation. Rooms for two persons
place characteristics are represented based on own observations and information provided by the COA (COA, 2015b). It shows that the current stock is very diverse in regard to the type of buildings used, ranging from former military barracks, holiday bungalows, hotels, monasteries, prisons and (temporary) tailor-made units. Only a few are purposely built to function as an asylum centre and only a handful in a permanent way. It also displays that only few asylum centres are situated for a longer period of time (> ten years).

Altogether, these analyses demonstrate that asylum centres can almost be located anywhere. The COA seems not to possess the means to determine or propose new locations for asylum centres. Nor does it has a spatial strategy to in order to do so.

In order to obtain a more detailed understanding of form of the asylum centres, the next chapter of the generation part contains a case study analysis of three asylum centres.

are preferred above larger rooms but four persons are. Most important guidelines are to have one or two person bedrooms and to have a minimum of 5 square meter of space per inhabitant. Another guideline is that it should be relatively accessible by public transport and near adequate facilities such as supermarkets and schools (Wender, 2012). Relatively accessible means: not more than a 30 minutes’ walk. The report also contains spatial demands especially for children or younger adults: asylum centres need to have a playground, a youth centre and computer and homework rooms. At last, it suggests guidelines for the spatial configuration of the asylum centre, as can be seen in fig. 23. The very simplistic projection reflects in my opinion the few spatial demands of the COA and its managerial way of working.

The COA aims to distribute asylum seekers evenly over the country (Wender, 2012). In reality, the asylum centres are to a great extent located in the north, east and the very south of the Netherlands. In the most populated areas (Randstad, west of the Netherlands) the number of asylum centres is very limited. The COA is prepared to rent out buildings for a minimum of two years and today the vast part of the accommodations are rented. Currently, a (minimum) number of 21 lease contracts will expire within a period of five years. (’Opvanglocaties coa’, 2015). The only instrument of the COA in the planning of asylum centres is a communicative one: it approaches municipalities with the question whether they would be prepared to accommodate asylum seekers. In this part of the planning process merely these two actors are involved. The municipality itself is responsible for the implementation in the environment and thus with contacts with private parties and local inhabitants. It means that the COA is completely dependent on the preparedness of municipalities to host an asylum centre.

Having all this in mind, I developed a complete visual overview of all the asylum centres in the Netherlands (by November 2015). In figure 24 a handful of
fig. 24: classification of asylum centres (2015) by own observations
CASE STUDIES

In the case study analysis three asylum centres are chosen to apply the principles established in ‘comprehension’. The choice is first and foremost instigated by a presupposition of the degree of isolation that these asylum centres display, as ultimate expression of a camp and total institution. I chose to investigate three ‘regular’ asylum centres as this function is most prevalent. Dronten, Winterswijk and Utrecht are respectively researched in depth. They are situated in an agricultural, village-like/sub-urban, and urban setting, vary in size and building type and accordingly spatial outlook.

The asylum centre in Dronten is one of the most isolated centres in the Netherlands and situated far from other habitation. It was redeveloped a few years ago and is therefore even more interesting to research. According to the Mayor of Dronten it functions ‘just like every other neighbourhood’ (http://nos.nl/artikel/2084515-ons-azc-in-dronten-is-een-gewone-woonwijk.html). The asylum centre in Winterswijk is according to the COA website ‘part of [local] neighbourhood Oostervoort’ (COA, 2015b) begging the question in what this ‘part of’ means and how this is designed. First brief observation is that it is one of the few asylum centres without a fence. Contrary to the asylum centre in Dronten the one (researched) in Utrecht may be the complete opposite. It lies close to the city centre and is one of the few asylum centres in the larger cities of the Netherlands.

I deliberately chose to investigate these ‘long-standing’ asylum centres because I wanted to know more about the functional relations between the centre and the context, and not only in current times of increased influx of asylees. The following analysis of the case studies is executed in the order as described above. Important to realize is that I was not allowed to take pictures with people instigated by privacy concerns.

fig. 25: site and location characteristics of three cases Dronten, Winterswijk & Utrecht
Fig. 26: Aerial picture of asylum centre in Dronten.
The asylum centre of Dronten is situated in a typical Dutch polder area with planted forestry and vast open agricultural land including large scale farms. The initial opening took place in 1994 with the transformation of a vacant holiday park into one of the first large scale asylum centres in the Netherlands. In 2012 the terrain was redesigned after negotiations between the real estate division of the COA, the municipality of Dronten and some employees of the centre itself. A large building company and architects were involved in the planning and design. It is designed to accommodate up to 1000 asylees in 134 units spread out over the terrain. In 2014 four large and temporary units have been placed to raise the number of accommodation to 1300. Upon visit (25-02-2016) about 300 residents are in the possession of a Dutch residents permit and entitled to leave the asylum centre and will upon the moment suitable housing is found. Another 300 residents has not started the general asylum procedure yet. Of the 700 (other) asylum seekers, 100 are of minor age and stay in a separate cluster in the centre (purple coloured in ‘cluster’ image, fig. 33 on page 67).
1. entrance path from public space
2. route from bus stop at the dike (500 m. walk) along regional road to asylum centre
3. fenced terrain with special entrance for cars of staff
4. asylum centre is hardly visible from adjacent road
5. reception building with security guards and staff, public interior space is surrounded by locked doors to staff spaces
6. hidden (pedestrian) entrance from regional road
7. holiday park lay-out: wide design of exterior spaces and new wooden bungalows
8. holiday park like street sign
9. holiday park lay-out, here with brick bungalows
10. primary school for children asylees and permit holders on terrain of asylum centre
11. temporary barracks with corridor entrances - 4 in total accommodating around 300 persons
12. building with rooms for staff upstairs, not accessible for inhabitants

fig 30: pictures of asylum centre in Dronten
Entering the terrain

The location of the asylum centre is very isolated: it is ten kilometres to the town of Dronten and about five to reach the closest town Kampen. The adjacent regional road is mainly used for commuting and distribution by trucks. Next to the roundabout, one can find the bus stop where busses to Kampen and Dronten go by every half an hour during daytime. From up here it is a 500 metre walk to the pedestrian entrance of the asylum centre. Originally a cycle path, the route to the asylum centre is now mainly used by asylees. From the road and the path one cannot derive that an asylum centre is nearby. The centre is hardly visible from the road and is separated by a low fence, a ditch and a zone of dense shrubbery and large trees. No signs indicate the entrance and it makes it almost unseen.

Going in and out the centre happens through a narrow and fenced entrance path sided by the reception desk. It forms the focal point of activity in the asylum centre: it is the place where new asylum seeker coming in, asylees collect their post, frequently ask questions to COA employees, need to wait for conversations with the alien police or the COA and where visitors are entitled to report upon entering the terrain. The interior of the reception hall is bordered with locked doors to the rooms of the staff which can be found in the rest of the building. The more than seventy staff members include security guards, training and civic education managers, teachers, psychologists, nurses, location managers etc. Almost every staff member carries a radio transmitter and large bunch of keys. They can open every door with it, including the doors of the 134 units scattered over the terrain.

Facilities

The amenities for the residents are clustered at the south side of the terrain and illustrated in figure T. It resembles a small village with its own school, small library and several recreation facilities. Even most medical care is given on the terrain of the asylum centre. Once a week a mobile truck exposing groceries comes by – run by a former resident of the terrain – to supply residents with ingredients which cannot to be found in the stores of Kampen. Volunteers from mostly Christian organisations provide some extra activities in common spaces. Religious or cultural specific expressions at the other hand are absent in common spaces on command of the COA.

