



# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Context

---

Since the 1980s, planning approaches in European regions shifted as a result of increasing attention to spatial patterns of interaction and movement on regional levels of scale, and alongside “a relative decline of the role of the state, a growing involvement of nongovernmental actors in a range of state functions, the emergence of new forms of multi-agency partnerships and more flexible forms of networking at various spatial scales” (Davoudi, 2008, p.63). Upcoming approaches, often called *spatial planning*, moved attention from the planning of predefined, contained territories to the planning of spatial networks, stretching across multiple and multi-scalar administrative boundaries. Planning that relied on generally applicable rationalities, statutory planning frameworks and authoritative planning power was challenged by planning that relied on an understanding of the specificities of regions, political consent on their desirable futures and the dedication of actors to these visions (Albrechts et al., 2003, Allmendinger and Haughton, 2010, Healey, 2006, Nadin, 2007, Needham, 1988, Schön, 2005). New approaches typically involved coalitions of plan actors from multiple tiers and levels of government as well as market and civil actors. Packaging their interests in shared visions became a way to operationalise planning. Collaboration in decision-making was used to simultaneously legitimise it. In an “institutional void” (Hajer, 2003, p.175) - in near absence of generally accepted and formally approved regional planning guidance - the inclusion of many in decision-making - good governance - became a normative goal of planning in itself (Innes and Booher, 2003, Mayntz, 2004).

The Netherlands is no exception. As elsewhere in Europe, planning underwent a process of regionalisation in this country from the 1980s onward. Increasing attention to regional spatial development led to new planning agendas that emphasised the importance of places in larger, mostly economic, networks. A shift towards regionalisation coupled with deregulation, and an enhancement of development-led planning practices. Direct investment into strategic projects and

area development became a dominant way of planning (Hajer and Zonneveld, 2000, Waterhout et al., 2013, Needham, 1988). Regionalisation liaised with tendencies of decentralisation, which resulted in a more equal distribution of planning power across national, provincial and municipal authorities (Haran, 2010, Salet, 2006, Salet and Woltjer, 2009, Teisman and Klijn, 2002). Regionalisation also coincided with the emergence of new decision-making approaches: “[P]lanners [...] began to promote constructive ways into actively developing new perspectives for the future instead of merely relying on protective and prohibitive regulation – hence the emphasis on the word ‘development’. Development planning refers [...] to a more involved and anticipatory activity by collaborating public and private agencies, stimulating the likelihood of implementation, rather than public agencies setting limits by decree” (Salet and Woltjer, 2009, p.236).

Among decision-making procedures that emerged in the context of spatial planning in the Netherlands was an array of practices commonly referred to as *regional design*. Practices that gained this label differed in their spatial scope and scale. They had a varying concern about issues such as: urbanisation, the development of transport, landscape and/or water systems at the city-regional, regional, national and transnational levels of scale. Some shared characteristics justify their common label though. Practices were all anticipatory indeed, concerned with the imagination of desirable spatial development. They all sought for comprehensiveness through considering a multitude of aspects that influence the form and functioning of this development. In all practices, the production of spatial representations, maps and models, was a core activity. Although differing in the composition of engaged parties, all practices knew the involvement of design professionals and a multi-actor setting. A significant shared characteristic was their strong relation with ongoing planning, expressed in their concern about large-scale public works, formal plans and policies, and in the frequent participation of governmental actors in practices. Practices also typically raised high and often varied expectations on their performances in this planning realm.

