

### Section 1 - Application details

Title of the proposal	A NEW PLANNING
Main applicant	Wil Zonneveld
Co-Applicant	Paul Gerretsen
NWA route(s) applicable to the research proposal	Towards resilient societies Quality of the living environment Sustainable development goals for inclusive global development Smart, liveable cities
Keywords	Spatial planning, comparative method, NOVI, institutions

### Section 2 - Research proposal

**A total limit of 2000 words applies for section 2 (not including literature references)**

#### 2a. Description of the proposed research

*Please provide a description of the proposed research. Include the aspects mentioned under criterion I (quality of the research proposal) in section 4.2 of the call for proposals.*

TU Delft and the *Vereniging Deltametropool* have created a Consortium of academic, civil society, government and market sectors to meet the urgent need for a new model of strategic spatial planning that will keep the Netherlands at the forefront of territorial governance. Our argument is that a fundamental breakthrough is needed to completely recast the spatial planning system to fit totally transformed social, economic and cultural conditions, and meet critical interconnected societal challenges.

Since 1941 the Government of the Netherlands has created institutions and policies for the formulation and implementation of national spatial planning policy that has had a decisive impact on the form and character of the Dutch territory. From 1966 successive versions of 'national plans' gave expression to ambitions that would become known as 'Dutch planning doctrine' (Faludi & Van der Valk, 1994; NSGCP, 1998, 1999). These plans were based on the assumption that a national approach to strategic spatial planning was needed to provide solutions to massive post-war population and household growth, and growing demands for services, mobility and economic expansion. Spatial strategies would 'keep the Netherlands in shape': maintaining spatial and environmental quality.

Whilst the approach of successive plans has varied in terms of spatial concepts, governance arrangements and concrete instruments, the core principles of balanced urban development, complementary functions of cities and high spatial quality has persisted. Above all, national policy has provided a 'strategic approach' to development of the territory, coordinating the contribution of sectoral policies to place-making and quality of life, and managing vertical cooperation across administrative levels. This Dutch model has been described as 'comprehensive integrated'; an approach which has earned national spatial planning an international reputation (CEC, 1997) and even global recognition (Sanyal, 2005).

In the face of changing conditions, criticism of this model of spatial planning grew at the end of the 1990s. It was expressed in what turned out to be a highly influential report by the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR, 1998; NSGCP, 1999). Perceptions of spatial structure were regarded as outdated and the underlying planning model was considered inappropriate in 'the age of the network society' (Hajer & Zonneveld, 2000) From the early 2000s the conditions that

supported national spatial planning weakened in the face of increasing economic competition, neoliberal thinking in government, decentralisation of powers, market-led development and changing citizen preferences. National planning changed course, handing over main parts of the planning agenda to local government, dropping ambitions to coordinate spatially relevant policy sectors as well as coordination across administrative levels: the end of Dutch planning doctrine (Zonneveld & Evers, 2014). However, the core model remained much the same.

The Netherlands now faces a new round of urgent challenges resulting from household growth and associated demands for travel and services, the risks associated with climate change, the energy transition and the opportunities and threats posed by new information technologies and automation (Borja and Castells, 2013). The need for coordinating the many strands of government law and policy in the interests of more sustainable development and spatial quality remains and intensifies. Critical issues cannot be dealt with by just one of the three administrative levels alone but also need involvement of societal stakeholders and need citizen support at large. At the same time, the tools used for integration are no longer fit for purpose and the underpinning institutional apparatus of the Dutch planning doctrine is disordered. While there has already been a substantial reform of the formal institutions and the framework of laws and competences (the new Environment Act), there are no clear solutions to arrive at 'authoritative governance' (Hajer, 2010) in situations of fragmented power or even an 'institutional void' (Hajer, 2003).

All this requires a breakthrough in thinking about spatial and environment planning: a new way of doing planning. A new planning model is needed that can simultaneously provide direction and coordination whilst working inclusively in more complex governance settings, addressing effectively the urgent spatially relevant challenges. This requires not only reform of the formal institutions of planning law (which is underway), but also a reworking and reinvention of the core strategic planning instruments at national, provincial and local levels. Formal (especially legal) institutions tend to change extremely slowly, but informal institutions may be even more resistant to change. This project will address the formal tools that are used to formulate and implement policy within the new legal framework, but also the informal 'ways of doing' planning, seeking a balance between what Salet (2018a, b) calls 'institutions' on the one hand, and 'planning in action' on the other.