The terrain is very lively and vivid. Children play on the school’s playground, residents walk back and forth over the terrain and small talks (and conflicts) occur in the corridors of the temporary buildings and at the front of the bungalows.

According to the assistant location manager I spoke to residents often pass the days on the terrain of the asylum centre. A number of hundred residents execute small job tasks such as cleaning or surveying, managed and directed by the staff. Most of the others make use of the facilities provided. Leaving really depends on the willingness and mobility of residents. Shopping (groceries) in Kampen can be considered as their primary motivation of leaving. Other trips are aimed to meet family or close friends who already live in the Netherlands: often they are picked up by their cars near the bus stop. Most residents do not possess a bike which means that walking is their primary mode of transportation in an area with very low activity.

Living units

Residents live together in small, sober but new and well maintained bungalows. Three types can be distinguished but all come with typical Dutch elements as sloped roofs, large windows and brick or timber facades. A couple of clusters can be defined where (these) solitary standing bungalows follow the line of interconnected system of pathways. Together with vast green lawns and sometimes a small line of trees clusters and buildings are separated. Buildings are all sided orientated and depending on the type (three different types) accommodate up to eight
residents. A little path from the main pathway leads to the entrance into a small hall and subsequently a sober spaced living room with kitchen and television. Wherever possible, family members share rooms, in any other case bed rooms are shared; as are the kitchen and bath room. Although the buildings can be accessed by the staff, which happens weekly, residents possess some privacy as the distance between buildings where the staff is located is rather large. There are furthermore more steps between the most private unit (bedroom) and the most public, and controlled (!) unit (entrance of asylum centre). However, what they encounter outside the asylum centre is merely not a public space by means of liveliness, diversity or enclosure.

**Final remarks**

The life in the asylum centre almost seems to take place in a parallel society, an asylee migration enclave, a place cut off from public life. The liveliness of the centre sharply contrasts with the environment which is dominated by fast-moving traffic. It has its own facilities, own way of organisation of daily life and therefore the perfect example of a camp and a total institution.

---

fig 35: expression of territorial control by spaces and the (number) of borders between them. The most controlled space (by coa) is the 'exterior space' and the way to public space is only reached via the central entrance.
fig. 36: areal picture of asylum centre in Winterswijk
The asylum centre of the town of Winterswijk is situated in a suburban setting a few kilometres away from the historical centre. It was opened in 2000 to accommodate 400 asylees. The type of development process is rather exceptional as this asylum centre has been developed by housing corporation De Woonplaats in close cooperation with the municipality of Winterswijk and the COA. De Woonplaats rents out the buildings to the COA and continues to do so after the original lease contract expired two years ago. When one of the parties decides to stop the collaboration, the buildings can be transformed to row housing by splitting the building into four units, replacing its façade, installing staircases and planting front and back yards. Nevertheless, in 2014 it was decided to temporary raise the capacity up to 500 people as the COA needed all its capacity to accommodate asylees. Upon visit (14-03-2016) almost 80% of its residents was in possession of a Dutch residence permit and are awaiting to housing somewhere in the Netherlands. It means that only 100 asylees are in their asylum procedure accommodated here.
1. view on asylum centre from the only road to (cul-de-sac) neighbourhood

2. inhabitants have their own letter boxes

3. large windows from bedroom and shared living room looking out over pavement tiles and grass lawn in between building blocks

4. central plaza of asylum centre accessible for employees’ cars with COA building at the right side of the picture

5. basic room for two persons in room with large windows

6. entrance hall of living units (two times twelve people) at sides of buildings

7. paved space in asylum centre is municipal, public space and is connected to the rest of the neighbourhood (an absence of fences)

8. view on pedestrian, public axis through the asylum centre

9. building of asylum centre next to publicly used road

10. suburban spacing of main road separating asylum centre on the right and houses on the left

11. fences around small, green slope on south side borders the asylum centre
Lay-out

The asylum centre is located in a suburban neighbourhood of Winterswijk next to a cemetery. It carries a village-like feeling, a quiet and child-friendly place with (semi-)detached housing compromising large front and back yards. The complete neighbourhood is set up according to a cul-de-sac structure. Houses are faced off from the street and only local traffic passes by. The creation of inward-facing clusters stresses the privacy of its inhabitants and public life on the streets is low.

The asylum centre fits neatly into the suburban fabric and streets and paths are connected. The asylum centre is at one side directly bordered to the street (east side). The northern and southern side are bordered with five-meter wide lawns. In respect to the pavement one can hardly notice a difference. There is no fence or central entrance or exit. Important in reading the space is that the (interconnected) streets and paths are public space and not included in the rental of the COA. It means that every building has its own address and post box. Furthermore, the maintenance of the buildings and the exterior space is in the hands of housing corporation De Woonplaats. A number of its employees take care of this task on site on everyday basis.

It almost resembles the housing and the feeling of the neighbourhood it is attached to. Visitors are nevertheless attended to announce themselves at the reception desk with signs near the borders of the asylum centre. The small reception desk is located in the heart of the asylum centre in the same building of the COA staff. The building is similar to those where asylees reside in. Staff members also carry radio transmitters and large bunch of keys here and furthermore regulate the (time) availability of the facilities for the asylees.

Buildings

The asylum centre comes with twenty identical, two-story buildings which are placed in straight forward formation of six clusters. The brick and timber buildings are sober but seem properly maintained. The entrance of the buildings can be found on the short sides, with staircases leading to the second floor. The long sides with large windows face the street/path or the inner court. Most of the windows have curtains to give residents some privacy. The spacious inner courts are solely planted with grass and a shallow zone of pavement lies in between the façade and the grass. Some of them are function as a playground or football court.

Every building contains four living units for six or seven people. The entrance hall at the side of a building is immediately followed by the entrance of the living unit. It comes out in a very basic living room with almost no furniture. The kitchen, bathroom and bed rooms are shared. Every bedroom has large windows facing the street or the inner court. In comparison to a regular neighbourhood the transition zones from street to the most private zone (bed room) are very shallow or even directly following each other. Only grass and about a meter of pavement separates the public and the most private space.

Facilities

The facilities for the asylees are located in the heart of the centre as illustrated in figure Y. One can find here medical facilities, computer and homework rooms for children and young adults, an inside playground. Language classes are given by volunteers for those with a residence permit. Upon visit it became clear to me that there was a significant demand for volunteers to teach language courses as almost 80% was – as permit holder – entitled to learn Dutch. Next to that the space to give language courses was lacking. A few hours a week families can bring their children to the kindergarten, also run by volunteers, in order to follow (compulsory) courses. Other than in Dronten, children go to a regular school in the nearby neighbourhood. Residents make use of the park beginning at the south side of the centre. It is also used as the main route towards the town centre which is easily walkable.
Final remarks

According to the employee I got a tour from, the centre is in comparison to other asylum centres very peaceful and very few tensions are experienced. She added that irregularly meetings between the COA and nearby residents occur but that very few locals are interested in attending or coming with complaints. She moreover stated that very few activities are organised at the asylum centre but that residents nevertheless mostly spend their days within the boundaries of the asylum centre. In the end, she reckoned that the orderly and spacious, though compact lay-out contributed to a relatively controllable and pleasant environment.

Although the liveliness in streets of the asylum centre contrasts with the quiet and private oriented neighbourhood attached to it, the asylum centre is rooted in its environment. The borders are soft and porous and its streets and paths merge into local public space. It is easily accessible both for asylees as for visitors and locals. There is nevertheless very few motivation for others to use the public spaces due to the cul-de-sac lay-out and absence of continuous pedestrian or biking routes.