Using design-led approaches in planning decision-making was not new in the Netherlands in the 1980s. On the contrary, such use can be traced back to the beginning of the 20th century, when urban planning emerged as a distinguished discipline. By then, the Dutch designer Cornelis van Eesteren became a prominent figure in a European-wide debate on where to take the new discipline in the future (Van Rossem, 2014). In the Netherlands, in collaboration with the more analytically-minded Theodoor Karel van Lohuizen, he established design as a way to synthesise a deep understanding of spatial development with political aspirations, in the form of simple, and persuasive planning principles and to thus enhance the spatial quality of plans (Van Bergeijk, 2015, Van der Valk, 1990). However, expectations

concerning the performances of design-led approaches accumulated from the 1980s onward. When regulatory land-use planning came to be seen as an approach that “stifles entrepreneurial initiative, [and] impedes innovation” (Klosterman, 1985, p.2) regional design came to be seen as an artistic, and creative practice that bears unexpected, inspiring and inventive results; a way to mobilise “thinking capacity” in the realm of planning (Ministeries van OCW et al., 1996, p.18). When decentralisation and regional governance became issues in Dutch planning, regional design became expected to perform not only in discussion on spatial matters, but in political and organisational realms too. When efficiency became a major aspiration of Dutch spatial planning, the use of regional design in planning decision-making gained an efficiency rationale as well. The national government argued that the practice “is crucial in accelerating (administrative) processes by curbing the complexity and uncertainty that characterises contemporary tasks” (Ministeries van I&M et al., 2012, p.9, my translation). It became expected to lead to a “better, faster, and therefore cheaper process” (idem).

In parallel to these accumulating expectations (outlined in Table 1.1), the use of regional design in planning decision-making underwent a process of formalisation, in particular within the realm of Dutch national spatial planning. While the national government had first been involved in the practices incidentally from around 2000 and onward its engagement became more structural. The scope of policies aimed at stimulating architectural design practice through dedicated funding mechanisms was enlarged in the period, to include design with a concern about high levels of scale (Ministeries van OCW et al., 1996). During frequent reforms of these policies, fundable design practice became more and more thoroughly tied in with national spatial-planning agendas (Stegmeijer et al., 2012). In 2010, regional design became a mandatory moment in decision-making for large scale infrastructural projects (Enno Zuidema Stedebouw et al., 2011, Ministerie van I&M, 2010). Policy makers who promoted this formalisation assumed that interactive regional-design processes can, when employed at an early stage of implementation processes, explicate interdependencies among planning issues at different scales, facilitate discussions on these and in this way help to avoid conflict, delay and costs at later stages. In 2012, regional-design practice became associated with the set up top sector policy, a national policy aimed at an enhancement of internationally operating economic sectors (Ministeries van I&M et al., 2012). Representatives of the national government started to advertise the practice among an international audience of planners and entrepreneurs in urban development, during trade missions for instance. Under the header ‘a Dutch approach’, regional design came to be seen as a marketable export product.

TABLE 1.1 Expectations on the performances of regional design in spatial planning

Expectation	Source
– Design makes unconscious knowledge explicit and thus facilitates debate.	Van der Cammen (1987)
– Design involves ‘thinking capacity’ from outside the formal planning apparatus and thus enriches planning.	Ministeries van OCW et al. (1996)
– Design supports the implementation of planning decisions.	Vereniging Deltametropool (1998)
– Design accommodates attention to the diversity of local situations in planning decision-making.	Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR) (1998)
– Design clarifies political options. – Design helps to decide on investment strategies. – Design forges societal alliances.	Frieling (2002)
– Design facilitates reflexivity in planning decision-making.	Sijmons (2002)
– Design contributes to the innovation of planning. – Design helps to identify conflicts around planning solutions and thus makes these manageable.	Dammers et al. (2004)
– Design identifies relations between plans on different levels of scale and thus enhances integral planning. – Design identifies relations between physical, functional and financial aspects of plans and thus enhances integral planning. – Design contributes to systematic governance through involving local, bottom-up approaches.	Provincie Zuid-Holland (2004b)
– Design brings the essence of regional spatial development to the foreground. – Design identifies regional spatial relations and thus contributes to solutions that address complex spatial networks. – Design makes use of ‘free thinking space’; it facilitates a critical perspective on spatial planning and policies.	Atelier Zuidvleugel (2005)
– Design accommodates creativity of citizens in planning decision-making. – Design enhances the quality of democratic decision-making.	Frieling (2006)
– Design helps to leave old patterns of thought.	De Rooij (2006)
– Design helps to identify relevant tasks and scales of planning. – Design generates problem ownership. – Design organises planning through providing insight into spatial development.	Atelier Zuidvleugel (2008b)
– Design generates original planning solutions. – Design facilitates an in-depth understanding of planning tasks. – Design enhances the comprehensiveness of planning. – Design accelerates debate and thus enriches planning. – Design helps to place problems on the political agenda.	Blank et al. (2009)
– Design contributes to the articulation of planning tasks and thus coordination. – Design mobilises knowledge.	Hajer et al. (2010)
– Design facilitates synergetic effects of planning. – Design speeds up planning decision-making.	Ministerie van I&M (2010)