The project seeks

- i) to provide a thorough evaluation of the institutions of the Dutch spatial planning model in the content of new and evolving socio-economic conditions and its national, cross-border neighbourhood, transnational and global European context;
- ii) to design and test alternative instruments or components of a planning model through simulation exercises and dialogue with government, market and civil society partners;
- iii) to draw on the testing and comparative analysis to provide a road map of how current formal and informal institutions can evolve into a new model of planning that is fit for purpose.

The outputs from the project will be

In years 1 and 2, a constructive evaluation of performance of strategic planning, across national provincial and municipal levels and the relationships between them, comprising:

- international benchmarking of the Dutch planning model(s) and trajectories in terms of policy integration, territorialism, democratic accountability, engagement, and readiness to innovate;
- pinpointed strengths and weaknesses of the current model in stimulating integrated policy and transition through urban redevelopment, mobility and services, the energy transition and economic restructuring;
- a portfolio of innovative practices in other countries that may provide enhanced or complementary planning instruments that can stimulate coherent responses from market, civil society and public actors towards more speedy and effective, sustainable and resilient urban transformation.

In years 3 and 4, a detailed assessment and selection of new institutional forms for the planning model from case studies and international scoping, comprising:

- joint formulation with partners of amended, replacement or complementary instruments that will stimulate transition and enhance integration, territorial governance and democratic accountability and make the most of new technology;
- formulation and testing of prototypes of components of a new model (form, content and processes of national and regional strategic planning) in joint simulation exercises with public, market and civil society partners;
- a roadmap for reform of the Dutch planning model addressing both formal and informal institutions.

The evaluation will be based on a conceptual framework that addresses the dynamic interrelations between six critical dimensions of territorial governance: policy integration, functional territorialism, democratic legitimacy, proportionate action, engagement and readiness.

The forms and mechanisms of **policy integration** or coordination of the territorial impacts of sectoral policies are well known yet the reality is often little more than 'muddling through' or 'loose coupling' (Benz, 2010). The reality (and potential benefits) of sectoralism are rarely addressed. An increasingly used approach to policy integration is **territorialism** or the creation cross-border and transnational territories – the new functional or soft planning spaces (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2010). The creation of such spaces, divorced from formal jurisdictions raises questions of **democratic legitimacy**. There is also the perennial challenge of **proportionality** – the force that planning instruments exert to influence change, that is the degree of commitment or discretion given in their implementation. In contemporary conditions of dispersed and fragmented power, control is no longer an option and new approaches are needed that give incentive to actors to 'do the right thing'. The relation between citizens and government will be assessed in relation to **engagement** rather than the hackneyed (and for strategic planning) largely unhelpful notion of participation. Finally, we will consider the **readiness** of planning institutions to benefit from the revolution of the information age in both its procedures and policies.

The methods of inquiry introduce novel approaches alongside well-tried methods. The main elements are,

- evidenced-based and peer evaluation of the current planning model(s) in partnership with civil society, government and market stakeholders through in-depth case analysis and dialogue, based on stories of specific places where multiple sectoral policies at national, provincial and local levels come together;
- international peer review of the primary instruments of strategic spatial planning through a series of symposia and workshops, and structured dialogue;
- international comparative analysis of planning models bringing into relief the effects of nationally-bound institutions and structures on territorial governance and raising awareness of novel solutions (and the limitations of policy transfer);
- formulation and simulation of prototype components of the new planning model with government, market and civil society partners.

The project will concentrate attention on a limited number of policy domains with urgent territorial challenges. This will focus attention, reduce the workload and reduce risk. The priorities will be discussed with partners but are likely to include: the energy transition; urban growth and housing regeneration; accessibility to urban services; and the promotion of local entrepreneurialism.

In addition to analysis of **domestic practice**, from national to local, international comparisons will be undertaken in three interrelated 'rings' with specific cases drawn from places that face similar territorial challenges, particularly managing urban growth in a dense urban network. The rings are:

**Neighbourhood territorial policy alignment** – in the context of complex dynamics of cross-border relations we will evaluate the complementarity of Dutch national and regional spatial strategies and strategic planning methods with neighbouring strategies in north-west Europe, with particular attention to North Rhine-Westphalia and the Flanders region of Belgium.

**European comparative institutional analysis** – this will compare the performance of Dutch strategic planning with other approaches in countries with similar political and institutional structures and critical territorial challenges. The project will take a selection of European countries and regions and concentrate on a substantive challenge for each, for example, the UK/England on the energy transition; Denmark/Copenhagen on climate adaptation and urban spatial structure; Finland on housing and social development; France on service provision in functional regions; and Italy on entrepreneurialism and regeneration of metropolitan regions.