The asylum centre in Winterswijk with its absence of fences and central entrance – visible in the public domain – though function as a (rare) example of a centre not looking as a camp or total institution. Its residents have more freedom to move and can be seen as temporary inhabitants of Winterswijk.
fig. 46: areal picture of asylum centre in Utrecht
The municipality of Utrecht is home to around 340,000 people and one of the few large cities in the Netherlands with a (long-standing) asylum centre. The asylum centre of Utrecht is located somewhat western of the historic inner core of Utrecht in the neighbourhood Oog in Al. Since the early nineties a part of a former (military) hospital is used to receive and accommodate asylees. It accommodates nowadays 450 asylees over 146 rooms from different size and capacity. It differs from the asylum centres in Dronten and Winterswijk in the sense that asylees are accommodated in one and the same building.
1. fenced main entrance of asylum centre with small building housing reception desk, staff spaces and recreation room

2. interior corridor of asylum centre creates shallow form of privacy in adjacent rooms of inhabitants

3. facilities for inhabitants are in the basement of building such as children playground, study rooms and gym

4. basic room for four persons in basement of building

5. the small building directed to the square is not accessible for inhabitants

6. confusion: an open view towards the backside of the building in combination with a derelict road sign & sudden interruption of the fence

7. small building blocking the view towards semi-private square

8. greenery in front of most prominent facade

9. square in front of building used for parking of employees and nearby businessmen

10. open view from the park towards back of the building
The asylum centre’s neighbourhood carries both the elements of a vibrant, mixed-use city and of a residential quarter. It faces a busy road predominantly used by cyclists, cars and busses. When one turns into some of the side roads several shops, schools, churches and other institutions can be found. Row housing and small apartment buildings follow distinct and carefully designed streets and small public places such as pocket parks and little squares. The lay-out is rather spacious due to front yards and low row housing.

The former (military) hospital forms one of the largest buildings in the near surroundings. It consists out of three separate buildings of which the most eastern one is rented by the COA and used as asylum centre. The rest is used by the Dutch Protestant Church a handful of (related) non-profit organisations and some businesses. As the building style corresponds, it does not give the asylum centre a spatially different outlook on large scale. At the south comes with only one pedestrian route leading to the waterfront of the Amsterdam-Rhine canal. The large courts at the northern side are used for car parking. The entrance to the asylum centre can also be found on the north side.

A small, one story building cuts off the semi-enclosed court from the busy road (see areal picture). When standing in front of it, the left side marks the entrance of the asylum centre (see fig. 50.1). The building contains the reception desk and is attached to a low fence and a crossing gate. A flag and sign indicate that the terrain is used by the COA and unauthorized enter is prohibited. Visitors are attended to report at the reception desk. The building is faced off from the street and marked by a blind wall.

Meetings between volunteers, visitors and residents of the asylum centre often occur in the vicinity of reception desk. After going through the fence, the court opens itself to the resident/visitor. On the immediate left a long line of parked bicycles stands in front of the building. This façade is most prominent and faced towards the road. After a few meters of pavement it is subsequently bordered by a high fence and shrubbery and trees. Going straight on leads to the main entrance of the building – now, the outer court is clearly visible. The outer court is relatively large and covers more than 3400 square metres. Most of the place is spaced for car parking. There is however also place for trees, small benches and public activities.

Upon visit (04-04-2016) I circumvented to enter via the formal and secured entrance of the asylum centre. Between the right side of the small building and the former hospital a small and open entry leads to the same outer court (see photo collage). It forms the (car) entry for the businesses and organisation with an entrance at the other side of the court. The outer court therefore compromises a semi-private character used by asylees, COA staff, visitors and employees of the organisations and business located there.

A similar ambiguous relationship between the very public space and the spaces belonging to the asylum centre exists at the backside of the building bordering the park. The route through the park at the west side is separated from the asylum centre with a high fence and a zone of thick vegetation. A sudden interruption makes an open, unrestricted view or contingent walk to the asylum centre possible. It creates confusion and questions the role of the fence. A derelict stop sign only contributes to this confusion it causes even more (see photo collage).

The building

The building includes a basement and three floors of which the upper floor is spaced under a sloped roof. Corridors and stairways form the interior routing in the building. These corridors can be accessed through several entrances. Two of them can be found at the formal side of the building, i.e. at the outer court; three other entrances can be found around the inner court. The inner court of the building is accommodated with a playground and some benches. It is closed off from the park by a fence and thick vegetation.
Living units of various sizes (max. 5 persons) lie on either sides of the corridor resulting in one side oriented spaces. Wherever possible, family members share living units. The largest part of the living units are shared and spaced for sleeping, eating and watching television. A number of eighteen kitchen rooms and bathrooms are available for the residents and can be accessed via the corridor. A minor share of the living units is featured with separate bathroom and kitchen.

The corridors can be busy, noisy and as staff members are entitled to enter every room, living units contain limited privacy. The interior structure creates a shallow line between private (but also shared) spaces and the most controlled space: the corridor.

Facilities
The various functions of the asylum centre are located in the basement. Low windows provide some daylight here. There is a gym, a children playground, a kindergarten and some computer and homework rooms. Other rooms are used for compulsory courses for its residents. In the small building on the outer court residents can ask for a key to use the (very basic) recreation room which is located there. Children go to school in the neighbourhood which is less than a kilometre walk.

Residents make relatively more trips in comparison to Dronten or Winterswijk. There is the ability to go to the library in the centre of Utrecht where also Dutch language classes are given. They make morning walks through the park at the back of the asylum centre and sometimes do grocery shopping in oriental supermarkets. A range of religious institutions are located in the vicinity of the asylum centre. Young adults play football or other sports in small parks and squares in the neighbourhood. Next to that a number of voluntary organisations such as ‘U voor vluchtelingen’ (Utrecht for refugees) and the Red Cross are closely involved for the benefit of asylum seekers and permit holders: various trainings and educational courses are organised and offered ranging from ‘cycling training’ to ‘establishing a business in the Netherlands’. Its distinctive element is that these things happen throughout the city and not in the asylum centre itself.

Final remarks
In respect to the form of the asylum centre it can be argued that the soft and hard borders of the asylum centre seem not to be based on preconceived plans but seem a result of a series of separate interventions. It has created an ambiguous relationship between public and private space and the spatial interventions raised the status of the asylum centre as an isolated, non-visible and non-accessible place. Next to that, the corridor organisation of the building comes with the intrusion of personal spheres.

On the other hand gives the location of the asylum centre far more opportunities to participate in society, to meet new people, to actively learn how Dutch society works, by means of voluntary help or seeing it with their own eyes. The organisations working in Utrecht and the liveliness of the environment give asylum seekers both the opportunity to move anonymously through the city as well as the opportunity for encounter. One can also argue that the temporary stay of asylum seekers in the centre furthermore suits a city as Utrecht furthermore better than a place as Winterswijk.
In Dronten, the life in the asylum centre almost seems to take place in a parallel society, an asylee migration enclave, a place cut off from public life. It has its own facilities, own way of organisation of daily life, own ‘public’ (i.e. controlled) space and the liveliness within sharply contrasts with its surroundings which is dominated by fast-moving traffic and where public spaces in its vicinity are hard to be found. Dense vegetation, a fence, a ditch and a hidden entrance furthermore cuts off the place from the environment. The invisibility of the place comes by inaccessibility as well.

In comparison to the other two cases, this location seems the most perfect example of a camp and a total institution. The isolated location and inward faced functioning of the asylum centre constrains the mobility of its inhabitants, the ability to meet native citizens and the ability to see how Dutch society works with their own eyes. On the other hand, it can be argued that the spacious outlook of the centre provide more opportunities to withdraw in the very private sphere in comparison to Utrecht. In Utrecht the corridor as most controlled and permanently used space by the staff is directly linked to the most private space, the bedroom. Whereas in Dronten the exterior space is most controlled and far more extensive and/or located further away (most controlled part is near the function cluster). It means that there are more steps between these spaces and more opportunities for privacy.