>>>

**TABLE 1.1** Expectations on the performances of regional design in spatial planning

Expectation	Source
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Design facilitates communication and thus the creation of organisational capacity for planning.</li> <li>– Design combines working on spatial solutions with working on organisational capacity.</li> <li>– Design enhances the efficiency of planning.</li> <li>– Design contributes to the definition of problems as well as the refinement of solutions to these problems.</li> <li>– Design facilitates integral spatial-planning solutions.</li> </ul>	Enno Zuidema Stedebouw et al. (2011)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Design contributes to the sustainability of planning decisions.</li> <li>– Design contributes to better, faster, and therefore cheaper planning processes.</li> <li>– Design creates societal and economic added value through supporting sustainable and resilient spatial development.</li> </ul>	Ministeries van I&M et al. (2012)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Design enhances the cultural significance of planning.</li> <li>– Design helps to unravel complex decision-making procedures.</li> </ul>	Boeijenga et al. (2011)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Design enhances the speed of decision-making through bringing conflict to the foreground.</li> </ul>	Ministerie van I&M (2013)

## 1.2 Problem field

The accumulated expectations that regional-design practices raise in the realm of spatial planning, and the formalisation that practices underwent in Dutch national planning since the 2000s imply that regional design and spatial planning are strongly interrelated, at least in the Netherlands. However, their performances in this realm are not well understood. Whereas many regional design initiatives refer to multiple objectives simultaneously, it remains unclear whether and, if so, how regional design-led approaches influence and improve planning decisions. This lack of sophisticated understanding has a set of reasons which are explained below.

The frequent use of regional design-led approaches in planning decision-making has led to abundant knowledge and expertise in the Dutch professional domains of spatial planning, urban, and landscape architecture design. Interrelations between practices are recognised, as a rich body of professional literature and a vivid debate among professionals shows. When to use design during planning processes is an issue in discussion, for instance. Designers plea for an open process that allows for a continuous reflection on the quality of plans by means of design (Sijmons,

2002, Dammers et al., 2004, Hajer et al., 2010). Planners subscribe to this call but with tempered enthusiasm about such open-ended decision-making: “Good for the project perhaps but a nightmare for the process” (Boeijenga et al., 2013, p. 7). Governance arrangements, which became important regional design commissioners since the early 2000s, gained critique by designers on their inability to define clear tasks, and on their lack of dedication to design output. Arrangements were also adjudged on being overly focused on their territories: “Not administrative relations, but an understanding [...] of complex spatial relationships should determine the scale of intervention. Changes taking place turn the existing layers of government at every scale into an anachronism” (Atelier Zuidvleugel, 2008b, p.100, my translation). However, the rich body of knowledge, including the multiple assumptions on interrelations between design and planning that controversies in discussion imply, is underused. It has in particular not yet benefitted a comprehensive understanding of the multiple expected performances of regional design in the spatial-planning realm. Most primary and secondary professional literature is focused on single regional-design practices with a concern about distinct problems in particular regions. Only few publications consider multiple practices at the same time (see for example Boeijenga et al., 2011, Boeijenga et al., 2013, Colombo et al., 2018, De Jonge, 2008, Hajer et al., 2010). Although the writings incidentally observe assumed performances in real world settings, none is dedicated to this purpose. In particular, writings by designers take positive outcomes of regional-design practices for granted. Also, the formalisation of regional design in Dutch national planning and policies has not led to an enhanced understanding. There are only few evaluations of its impact, for instance embodied in revisions of policies (Ministeries van OCW et al., 2005), and even fewer that take a distant and scientifically grounded approach in assessment (see for example Stegmeijer et al., 2012).