**Global exemplars of innovation** - with reference to effective techniques of international policy transfer, drawing lessons and principles from ground-breaking examples of territorial governance processes and policies around the world, including for example, national policy communication techniques in Japan; strategies to give incentive for circular economy and local entrepreneurship in China; and prioritising natural resource management in New Zealand.

## 2b. Potential scientific and/or societal breakthroughs

*Please address the potential scientific and/or societal breakthroughs. Include the aspects mentioned under criterion III in section 4.2 of the call for proposals.*

### *Description:*

At the heart of this proposal is a novel inclusive research design that will bring together academic, civil society, market and government actors to characterize, problematize and propose comprehensive solutions to the challenges of managing the Dutch territory towards a more sustainable and resilient future. It will provide a much needed internationally informed evaluation of the Dutch model of strategic spatial planning. It will propose an alternative that is fit for purpose and explain the steps needed to transition to a new model.

The project addresses four 'routes' and their interdependencies. In its interaction with market and civil society, the strategic spatial planning system tackles the interaction, complementarity and competition between policy goals in particular places. It will evaluate the role of strategic spatial planning in mediating the interaction 'between policies, government and citizens' and propose 'new political institutions and practices' that can strengthen society's **resilience**. It will address the capacity of government to manage the place-based interdependencies of that contribute to the **quality of the living environment**. It will propose mechanisms 'to improve horizontal [and vertical] policy coherence and provide lessons that can be applied for more **'sustainable and inclusive global development'**. Above all, it will make a positive impact on the capacity of government to engage with many interests in the contribution of strategic spatial planning to truly **smart, liveable cities**.

The project will provide a scientific advance in combining concepts that provide insights into the nature of the institutions of spatial planning systems into a theoretical model of a planning system that is universal, and apply and test this model in a variety of international settings. It will provide a step change in the analysis of strategic spatial planning from static synchronic descriptions to diachronic explanations of the evolution and trajectory of institutions.

## 2c. Literature references

- Allmendinger, P. and Houghton, G. (2010) Spatial planning, devolution and new planning spaces, *Environment and Planning C*, 28(5).
- Balz, V. (2017) Transformations of planning rationales: changing spaces for governance in recent Dutch national planning, *Planning Theory*,
- Balz, V., Zonneveld, W. and Nadin, V. (2014) Discretionary approaches to regional planning in the Netherlands, paper presented to AESOP Utrecht/Delft.
- Borja, J. and Castells, M. (1997) *Local and Global: The Management of Cities in the Information Age*, London: Routledge.
- Borja, J., Castells, M. (1997) *Local and Global; The Management of Cities in the Information Age*. New York/London: Routledge.
- CEC, Commission of the European Communities (1997) *The EU compendium of spatial planning systems and policies*, Regional development studies 28. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
- Faludi, A., Valk, A. van der (1994) *Rule and Order: Dutch Planning Doctrine in the Twentieth Century*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hajer, M.A. (2003) Policy without polity? Policy analysis in the institutional void. *Policy Sciences*, 36(2), No. 2, pp. 175-195.
- Hajer, M.A. (2010) *Authoritative Governance: Policy Making in the Age of Mediatization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hajer, M.A., Zonneveld, W. (2000) Spatial Planning in the Network Society - Rethinking the Principles of Planning in the Netherlands, *European Planning Studies*, 8(3), pp. 337-355.  
doi.org/10.1080/713666411.
- Nadin, V. (2013) International comparative planning methodology: introduction to the theme, *Planning Practice and Research*, 27(1): 1-5.
- Nadin, V. and Stead, D (2013) Opening the Compendium: an evaluation of international comparative planning methodologies, *European Planning Studies*, 21(10): 1542-61.
- Nadin, V. and Stead, D. (2008) European spatial planning systems, social models and learning, *DISP* 172, January, 35-47.
- Nadin, V. et al. (2018) COMPASS – Comparative Analysis of Territorial Governance and Spatial Planning Systems in Europe, Luxembourg, ESPON
- Salet, W. (2018b) *Public Norms and Aspirations; The Turn to Institutions in Action*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Salet, W. (2018b) *Public Norms and Aspirations: The Turn to Institutions in Action*, RTPI Library Series, Oxon/New York: Routledge.
- Salet, W. (Ed.) (2018a) *The Routledge Handbook of Institutions and Planning in Action*, Oxon/New York: Routledge.
- Salet, W. (Ed.) (2018a) *The Routledge Handbook of Institutions and Planning in Action*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Sanyal, B. (Ed.) (2005) *Comparative Planning Cultures*. New York/London: Routledge.
- WRR (1998) Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (1999) *Spatial Development Policy; Summary of the 53rd report*, Reports to the Government no.53, The Hague: Sdu Publishers.