Also in Utrecht one can find fences and a thick layer of vegetation between the asylum centre and its environment. However, only half of the border zone is arranged like that. The other half is more visible from public space and reveals a building that is part of a larger structure and not immediately recognizable as a place for ‘others’. The backside has a visual relationship to the park (path) whereas the front side is marked with a central entrance facing a busy street. It includes a barrier, a low fence and several signs as well as a slightly hidden square. This square is also used by employees working in the building adjacent to the centre giving it a semi-private character.

The analysis of the cases studies were executed with the spatial principles as established in the comprehension part of this thesis. I hypothesised important elements of the asylum centre which were derived from the characterization of the asylum centre as a camp and a total institution. In the illustration of the analysis I find a way of expression where images did not necessarily corresponds to one spatial principle only and thereby were explained by multiple images. In order to compare the cases, I nevertheless made a scheme in which every case is visually compared on the basis of each spatial principle (i.e. a visual summary of the findings).

It turned out that some principles were more applicable than others. The ‘organization of the camp’ turned out to be too generic to be useful for comparison for instance. Some spatial principles are renamed in order to concretize its meaning. I decided to categorize them into two groups: spatial elements of the asylum centre & spatial relations on large scale.
In any case, the asylum centre of Winterswijk displays the most public relation with its context. It is not surrounded by a fence and does not come by with central entrance or exit. It is on the contrary enclosed by public space and its streets and paths neatly fit in the surrounding (sub)urban fabric. It means that residents of separate living units have their own entrance and are not directly controlled by COA staff as they can move to other public spaces in the network. On the other hand, the cul-de-sac and low density lay out of the local neighbourhood means that these public spaces are not very vivid and also suggests that probably others rarely make use of the public space around the accommodation units. Together with the only few functions within the centre, it is nevertheless this distinctive character of the asylum centre in Winterswijk which makes it less functioning as a total institution or a camp.

Although a corridor structure is the ultimate expression of a controlling power, asylum in Utrecht have more opportunities to give shape to their own lives than in Dronten and Winterswijk. They are able to move relatively anonymously through space and at the other hand can meet others, and execute diverse activities here. Children go to school in one of the nearby schools and come in contact with native citizens (this also applies to Winterswijk), other residents can go to the library, arrange language courses, participate in sport clubs nearby etc. Also more activities are organised by a number of voluntary organisations to promote interaction, taking place inside as well as outside the asylum centre.

fig 56: comparison of case studies based on spatial principles from comprehension; part 2
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‘Asylum [...] entails the anticipated possibility of becoming rooted again’ (Oudejans, 2011)
balance the interest of the nation state to execute territorial control and the intrinsic desire of asylum seekers to become rooted again

= POSITIONING OF DESIGN

MISSION STATEMENT
The mission statement forms the starting point in the process of adhering to the second objective of this graduation project: provide a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers in the Netherlands by means of design. It seeks to provide an alternative form of the asylum centre based on the knowledge acquired in the previous chapters of this thesis i.e. a regeneration of the contemporary asylum centre in the Netherlands. But as these chapters have not necessarily provided me with specific (design) tools to envision a more humane accommodation, the regeneration phase is an explorative one. By means of research and design I will try to find out which spatial interventions in the accommodations of asylum seekers could better cater their needs.

This mission statement sets the main goal to achieve the latter and starts from thinking from the perspective of the asylum seeker and refugee. In my opinion the planning and design of asylum centres and its distribution system seem to neglect their intrinsic desire and the importance that place plays in that desire. Namely, asylum seekers may come from different countries, with different cultures and values but they have one thing in common: by leaving their homes they all seek for a new and safe place which opens up to opportunity to participate in society and to belong somewhere. Oudejans (2011) perfectly described this by stating that ‘the claim to asylum is ultimately a claim to an own place’ and that ‘asylum [in the end] comes to the fore as the anticipated possibility of becoming rooted again’. In other words, asylum seekers greatest desire is to find a place which they can call home again.

In the comprehension I characterized the asylum centre nevertheless as a camp and total institution. A place which assumed to negatively influence asylum seekers’ opportunities for self-expression and own decision making and which provokes feelings of hospitalization and alienation from society. The asylum centre designed as a camp and total institution forms the expression of the interest of the nation state: a place which acts as a mode of territorial control and puts of belonging by the restriction of asylum seekers’ mobility and prevention of early. However, the interest of the nation state in controlling who can belong and who cannot, on the basis of the 1951 Refugee Convention, and in controlling the number of applicants is not something which can be left aside. Therefore the upcoming proposal should take into account the motivations to cluster asylum seekers in specific places.

The generation phase nevertheless brought to the table that there is room for interpretation in the planning and design of asylum centres. Major differences illustrate that the mode of territorial control is sometimes stronger on one place in comparison to the other; reckon the spatial differences between the asylum centres in Dronten and Winterswijk for instance. Extracted from the application of the spatial principles, these differences in form makes it possible to envision a situation in which asylum seekers have more opportunities to choose, have a higher mobility and are more involved in (local) society.

In conclusion, my design should balance the needs of asylum seekers to become rooted again and the territorial control executed by the nation state. Redesigning the asylum centres from the case study analysis will allow me to demonstrate that there are opportunities to cater these needs by proposing a small number of interventions only.
CONCEPT
The positioning of my design can be seen as taking a political stand towards the accommodation of asylum seekers. I took this to the next level and developed a new concept, which afterwards is practically translated into a concrete design for a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers.

Asylum as the anticipated possibility to become rooted again – looking for a new place to belong – is used turn the asylum centre into a ‘place of becoming’. From the book ‘Parrot flew over the IJssel’ from K. Abdolah I learned that the process from seeking asylum and receiving a residence permit to becoming rooted in (Dutch) society is spatially experienced: a new living environment and new people around them triggers a transformation of who they are. I also encountered that this process takes years, only gradually evolves and is very personal. From encounters with asylum seekers and refugees and talking to experts in the field of asylum I learned that uncertainty is asylum seekers’ largest concern. Their biggest uncertainty is not having a residence permit (refugee status) yet i.e. being in limbo. Altogether, it means that the asylum centre as a place to cluster asylum seekers, where their stay is only ever temporary, is not the right place to offer them a home and place of belonging.

What it could become however is a place which offers them opportunities and clues for the anticipation of becoming rooted. The asylum centre can be transformed from a non-place into a place of becoming. It entails an asylum centre which offers its inhabitants means to explore their new environment, to get in contact with native citizens and to find out how (local) society works. It should interact with its environment and offer escapes for the in limbo situation. An important precondition for the place of becoming is a major decrease of the number of transfers between centres. This notion is further developed later on (see next section).

In the conceptual drawing on the left side the place of becoming is visually represented. The path represents the life of asylees lived in limbo during their stay in an asylum centre. It also represents movement, discovery and the passage of time within the public spaces surrounding the asylum centre. The places represent a temporary interruption of being in limbo, places for deepening, stay and involvement with society and ways to meet native citizens. The way to these places is marked with borders, sometimes soft sometimes hard, sometimes concrete and spatial (bridge to an open air theatre) sometimes non-spatial (money for a concert).