Debate and literature indicate that Dutch professionals hold a rich but implicit and fragmented body of knowledge on interrelations between regional design and spatial planning and the performances these produce. In the academic domain, attention to these matters have increased. Since the 2000s, planning and design scholars have published a range of dedicated studies, mostly drawing on the Dutch experience (De Jonge, 2009, De Zwart, 2015, Kempenaar, 2017, Klaasen, 2003, Neuman, 2000, Van Dijk, 2011). In addition, a range of other studies have had a latent concern about Dutch regional-design practice, through incorporating an elaboration of cases for the purpose of an enhanced understanding of, for instance, the use of spatial visualisation, scenarios and planning concepts in planning (Carton, 2007, Salewski, 2012, Van Duinen, 2004). However, the body of scholarly writing on regional design remains to be small and has some deficiencies for this reason. The empirical base upon which knowledge builds up is narrow; writing relies on the observation of few cases only. As in professional literature and

debate, scholarly writing on design (mostly written by design scholars) tends to have a normative bias, more focused on expectations than on verifying them (for similar observation in the realm of urban design, see Marshall, 2012, Stolk, 2015). As noted above, expectations concerning the performance of design in planning decision-making are varied. They imply a broad range of links to the neighbouring disciplinary fields and subfields of planning, governance and geography too. Research into regional design tends to focus on particular links, and consequently, a limited integration of theory. A particular knowledge gap is caused by a one-sided perspective on the performances of regional design in the realm of spatial planning. Most writing focuses on the impact that design practice has on planning. A reversed approach in which the impact of planning on design is investigated is missing. While the above mentioned recent research has provided important insights into how regional design influences specific aspects of spatial planning, it remains unclear whether and if so how practices are affected by their changing positions in planning and governance (for a similar notion on the integration of urban design and planning, see Gunder, 2011).

## 1.3 Research aim and questions

---

The above sketched situation implies that there is an abundant amount of knowledge on interrelations between regional design and spatial planning but that knowledge is implicit and fragmented: spread across professional and academic domains, and across disciplines and sub-disciplines. The main aim of this research is therefore to provide a more comprehensive understanding of interrelations, and, on these grounds, a better explanation of the variety of performances that regional design is expected to cause in the realm of spatial planning. Associated with this aim are a series of secondary aims (or requirements):

- **Positioning regional design in the academic fields of regional spatial planning and governance:** Knowledge about regional design is spread across professional and academic domains, and over a variety of disciplines and research fields. An aim of this research is to integrate notions from domains and the fields of design, regional planning and governance, for an enhanced trans-disciplinary understanding of regional design.



- **Understanding performances of regional-design practices:** Whereas many Dutch regional design initiatives refer to multiple objectives simultaneously, it remains unclear whether and, if so, how regional design-led approaches influence planning decisions. A second aim of the research is to distinguish regional-design practices by their relations to spatial-planning frameworks and an improved prediction of key performances on these grounds.
- **Understanding aspects of planning frameworks that influence performances of regional design:** It is unclear if and how design informs planning decisions as expected. It also remains unclear whether and, if so, how planning frameworks influence the performance of design. Since the 1980s, the Dutch national government became increasingly engaged in regional design and the practice underwent a process of formalisation. A third aim of the research is to understand key aspects of planning frameworks that influence the performance of regional design and that explain such processes of institutionalisation therefore.

In accordance to the main aim, the main research question is:

**How do the interrelations between regional design and spatial planning influence the performances of regional design?**

In accordance to secondary aims, the sub-research questions are:

- What are key performances of regional design in the realm of spatial planning? How can these key performances be analysed?
- What aspects of spatial-planning frameworks influence the performances of regional design? How can these aspects of spatial-planning frameworks be analysed?

