

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Actor-relational planning in deprived areas : challenges and opportunities in
Luchtbal Antwerpen, Belgium

Reference:

Boelens Luuk, Coppens Tom.- Actor-relational planning in deprived areas : challenges and opportunities in Luchtbal Antwerpen, Belgium

Planning practice and research - ISSN 0269-7459 - 30:4(2015), p. 410-423

Full text (Publishers DOI): <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/02697459.2015.1060051>

To cite this reference: <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1285990151162165141>

Article: Actor-relational planning in deprived areas

Challenges and opportunities in Luchtbal Antwerpen, Belgium

Authors

Luuk Boelens, Full Professor, University of Ghent, Urban Unlimited

Tom Coppens, Associate Professor, University of Antwerp, (former employee of the city of Antwerp)

Corresponding author: tom.coppens@uantwerpen.be

Abstract

In this article, we report and discuss our experience with actor relational approaches in the regeneration of a post war housing estate in Luchtbal, Antwerp, Belgium. Actor relational approaches are informed by post-structuralist ideas of space, complexity theory and actor network theory. Although ARA itself is not new, the application of ARA to deprived area's such as Luchtbal is novel. We report how the approach has been elaborated, its process and outcome. We conclude with our evaluation from an insider's perspective.

Introduction

The actor-relational approach is a relatively young planning approach based upon post-structural planning theories. It aims to break away with more traditional, government-led planning approaches, including approaches such as comprehensive, strategic, communicative or collaborative planning. At its very core are poststructuralist conceptions of space, self-organization and co-evolution, and actor-network theory.

Although AR approaches have already shown merits in the context of regional development (see for example Boelens 2009), its added value to urban

regeneration of deprived areas has been less explored. This is a particular challenge as the regeneration of post-war housing estates has been a major concern for many European cities over the last decades. Once considered symbols of social and technological progress, most of these areas are today often under severe stress. Almost two decades ago, Peter Hall (1997) identified a number of interrelated problems such as physical decay, the concentration of social problems, low social and economic capital, the lack of amenities and a solid economic base. Since then, problems mostly have accumulated, despite the numerous urban regeneration initiatives that have been taken in many European cities. Moreover, a growing pile of evidence showed that traditional approaches based upon physical comprehensive masterplanning are both insufficient as no longer feasible due to cutbacks to tackle the problems these areas face (Ouwehand and Davis 2004, Kleinhans 2005, Slob, Van Kempen & Bolt 2008, Van Beckhoven and Van Kempen, 2006).

Figure 1: view on the characteristic Venezuela towers in Luchtbal, source: city of Antwerp

Luchtbal is such a problematic high-rise modernist social dwelling area of about 2500 families in the northern fringe of Antwerp. Physical decay, growing social unrest, the lack of an economic base urged the city to set up a regeneration project for the area. When in 2007 a physical masterplan was made for the area, it was hoped that through the construction of new homes affluent middle class families would be attracted to the area, in order to dilute its social and economic problems. However, the implementation of this plan soon proved unfeasible as there was hardly any interest from private developers and the targeted group to invest in Luchtbal. The failure of this physical approach in Luchtbal Antwerpen was exactly what brought the two authors of this paper together and provided an opportunity to experiment with emerging actor relational approaches. Whereas the first

author acted as a consultant, the second was involved as the responsible public officer.

Figure 2: Physical Masterplan De Nijl, Source: city of Antwerp

We realise that the application of ARA to post-war housing estate is far from self-evident, as self-organization in areas with a low organizational capacity might be a challenge. Therefore our paper has three aims. First, we want to explain how complex theoretical post-structural ideas have informed a practical workable approach in the case of Luchtbal. Secondly, we want to discuss the process and the outcome of the particular case. Third, we aim to evaluate the application of ARA in post war housing estates from our inside perspective as public officer and consultant.

The remainder of this paper is therefore organized as followed. First we will briefly discuss the basic building blocks of actor-relational approaches, and how they can be operationalized for planning processes. Next, we will describe the outcomes of the approach. What were the problems we encountered in implementing actor-relational theories on planning? What were the outcomes of the planning process, and to what extend did they have a structural and transformative impact? We will conclude with some remarks on the applicability of ARA to deprived post war housing estates.