WRR, Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (1998) *Ruimtelijke ontwikkelingspolitiek* [*Spatial Development Policy*], Rapporten aan de Regering nr.53, Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers.

### Section 3 - The consortium

#### 3a. Composition of the consortium

Please indicate the main applicant, co-applicant(s) and co-financing partners in the tables below. Per consortium member, a short CV of max. 0.5 A4 can be uploaded in the online system. Please add all the CV's in one combined pdf file and upload this file as an attachment in ISAAC.

Main applicant			
Name, title(s)	Organisation	Position	Expertise
Wil Zonneveld	Delft University of Technology	Professor of Urban and Regional Planning	Urban and Regional Planning, Spatial Planning and Strategy

Co-applicant(s)*			
Name, title(s)	Organisation	Position	Expertise
Paul Gerretsen	Deltametropolis Association	Director	Urban and regional planning, Project Management, strategic Development

Co-financiers partner(s)			
Name, title(s)	Organisation	Position	Expertise
Emiel Reiding	Nationale Omgevingsvisie (NOVI)	Director	Spatial Planning and Development
drs. Paul Rijzinga	Provincie Gelderland	Strategy Advisor	Strategic Planning and Policy development
ir. Shirin Jaffri	Provincie Noord-Holland	Senior Advisor, Directorate of Policy	Program Manager and Energy Infrastructure
Erik Pasveer	Gemeente Den Haag	Head of Urban Planning and Planning	Urban Planning and Development
Marije ten Kate	Gemeente Rotterdam	Principal Planner	Housing and Urban Planning
Luc Pacilly	Rijkswaterstaat Water Transport and Environment	Head of Unit Spatial Planning, Economy and MIRT	Knowledge management, Change management, Administrative law
ir. Micheline Zeenni	Arcadis Nederland B.V.	Director Market Group	Master Planning and Sustainable Urban Development
Prof. dr. Jos Arts	University of Groningen	Professor Environmental & Infrastructure Planning Faculty of Spatial Sciences	Environmental & Infrastructure Planning

\*Please add a row for each co-financing partner.

### 3b. Description of the consortium (max. 1000 words)

Please give a description of the consortium. Include the aspects mentioned under criterion II (quality of the consortium) in paragraph 4.2 of the call for proposals.

The consortium has been created to match the real practice of strategic planning that always involves a mix of stakeholders from government, the private sector and civil society. The main partners have experience of successful collaboration previously. In addition, the *Vereniging Deltametropool* provides access to over 80 members, a selection of whom will be engaged as a wider sounding board for findings and proposals.

The academic project leader, TU Delft is recognised as of international excellence in research and publication on spatial and urban planning with a large team of researchers, many working on institutional aspects of strategic spatial planning in the Netherlands and/or international comparative analysis of planning systems. Delft will be supported by Groningen University on the academic work, particularly on institutional design in complex settings.

It is intended to use the project to provide opportunities for a recent PhD graduate as a post-doc and a new PhD candidate. Other senior and junior researchers will be involved both in the academic partners and the *Vereniging Deltametropool*, which will entail a significant in-kind contribution.

TU Delft has been prominent in the application and interpretation of its academic scholarship and research in society, for example in the role of planning and urban design in the management of deltas around the world. This experience will be invaluable in transposing the academic work of the project into practical outputs. Societal partners will be engaged from the outset, and much attention is given in the research design to establishing and maintaining a dialogue among the partners, through symposia (that will also involve international partners), a programme of workshops and the practical simulation exercises, that will employ all relevant partners for a particular case. Government partners will facilitate access to information for specific locations that are selected for detailed study, for example, in relation to the Dutch-Flanders cross-border planning. The private sector and civil society partners will contribute to evaluation of the current model and will help to test the feasibility of alternatives in the simulation exercises.

The partners have indicated that they are committed to providing the substantial in-kind assistance which is needed to deliver the project. The second stage application, like this first stage will be a collaborative exercise with each partner having an input so that we can specify in more detail the specific roles and commitment of each partner with certainty.

It is intended to extend the consortium with international partners to assist in the case studies and scoping exercises, and the wider dissemination of 'the new planning'. We have strong connections already with potential partners for the possible cases that are mentioned above, and there is strong international interest as always, in working with and learning from the Dutch experience.