## 1.4 Results and relevance

---

The aspirations of the research are described above. Concrete results of it are twofold. A first result stems from empirical analyses and is a critical discussion on Dutch national planning and policies in the period between the 1980s and the 2010s. Criticism, detailed in discussion sections of chapters in this volume, concerns above all a pragmatic turn in spatial planning over the time. It is argued that this turn has diminished interest in spatial development and collaboration in Dutch

national planning (Chapter 5). More importantly (and more relevant in the context of this thesis) it is argued that this turn has led to a one-sided institutionalisation of regional design in Dutch national planning, emphasising performances concerning efficient territorial management, while neglecting others that design-led approaches were claimed to have (Chapter 6 and 7). Criticism is meant to be constructive; it establishes part of the societal relevance of this thesis. Above, it was noted that regional design underwent a process of formalisation in Dutch national planning and policies but its outcomes have rarely been evaluated. Due to an exploratory nature of this dissertation, positions presented here are not the result of an in-depth policy assessment. However, their empirical underpinning is sufficient to facilitate critical reflection on the overly high and varied expectations that are often expressed in justifications of policies. A societal relevance of this research is established by an improved understanding of the position of regional design in Dutch planning. However, regional design is not a Dutch practice only. During the conduction of the research, a series of events were organised, appealing to an international audience of professionals and scholars with an interest in the practice. This showed that planning professionals and politicians in numerous European regions experiment with similar approaches, to challenge limitations that statutory planning systems pose to addressing problems that stem from particular circumstances in regions. As in the case of the Netherlands, expectations are high and varied but rarely verified in these regions.

A second, and most important result of this dissertation is an analytical framework that identifies different interrelations between regional-design practice and spatial-planning frameworks and predicts performances of regional design on these grounds. The framework draws on design theory, in particular on notions that conceptualise design as a reflexive, social-constructionist practice. When conceived in this way, design is imaginary and also argumentative, oriented towards building rationales for solutions that improve situations in the built environment. Argumentation considers this environment as a complex, and holistic system; it is therefore exploratory, evolving during multiple synthesis-evaluation iterations (Caliskan, 2012, Cross, 1990, Hillier and Leaman, 1974, Lawson, 2006, Schön, 1988, Schön, 1992, Rittel, 1987). During explorations, rules on the interaction between imagined solutions and simplified, typological classifications of the environment are formulated: “As rules of law are derived from judicial precedents, (...), so design rules are derived from types, and may be subjected to test and criticism by reference to them” (Schön, 1988, p.183). Building upon these characterisations of design, the framework also draws on theoretical notions from the field of spatial planning. Spatial planning is acknowledged to pay more attention to spatial development in particular areas and regions than other forms of planning (Albrechts et al., 2003, Allmendinger and Haughton, 2010, Faludi, 2010, Healey,

2006, Nadin, 2007, Needham, 1988, Schön, 2005, Waterhout, 2008). Theoretical notions that explain and detail how this attention is facilitated in planning decision-making received the main attention during the building of the analytical framework of this thesis. These include notions on argumentative planning, territorial governance, spatial representation, and, most importantly, spatial concepts, which are institutionalised perceptions of geographies that facilitate deliberation on how planning affects spatial development in regions and areas (Van Duinen, 2004, Zonneveld, 1991, Davoudi, 2003, Davoudi et al., 2018).