The place of becoming is aimed to increase asylees’ mobility and opportunities to choose which should lead to more interaction with native citizens and presence in society. Spatial interventions which translate this place of becoming into reality must therefore:

- **strengthen the relationship between the asylum centre as place of arrival and possible future housing**
- **promote interaction between asylees and native citizens**
- **allow for an intrinsic and visual relationship between the asylum centre and the urban fabric it is situated in**
- **cater different uses of (public) space**

‘Asylum [...] entails the anticipated possibility of becoming rooted again’ (Oudejans, 2011)
3. An alternative distribution model

The place of becoming cannot be achieved with asylees’ current number of transfers between different asylum centres. It requires a strong relationship with the place of stay. Therefore I propose to connect the place of stay to their possible future housing (i.e. in case of an affirmative answer on their asylum request) and to combine several types of asylum centres (see fig. 59 in comparison fig. 14 on page 26). A longer period of stay at one location enables asylees with more certainty which could encourage asylees to establish contacts with other people (native citizens, other asylees) around the asylum centre.

In addition, I propose to let asylum seekers choose their preferred way of life when arrived at the central reception centre. They can choose between a village-like, suburban or urban way of life, linked to the location of asylum centres in the Netherlands and to the heterotopian spaces they can acquire. In a village-like situation the heterotopian space might be a communal garden whereas in an urban location it might be a music festival.

**DESIGN PRINCIPLES**

In this section I present the translation of the concept ‘place of becoming’ into three design principles, which adhere to the goals from page 101. All the three design principles are based on current modes of spatial organisation. I propose a transformation of these modes of spatial organisation for the future asylum centre.

1. **A camp bordered with heterotopian spaces**

The first design principle proposes a transformation from the asylum centre as a camp towards the asylum centre as camp bordered with heterotopian spaces. Heterotopian spaces are ‘places and institutions that interrupt the apparent continuity and normality of ordinary everyday spaces (De Cauter & Dehaene, 2008). They form the opposite of a non-place (such as the contemporary asylum centre). These places also encompass a limited timeframe: they are only experienced in a short time period ranging from fifteen minutes to a few days. In the conceptual drawing of the place of becoming on page 100, the places represent these heterotopian spaces. The purpose of this design principle is to connect the asylum centre towards these heterotopian spaces. In the redesign of asylum centres it means that some of them might already be there. For instance, the schoolyard in Winterswijk is a perfect example of a heterotopian space for asylees. Children and parents come in contact with native citizens and provide a place far away from their in limbo situation. Other heterotopian spaces should be envisioned just outside the asylum centre and form a place for exploration and/or interaction.

2. **A co-controlled institution**

The second design principles suggest a transformation from the asylum centre as a total institution towards the asylum centre as a co-controlled institution. It primarily involves is a reduction of facilities within the borders of the asylum centre. Asylees should as much as possible make use of the same (regular) facilities as Dutch citizens such as: the primary school, the library, the gym, sport clubs, clothing shops, supermarkets etc. Only special facilities for asylees should be accommodated within the asylum centre: the medical treatment point, playground for small children, youth centre and computer & homework rooms. Secondly, it suggests co-control between COA, local municipality and NGO’s over those functions within the asylum centre. A clear relationship between these functions and the public space can act as a bridge between the asylum centre and is environment.
This chapter serves as a way to see how the goals from the mission statement got translated into a set of design interventions. I deliberately chose to redesign the existing asylum centre in order to show that the slightly poetic ‘place of becoming’ and the design principles that were derived from this concept very practically can be introduced in the design of an asylum centre. From the case studies I picked the asylum centre of Utrecht to demonstrate that a series of small interventions can reduce the camp and total institution way of functioning. The asylum centre in Utrecht has the most favourable location in comparison to the ones in Dronten and Winterswijk. The proximity and number of functions offer the inhabitants at least more opportunities to choose. However, the asylum centre is substantially separated from the spaces around it (also see analysis on pages 80-89).

The approach of the design has been to find out how to create an evident and logical relationship between public space and the asylum centre. I used the typical spatial elements found in the analysis such as the number and location of functions. Figure 60 projects the current situation and figure 61 sets out the proposal.
CURRENT SITUATION UTRECHT

fig. 65: isometric view of current situation of the asylum centre in Utrecht

1 gateway and central entrance
2 asylum centre is to a great extent fenced and hidden behind thick layer of trees and shrubbery
3 small building turned away from public space
4 semi-private outer court dominated by cars
5 corridor structure as organising principle of the building
6 fence and line of shrubbery suddenly stops at the back of the asylum centre

For an impression of the current situation see case study analysis Utrecht on pages 80-89
LIST OF INTERVENTIONS

1. remove gateway
2. establish pathway
3. reposition new/adjusted small building
4. open facade to pathway
5. realize platform with stairs on outer court
6. remove parking
7. relocate facilities to
   1) city 2) small building 3) 1st floor
8. relocate hall to facade
   open up facade with doors to hall
9. move central entrance
10. mark pathway with low, brick walls and new line of trees
11. construct pedestrian bridge
12. realize open air theatre at other side of the water
Main intervention is the introduction of a pathway perpendicular to the street at the front side of the asylum centre (left on the drawing) towards the park at the other side. The pathway forms a new route to the park from the surrounding neighbourhood. The pathway stretches itself towards a new pedestrian bridge which connects both waterfronts. I propose to place an open air theatre or cinema at the other side of the water (fig. 60 and 64). It forms a heterotopian space where asylum seekers and refugees go to, mingle and interact with native citizens and moreover could become an asset for the city of Utrecht. The intervention suits the place of becoming and ties the asylum centre to its surroundings.

It is important that these heterotopian spaces are situated within the city but at the same time are connected to the asylum centre. The public pathway functions in this sense as a connector. On a larger scale the pedestrian bridge links the two waterfronts of the Amsterdam-Rhine-canal via the park with each other and aims to generate more public to make use of the designed spaces (fig. 64).

Second most important intervention is the repositioning or renewal of the small separate building. Together with a change of function it serves multiple purposes. Currently, the small building contains COA spaces, a small tucked away recreation room and the reception desk. It cuts the outer court from the public space due to its blind façade (fig. 67). Together with a gateway, fences and large signs it works as a hard border which clearly separates the asylum centre from its surroundings. The intervention will allow space for the pathway and reduces the space between the large building and the new small building.

The reconfiguration makes a relocation of the main entrance possible as well. The main entrance from now own can be reached via the pathway. Due to distance and a bordering of the way to the entrance with trees and stairs I create a transition zone between the communal and controlled space of the asylum centre and the public space. The transition is explicitly designed by soft means. The new small building will contain functions which are currently housed in the basement of the asylum centre (language classes, computer rooms, medical point). Large windows and an entrance point respond to the pathway and the street and allow for visual exchange. I can image that drawings made by children or recreation activities can be seen from the pathway. Again it forms the transition zone between the two worlds (fig. 68). Together with the pathway this intervention thus provides for means for self-expression and increases the visual presence of asylum seekers in the city.

Another set of interventions is to move the children playground and a recreation room from the basement to the first floor, to replace the corridor by a hallway alongside the façade and to open up that façade towards the hallway with sliding doors. These doors lead to a platform I introduce which forms the transition zone between these communal spaces and the public space (fig. 70). Children can play outside here. The platform is bordered with a staircase and indicates that this is more private. However, the function of this threshold can also temporarily change: I can think of a small music festival in summer that could take place here – attended by asylum seekers and refugees as well as local residents.

Altogether, the semi-private outer court can transform into a public space surrounded by transition zones which are made up by soft borders such as a platform, staircases and windows. It provides choices to sit or to walk and creates opportunities for interaction, but also a certain distance in between the private, collective and the public. I designed the pathway at the back of the asylum centre in the same vein. The pathway here is bordered with a few meters of grass and subsequently with a row of trees and low brick walls. It displays a less enclosed and thus more distant relation between the asylum centre and the environment as the backside contains (more) living units of its inhabitants. An interesting point forms the continuation of the park side to the outer court (or the other way around). Here the private living unit is linked towards the public space and inhabitants can use the balcony to watch the users of the path (fig. 72).

In conclusion, the pathway creates a robust relationship between the asylum centre and its surroundings. The main intervention goes hand in hand with other interventions. They display or create a particular transition zoning from the public to more collective, semi-collective and private spaces. It provides several spaces which can cater different needs, provide inhabitants of the asylum centre with more choices and opportunities for self-expression and encounter.

Next pages will show how the interventions come down to changes on eye-level.
fig. 67: current situation at the front side of the asylum centre in Utrecht
fig. 68: redesign of the front side of the asylum centre in Utrecht with public pathway, new crossing and new/adapted small building which responds to both the pathway and street.
fig. 69: current situation at semi-private outer court of the asylum centre in Utrecht
fig. 70: redesign of the outer court of the asylum centre in Utrecht with transition zones; public pathway is subsequently bordered with zone of gravel, stairs, a platform for activity, and doors to the hallway of the asylum centre with functions adjacent to it.
fig. 71: current situation at the backside (park side) of the asylum centre in Utrecht
Fig. 72: redesign of the backside (park side) of the asylum centre in Utrecht with public pathway, activation of balconies and new bordering in the form of low brick walls and tree lines.
fig. 76 (centred image): place of becoming Winterswijk
fig. 77 (bottom image): map of Winterwijk with design interventions on larger scale (1:10,000)

1. establish parkway with sitting spots next to the water
2. introduce verandas with balconies as extension of communal living unit
3. relocate functions next to parkway

fig. 78: (re)design of asylum centre Winterswijk
Construct side road with new bus stop

- Relocate entrance and direct buildings towards new road
- Remove a small part of the trees and shrubbery

Fig. 84: (re)design of asylum centre Dronten

Fig. 82 (centred image): place of becoming Dronten

Fig. 83 (bottom image): map of Dronten with design interventions on larger scale (1:20,000)
CONCLUSION & REFLECTION
CONCLUSION

This thesis commenced during what was called the European Refugee crisis, a period where a substantial number of world’s displaced people pulled towards (countries within) the European Union. These people irregularly moved through territories and sought asylum on European ground. It was followed by the observation that the reception and accommodation of these people revolves around a particular and local phenomenon: the asylum centre. As more and more European countries have established similar asylum centres, they appear to form an important link between the arrival and the (possible) integration of these people. I subsequently focussed on the Netherlands as a country with a comprehensive system of asylum centres on its territory. It was described that asylum seekers and refugees are accommodated in a system of several places during their asylum procedure – sometimes for many years. They are subject to sovereign decisions and their stay negatively influences their health and integration prospects. From a spatial point of view there is a lack of understanding how the form of the asylum centre relates to these problems. As there is no such thing as an asylum typology, this thesis consequently made an attempt to develop a more sophisticated overview of the way how asylum centres are formed. It also aimed to provide a more humane accommodation of asylum seekers – which would be inspired on the generation of knowledge that this overview would bring. The focus of this thesis has been on an increased understanding within the reference frame of the asylum seeker and refugee, and the ones who provide asylum in asylum centres by the name of the nation state and its executing body ‘Central Agency for the Reception of Asylum Seekers’ (COA). Both of the perspectives were tied together by means of the form of the asylum centre.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The sophisticated overview was developed in two chapters: comprehension and generation. The comprehension was based on literature review. The first part was of comprehension dwelled upon the motivations to cluster asylum seekers in asylum centres. It was described that nation states cluster asylum seekers in order to have them at all-time available for government activities that are necessary for the evaluation of the application for authorisation or return. As long as it not yet is clear whether he/she can obtain a residence permit, the asylum centres functions as a way to withhold them from society – i.e. prevent integration. In addition, the functioning of the place would furthermore discourage people from applying for asylum anyway. Accordingly, asylum centres must be seen as a mode of territorial control.

Secondly, the comprehension showed that the notion of camps and total institutions emanates from this mode of territorial control. From a characterisation of these two concepts I deducted as set of spatial (organisation) principles on which to understand and analyse the form of the asylum centre (see page 46). Lastly, I conducted a literature study on the assumed impact of camps and total institutions on its inhabitants which resulted in a refinement of the problem statement. These forms deprive inhabitants from the right to action and the right to opinion (i.e. political agency and self-expression) and constrain their ability to make choices. A merging of the public and the very private sphere leads to a loss of privacy. It furthermore engenders dependency and alienates them from society. In the longer run inhabitants can experience feelings of hospitalisation.

In generation, I established an overview of asylum centres in the Netherlands on basis of function, location, size, age and building type. It brought an enormous variety of forms to the table. Through analysing spatial strategies of the COA as planning body of these centres, I encountered an almost lack of location and form requirements. It also made me realise that the COA is to a great extent dependent on the willingness of municipalities to host asylum seekers to develop asylum centres.

With this in mind, I applied the spatial principles from comprehension on three asylum centres specifically. The asylum centres in Dronten, Winterswijk and Utrecht were chosen on basis of a presupposed degree of isolation. Most important conclusion that I could draw from the comparison was that there is a kind of grey range in the way how territorial control is shaped. I demonstrated that it depends on a variety of location and buildings aspects. The asylum centre in Dronten projects the most perfect example of a camp and a total institution. The isolated location and inward faced functioning of the asylum centre causes dependency among inhabitants. It constrains their mobility, their ability to meet native citizens and their ability to see how Dutch society works with their own eyes as well. I assume that feelings of hospitalisation and health related problems are most prevalent in this case.

Another major conclusion is that all three asylum centres display an adverse relationship towards public space. My impression is that this is symptomatic in the way how asylum centres are given shape; it seems to depend on three spatial principles. Firstly, it depends on the spacing of border zone, which creates connection or separation. Secondly, it depends on the location of the facilities for the inhabitants, which can be inwards or outwards oriented. And thirdly, it depends on the way how the transition from the private unit towards public space is organised, which arranges the degree of privacy and execution of control.

The comparison furthermore showed that the number of functional relations between asylum centres and their environment can differ; so is the number and intensity higher in Winterswijk than in Dronten. An example is that asylum seekers and refugee children go to school whereas in Dronten they are educated on the terrain itself. Nonetheless, I encountered that the inhabitants of Dronten (also) merely stay on the asylum centre during the days. My impression is that this is provoked because of the current transferring ditches and a dense layer of vegetation. The entrance is hidden and remote and could be more directed to the traffic intersection nearby. This situation stands in complete contrast with the asylum centre in Winterswijk, where these hard borders such as a fence are absent.

Another conclusion is that degree of territorial control can vary on different scale levels. I have experienced that the temporary barracks in the asylum centre of Dronten – organised by a corridor structure – impedes the privacy of the inhabitants to a far greater extent than the inhabitants of ‘regular’ separate bungalow on the terrain. Normally, without those temporary barracks, the spacious outlook of in Dronten creates more opportunities to withdraw in the very private sphere in comparison to Utrecht, where a corridor building closely ties the most private room and the most controlled (and used) space.

Another major conclusion is that all three asylum centres display an adverse relationship towards public space. My impression is that this is symptomatic in the way how asylum centres are given shape; it seems to depend on three spatial principles. Firstly, it depends on the spacing of border zone, which creates connection or separation. Secondly, it depends on the location of the facilities for the inhabitants, which can be inwards or outwards oriented. And thirdly, it depends on the way how the transition from the private unit towards public space is organised, which arranges the degree of privacy and execution of control.
system. Uncertainty about the period of stay and location of their first house in the Netherlands in any case does not encourage asylum seekers to get to know their environment, the people, the institutions etc.