The finally built analytical framework describes regional design as evolving in a discursive dimension of these concepts. By building planning rationales in this context, it resembles discretionary practice. Discretion is, in popular terms, “the art of suiting action to particular circumstances” (The Rt Hon Lord Scarman, 1981, p.103). It aims at an improvement of rationales for action – or rules – through judging their implications for particular situations (Booth, 1996, Booth, 2007, Forester, 1987, Tewdwr-Jones, 1999). Viewing regional design as a particular form of discretion – one that is focused on geography and is proactive – has implications for the role and positioning of the practice in spatial-planning decision-making. The context of design practice in the form of institutionalised perceptions of geographies gains importance. Discretionary action is strongly influenced by the room for interpretation that premediated rules involve: their flexibility determines if such action likely evolves as a refinement of rules or as a challenge to them. Likewise, the ambiguity of preconceived spatial concepts influences regional-design practices: ambiguity determines if practices seek to detail concepts in the light of particular spatial circumstances or seek to expand them by uncovering new aspects of the environment. Performances, when understood as a change in the quality of decision-making (Faludi and Korthals Altes, 1994), can be explained by the matches and mismatches between prevailing concepts and design proposals: their shared or excluded analytical foundation, normative values and territorial actions. The involvement of actors in regional design can be qualified by legitimacy standards. In discretion, there is a distinction between discretionary action and control. When perceiving regional design as a rule-building practice, a distance between the ones who initiate and conduct design, and the ones who judge the relevance of design outcomes for planning decisions are required in accordance to this distinction.

This research relies on theories drawn from the fields of design and planning. One scientific relevance stems from combining these theories and thus addressing a gap regarding the relationships between disciplines. During theory formation, it became apparent that the gap is not a clear-cut divide between a discipline that is dedicated to management in the built environment, and a discipline with an exclusive concern about its (future) form and structure. Nor is it constituted by a

full ignorance of each other's knowledge and theories. The consideration of notions brought to the foreground that the integration of disciplines is rather hindered by a semantic disorder, a multitude of theoretical notions and observations that resemble each other but are expressed in other words or are derived from a slightly different context.

In design theory, design appears to be “a relatively simple set of operations carried out on highly complex structures, which are themselves simplified by ‘theories’ and modes of representation” (Hillier and Leaman, 1974, p.4). Scholars argue that if a design method is to be improved, a sophisticated understanding of these theories and modes of representation is more important than an understanding of the practices themselves. The particular scientific relevance of this thesis for the field of design is in bringing to the foreground a set of theories that have emerged in the field of spatial planning and which through their concern about geography, can enrich the discipline. Its particular relevance for planning scholars is in its contribution to the discussion on planning in a post-regulative era, where there is an enhanced attention to and consideration of the particularities of spatial contexts (Allmendinger et al., 2016, Brenner et al., 2011). Such attention and consideration of material settings and practices – the built environment and the way it is used – is central to design. Through presenting a deeper understanding of how regional design performs in this respect, this thesis appeals to scholars who seek to understand the dilemmas and conflicts that such consideration causes, the pragmatic behaviour it unleashes, or the continuous governance rescaling happening in and across regions.

## 1.5 Structure of the thesis

---

This research has taken the form of an exploratory case-study analysis, as will be explained in more detail in Chapter 2. Throughout the course of the research, empirical analyses and theoretical reflection have informed each other. The chapters and articles that are presented here have not been written in the chronological order that the consecutive sorting of chapters suggests but simultaneously at times. In this publication, the elements of research form four groups:

## Research approach

---

- **Chapter 2 - Research approach:** In this chapter, research methodologies and methods are explained.

## Key performances of regional design in the realm of spatial planning

---

- **Chapter 3 – From concepts to projects: Stedenbaan, the Netherlands:** This chapter, earlier published in the book *Transit Oriented Development: Making it Happen* (Balz and Schrijnen, 2009), presents a review of a regional-design practice that was conducted between 2005 and 2007 in the Southern part of the Dutch Randstad region. It is argued that design has contributed to establishing the Stedenbaan project, a regional transit-oriented development strategy, on the political agenda of governance arrangements in the region. The chapter documents the observations that have led to initial propositions, explored during a first round of case-study research.
- **Chapter 4 – Regional design in the context of fragmented territorial governance: South Wing Studio:** This writing, earlier published as a journal article in *European Planning Studies* (Balz and Zonneveld, 2015), presents results of the first in-depth case-study analysis. Also here the Stedenbaan regional-design practice was under investigation. The article first establishes an analytical framework that distinguishes performances of regional design by their impact on dimensions of spatial concepts. Performances are identified through shifts in the levels of policy argumentation. Conclusions emphasise a pragmatic use of design, and motivate an enhanced attention to the planning context of regional design more broadly.