**DESIGN FINDINGS**

In the design part of this thesis which was called regeneration I valued the findings from the comprehension and generation part. The room for interpretation in the variety of forms of the asylum centres created the basis to redesign the existing asylum centre of Utrecht. I took a political stand by stating that my design should balance the needs of asylum seekers and refugees and the territorial control executed by the nation state. The desperate needs of asylum seekers and refugees were found in the individual and personal meaning of asylum: the anticipated possibility to become rooted again and thus the desire to feel home again. It resulted in the formation of a slightly poetic concept which offers opportunities and clues for this anticipation of becoming rooted. ‘The place of becoming’ does not merely provide a new home but render the inhabitants of the asylum centre with means to explore their environment, to come in contact with native citizens and to find out how (local) society works. First precondition of this place of becoming is offering asylum seekers and refugees the choice for a way of life (urban, suburban or village-like) and certainty about their stay in one asylum centre; future housing will subsequently be offered in its local environment upon affirmative request of their asylum application.

The concept was applied to the asylum centre in Utrecht. I chose to redirect the relation of the building towards public space and to introduce transition zones which would compose the new border(s) between the asylum centre and public space. The platform with its small staircase creates a new and legible threshold and shapes a path to the main entrance of the asylum centre. Low brick walls and a lawn, where people could sit, form the border at the backside.

The redesign of the asylum centre in Utrecht shows that small interventions which redirect the relation between public space and the camp and total institution could make it less function like the latter. An evident relationship between the two could make the asylum centre and its inhabitants more part of the environment and increase the ability for self-expression and thereby right to opinion and offer tools to explore the environment, its people and society.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DESIGN**

I have a few recommendations for (re)designing of asylum centres which are based on the analysis in generation and the design from regeneration. I found out three spatial principles from comprehension (derived from the camp and total institution) which must be taken into account when one aims to humanise the accommodation of asylum seekers. Following up the recommendations will allow for more functional relationships between the asylum centre and the environment but still allow the nation state to execute a degree of control over its national territory:

**Spacing of the border zone**

- face at least one side of the asylum centre to public space and public life
- create soft borders, preferably at most public side
- avoid one single entrance

**Functions within asylum centre**

- minimize number of regular functions; such as a primary school, gym, clothing shop or supermarket
- place (other) functions in between public space and communal and private living units
- leave the management of functions as much as possible to municipalities

**Territorial control and depth**

- provide legible and multi-interpretable transition zones between public space and private unit
- cater privacy needs and provide some spaces for inhabitants only but avoid an abundance of the latter
- connect design of boundaries to a village-like, suburban or urban way of life (as established in this thesis)

Besides the three main spatial principles for design of an asylum centre, I found out that a few conditions must be taken into account:

- acknowledge the asylum centre as (permanent) part of the everyday urban fabric – i.e. avoid as much as possible a temporary setting
- avoid the establishment of isolated asylum centres such as the one in Dronten
- prefer smaller centres; also needed to avoid hospitalization and to create an intrinsic relationship with its environment (which is significantly more difficult with a centre of more than 500 inhabitants)
REFLECTION ON DESIGN
This thesis not merely aimed to design a home for asylum seekers as they are, in whatever way, subject to uncertainty (in respect to their status and procedure) and, after arrival, being aware of the limited timeframe – although the precise length is unknown to them. Home discourses would furthermore deny the very own nature of an asylum centre in today’s world as it has become a way to control the border of the nation-state, a place to filter the genuine refugees from the bogus. I deliberately chose to redesign existing asylum centres, proposing small interventions with a focus on the opportunities that the (surrounding) place could offer. My design resembles current practice of receiving and accommodating asylum seekers and refugees in the form of a camp and total institution as apolitical and acultural space opposite to the (common) city, being the face of territorial control by the (Dutch) nation state in order to determine who (can) belong(s) and who cannot. Under my presumption the latter can still be achieved as my concept and (re)design not specifically focus on immediate civic integration by means of labour nor requires asylum centres to be on the most urban and vivid locations. My proposal is to focus on becoming, and not on belonging, intrinsically related to space, might open doors to change the way how we as society/policy offer asylum seekers and refugees a safe place and opportunities in the Netherlands.

During the research I recognized that the location of the asylum centre is very important, if not more important than the design of the asylum centre, in the opportunities that asylum seekers have for self-expression, the right to opinion and action and in the prevention of hospitalization. I also encountered that the right to opinion and action and in the form of a camp and total institution as apolitical and acultural space opposite to the (common) city, being the face of territorial control by the (Dutch) nation state in order to determine who (can) belong(s) and who cannot. Under my presumption the latter can still be achieved as my concept and (re)design not specifically focus on immediate civic integration by means of labour nor requires asylum centres to be on the most urban and vivid locations. My proposal is to focus on becoming, and not on belonging, intrinsically related to space, might open doors to change the way how we as society/policy offer asylum seekers and refugees a safe place and opportunities in the Netherlands.

REFLECTION ON RELEVANCE
The COA recently also wrote out a competition in cooperation with the chief government architect Floris van Alkemade in search for ‘innovative concepts to accommodate asylum seekers’. And although it in my eyes was not clear whether these concepts were to be used for permit holders or for recently arrived asylum seekers – which would make a big difference – the request to spatial designers suggest that the COA is more and more looking at space as something to take into account. Leaving aside whether it would be used to provide them the tools to rapidly establish temporary accommodations or to improve the situation of its residents, it nevertheless stresses the societal relevance of this thesis.

Taking in consideration the recent redevelopment of the asylum centre in Dronten on the other hand, explicit statements were not made: central entrance and exit points were not vanished and the site remained almost invisible from the road. Interventions were directed to cater future use (bungalow park) and having a certain degree of privacy by developing individual units. However, the visual, social and functional isolation of its inhabitants was left untouched in this project where architects and landscape designers were involved.

I want to end this section with something which is in my opinion a positive development. Namely, the design as established in this thesis in the end coalesced with a concrete initiative of the municipality of Utrecht (http://www.volkskrant.nl/binnenland/primeur-utrecht-gaat-vluchteling-al-op-dag-een-aan-de-stad-binden~a4290148/). With the approval of the COA, the municipality will provide starting points for integration for asylum seekers upon arrival instead after an affirmative request and moreover offer housing for permit holders. These starting points contain amongst others providing education and language courses in cooperation with the Open University, providing courses in respect to entrepreneurship by the University of Utrecht and a establishing a platform for exchange between asylum seekers and native citizens. It means that there might be (even) more possible than I thought there would be during the writing of my vision. It furthermore indicates that municipalities are prepared to reorganise how asylum is offered, with the COA as facilitating body.

A TOUGH BUT STIMULATING PROCESS
I am proud on the results of this thesis but mostly on the process and thus the things I have learned throughout the year. Being allowed to design a project and process all by myself gained me really helpful insights in what I am good at and what I like to do as future professional but at the same time formed a great challenge. The task to build up your own methodology, an academically argued perception of the problem and to coherently write down my findings and position proved to be quite hard but seemed one of the most interesting parts of the process. The degree of freedom in the way how graduation is organised at Urbanism at the TU Delft was for me at the same time a wonderful opportunity as a trap a could fall into.