## Regional design as a discretionary approach to planning

---

- **Chapter 5 – Transformations of planning rationalities: Changing spaces for governance in recent Dutch planning:** The first case-study analysis led to the proposition that existing spatial-planning frameworks - in particular the premediated spatial concepts that plan actors use for their justification - influence performances of regional design. To verify this proposition, a multiple case-studies analysis was conducted in the following. In this chapter, earlier published in *Planning Theory & Practice* (Balz and Zonneveld, 2018), it is first argued that the ambiguity of spatial concepts shapes room for interpretation and thus collaboration and governance. In the main empirical section of the article, spatial concepts that have been used in Dutch national planning between the 1980s and the 2010s are analysed. Next to preparing the multiple case-study analysis, the paper provides a detailed, and critical

reading of change in Dutch national planning in the period. On a theoretical level, it contributes to the discussion on governance responses to the use of geographies in planning decision-making.

- **Chapter 6 – Regional design: Discretionary approaches to regional planning in the Netherlands:** This journal article, earlier published in *Planning Theory* (Balz, 2018), details the central position of this thesis: that regional design is a form of discretionary action, meant to qualify planning guidance by means of reflecting upon its implications for particular regions and areas. The position is supported by an analysis of four regional-design practices and their interrelations with the earlier analysed spatial-planning frameworks. A strong shift towards a pragmatic use of regional design in Dutch planning over time is discussed in a dedicated section. In a concluding part, implications of the central position find attention. It is argued that regional design, through its engagement with particular regions and areas, brings tensions between a collaborative rationale of spatial planning and its strategic selectivity to the foreground.
- **Chapter 7 – The institutionalisation of a creative practice: Changing positions and roles of regional design in Dutch national planning:** An important implication of perceiving regional design as discretionary action is that the involvement of actors in regional-design practice requires careful scrutiny. This chapter (Balz and Zonneveld, 2019), earlier accepted for publication in the forthcoming book *Shaping Regional Futures: Designing and Visioning in Governance Rescaling*, critically discusses the institutionalisation of regional design in Dutch national planning on the grounds of an analysis of repetitive actor constellations and the formalisation of regional design in Dutch planning and policies. Conclusions emphasise on a need for discernible actor constellations when regional design is used for the qualification of planning decisions.

## **Conclusion**

---

- **Chapter 8 – Conclusion:** In this chapter, the main results of the thesis are presented in an overview and discussed. In addition, it contains critical remarks on the case-study research and the built analytical framework as well as a reflection on the implications of findings for future work. Chapter 8 is written for the purpose of this publication only.

## 1.6 **Additional remarks on this publication**

---

Chapter 3-7 have been published as peer-reviewed book chapters and journal articles before they were taken up in this thesis document. Some adaptations of original publications were undertaken to facilitate compilation. Numbers of chapters, sub-chapters, tables and figures as well as capitalisation of headers were changed for the purpose of overview. In case original publications do not include a list of key words, these were added. English spelling, punctuation, italic scripts and quotation styles were adopted from original publications. To be able to create one comprehensive bibliography, in-text citations and references have been adopted to match the reference style that has been chosen for this publication. In few cases, the combination of references in one list required the renaming of sources, for instance, due to individual researchers being listed as authors in one publication and their organisation in another or because abbreviations were used differently across earlier publications. In a few cases, translations of non-English literature were added or edited. However, there are no cases of the underlying literature being changed. Since the draft dissertation was presented to promotor for approval in January 2019, minor parts of so far unpublished text in Chapter 1 Introduction and Chapter 8 Conclusion were incorporated in forthcoming publications. In all cases the author of this dissertation is the first author of these.