One of the most striking aspects of my graduation was the continually question of my position as a person. Not only as a designer or planner concerned with spatial quality and spatial development, the search for the specific problem I wanted to target and possible solutions were related to my own values. Thinking from the perspective of the ‘other’ confronted me with my own existence, i.e. I was confronted with my own privileges as Dutch and European citizen. I can rather easily travel to almost any place in the world whereas other nationals are confronted with impossibilities or numerous obstacles (visas, working permits etcetera).

And I have never been in a position that I have to find my happiness or living somewhere else – where my home was not able to be my home anymore.

This whole year also gave me more insight in the way how we – as Dutch society – treat our own people. I will give a small example here. Municipalities and housing corporations are entitled to find social housing for (acknowledged) refugees as for other ‘weak groups’ in society such as disabled people. Considered as a very fair system, this impedes possible social housing for enrolled Dutch housing seekers. In a vast number of municipalities there is a waiting list for many years and the recent pressure on the social housing system due to an increase in permit holders thus questions the way how we as polity provide social housing for our people.

Another way of learning was achieved by engaging in lectures, meetings and debates in topics concerning the European Refugee Crisis. From a two-day workshop together with twenty, international academic experts to a small debate with representatives of the building and housing sector, it all contributed to an understanding of the very problems at stake and finding my position as a (future) urban planner and designer. It also helped to discover that the asylum centre was of vital importance in the, very spatial, journey from arrival to integration (or expulsion).
This phase was followed by attempts to visit several asylum centres. The examination of the three asylum centres in this thesis were not only prompted by my interest in its divergent spatial forms, but also influenced by difficulties I encountered in making appointments with local managers which proved to be very hard sometimes. Staff members I contacted were not always willing or did not understand why I wanted to investigate the spatial form of the asylum centre. The visit to asylum centres in Winterswijk and Dronten came along with a tour from a staff member and small talks with the residents. In Utrecht I have collected the material myself by site visits, small talks with residents and a conversation with a fellow student who was shown around there before (while my request was politely denied). As mentioned earlier, it is important to realise is that I was not allowed to take pictures with people instigated by privacy concerns.

Interviews with inhabitants of the three researched cases could have been contributed to a more distinct appreciation of the place and its specific spaces, but I nevertheless chose not to do so. After some encounters with (former) inhabitants of asylum centres and after reading about some experiences of theirs in reports, it became clear to me that the appreciation of their living environment were first of all very diverse, secondly culturally framed and lastly, dependent on the willingness to share their experiences. It furthermore turned out to be rather difficult to visit the asylum centre as a researcher.

During the development of the vision I had mixed feelings about my way to go. I was distracted by news articles and television reports on cultural differences, asylees with different and even opposite values in relation to myself, on claims and complaints about the way how Dutch behave, on complaints of asylees that recently arrived on the Dutch asylum system. After the start of my design process I therefore wrote down a precondition for the people who are willing and trying to seek sanctuary in the Netherlands: ‘Asylum seekers appeal to right to seek asylum, as one of the universal human rights, and in this respect their appeal is directed towards the ability to have the same rights as Dutch. The precondition should be that you need to respect these values that are derived from these universal human rights in order to become Dutch.’ I am aware of this very political statement but for me it was the only way to resolve my personal issues and to envision something which could really make a difference.

I also struggled with the idea that I as designer could not improve the situation of the inhabitants of the asylum centre. Asylum seekers and refugees would be far more concerned with their uncertainty about the future (whether they can stay in the country or not), about the situation of their family and friends etc. However, I am convinced that spatial designers could improve their situation. I demonstrated that there is insignificant number of spatial requirements; moreover that the most important one, the anticipated possibility to become rootet again, is not catered at all. Taken into account these needs – even in a little way – in the form of being present and able to self expressive in public space and life would provide asylum seekers and refugees with a better life during their stay in an asylum centre.

In the end, I am convinced that the spatial viewpoint that was taken can allow for a more open discussion in the way how we as society provide those seeking sanctuary with a place on our territory. In any case, the best way to test this would be to show my research and design to practice.
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Deze document van de Vreemdelingenpolitie is een uitgebreide beschrijving van de regels en verplichtingen die voor asielzoekers gelden. Hieronder volgt een kort overzicht van de belangrijkste punten:

### Vreemdelingenrecht

- **Meldplicht**: Uw verplichting om u te melden tijdens uw verblijf in de opvang is van de regierung van de Coördinerende Autoriteit (COA) en de Vreemdelingenpolitie. Het COA zal vaststellen of u nog in de opvangvoorziening verblijft.
- **Overlast**: Het COA kan strafmaatregelen opgraven als er bij u of medebewoners overlast wordt veroorzaakt.
- **Gebruik van water, gas, elektra**: U mag geen veranderingen aanbrengen in de woonruimte op locatie of de gemeenschappelijke ruimten, behalve bij toestemming van het COA.
- **Doorbreken van contacten**: U mag geen contact opbouwen met contacten op buitenoordelijke locaties, behalve bij toestemming van het COA.

### Huisregels

- **Deelname aan programma's**: U bent verplicht deel te nemen aan de gesprekken en een aantal onderdelen uit het Verstrekkingen (ROV).
- **Discriminatie, intimidatie en geweld**: Het COA kan strafmaatregelen opgraven als er discriminatie, intimidatie of geweld wordt uitoefend.
- **Veranderingen aan de woonruimte**: Veranderingen aan de woonruimte in de opvanglocatie dienen te worden geregistreerd bij de Infobalie.
- **Afspraken in het kader van verkrijgen van een woning**: U bent verplicht deel te nemen aan de gesprekken over de mogelijkheid om een vaste woning te verkrijgen.
- **Landelijke feestdagen**: Het COA kan strafmaatregelen opgraven als er overschrijdingen worden gemaakt van de beperkingen voor landelijke feestdagen.

### Medische zorg

- **Medische afspraken**: U bent verplicht aan medische afspraken te deelnemen.
- **Deelname aan programma's**: U bent verplicht deel te nemen aan de gesprekken en een aantal onderdelen uit het Verstrekkingen (ROV).
- **Veranderingen aan de woonruimte**: Veranderingen aan de woonruimte in de opvanglocatie dienen te worden geregistreerd bij de Infobalie.
- **Afspraken in het kader van verkrijgen van een woning**: U bent verplicht deel te nemen aan de gesprekken over de mogelijkheid om een vaste woning te verkrijgen.
- **Landelijke feestdagen**: Het COA kan strafmaatregelen opgraven als er overschrijdingen worden gemaakt van de beperkingen voor landelijke feestdagen.
### Ruimtelijst azc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Azc</th>
<th>Aantal ruimten per azc van 400 oppervlakte (in m²)</th>
<th>Benodigd aantal m² per ruimte (nuttig oppervlak)</th>
<th>Gem. aantal gebruikers per ruimte</th>
<th>Aantal ruimten per azc van 800 oppervlakte (in m²)</th>
<th>Benodigd aantal m² per ruimte (nuttig oppervlak)</th>
<th>Gem. aantal gebruikers per ruimte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slapenruimte</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucheruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiletten</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keukens</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was- en droogruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruimte installaties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open / werkplek</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantoor, ketenpartners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huisvuurder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructuur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gebruik gebouwen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaapruimte</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucheruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiletten</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keukens</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was- en droogruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruimte installaties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activiteitengebouwen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaapruimte</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucheruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiletten</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keukens</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was- en droogruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruimte installaties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruimte VWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruimte VWN administratie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Algemeen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaapruimte</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucheruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiletten</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keukens</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was- en droogruimte</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruimte installaties</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Voor een éénpersoonsslaapkamer dient in de praktijk 5,3 m² aangehouden te worden.

Appendix: Spatial requirement/guidelines for an asylum centre (Bender, 2012)