Building blocks for an actor relational planning

The building blocks of actor relational approaches are made from insights from post-structural geography, complexity theory and actor-network theory. In poststructuralist ideas on geography (Thrift 1999, Belsey 2002, Murdoch 2006, space is not so much seen as a 'container', a prefabricated décor or platform upon which social, economic and/or cultural activities appear, but as an actor itself capable of influencing and stirring other actors, which in turn is stirred and influenced by those actors and other

spaces itself. According to Jonathan Murdoch (2006, p. 21), these kinds of ideas of space are characterized by the following four main features:

- space is made of heterogenic entities and contingent processes, which combine in relations; thus space is in essence relational;
- discrete spaces and places are only temporal stabilizations of those relations; these relations are therefore only stabilized provisionally and must be continually remade, as they are remade themselves;
- moreover these relations are more and more multiple; therefore there can be conflicts as sets of relations jostle for supremacy; equally there can be consensus as alliances are build and alignments forced;
- therefore spaces are always 'open', not closed in a pre-determined Cartesian three dimensionality; spaces are dynamic, rather than static, and always in a process of 'becoming'.

According to poststructuralists geographers, spatial planners and urbanists must therefore trace the trajectory of change, the line of force and possible alignments, rather than research proposed underlying, generic driven forces for change or come up with of creative vision of how space should develop, such for the sake of society, humanity or some kind of moral standards (Boelens 2001, 2006). Spatial policies or planning proposals need therefore be highly situational from within, instead from outside as for instance generic planning methods, external consultants, the city hall..... etc. In reference to our case, the possible spatial developments and plans of post war housing estates and its social-cultural practices are very much intertwined, as that they are related to general economic developments and institutional changes. Following these interrelations and intertwining's, working with it from within, could possibly lead to new 'openings', innovations and more resilient forms of spatial practices.

The second building block comes from co-evolutionary planning and the theories of complexity. Since complexity theories are in essence focused

on the dynamic, contingent and situational *relations* between the elements (as in a weather system), rather than on the distinct elements themselves put together in an additive way (as in a clockwork) which was and is in essence the main focus of structuralist, functionalists planning and urbanism until now, complexity is highly in line with poststructuralist thinking (De Roo et al. 2010, 2012). Moreover taking into account that our cross-border networked society has to be regarded as a highly complex system, we need to realize that it is more and more the result of several assemblages, which are partly spatial, but also partly networked related (Castells 1996-1998). These assemblages adapt themselves in a specific space to each other and changing settings; or in other words become a complex adaptive system (Teisman 2009). This is especially also the case in deprived areas. Stake- and shareholders adapt themselves to new and changing circumstances; effects become emergent from a good understanding of these dissipative relations, the causality of input and result is more than elsewhere highly fuzzy and therefore the limits of modelling and strategic planning is especially here highly visible (Rydin 2015). Instead of generic, long term-strategic solutions, we need especially over here highly situational, adaptive and strategic approaches, with an open eye for unintentional consequences and self-organization (Boonstra 2015).

In fact that would need a kind of co-evolutionary approach of planning, mediating between species and contexts, or evolving subjects and evolving objects, towards possibly a more resilient and innovative assemblage on the long run; robust and strong enough to survive and becoming a base for further explorations and developments in time. Like the evolutionary theories, these ideas of co-evolution are rooted in general Darwinism, with its notions of heritage, fitness, survival of the fittest, mutation and variety. However, it also goes beyond these classic evolutionary concepts in the view that groups of organisms are evolving not only by themselves in specific biotic circumstances, but also and in explicit circumstances through

reciprocal selective interaction with other related organisms, contexts or systems (Ehrlich and Raven 1964). As such over time and space, subjects and objects dissipatively influence each other continuously, co-evolving towards a new, if possible more resilient situation, which in turn etc..... (Durrant and Ward 2011). As said before, here the dissipative arrangements between the species or elements, and their settings or contexts become more crucial than the evolution of the elements themselves. In other words, within co-evolutionary approaches the networks or evolving assemblages between the elements become the main focus point.

The latter brings us also to the Actor Network Theories (ANT) of Callon (1986), Law (1986, 2004) and Latour (2004, 2005), the third theoretical building block of the actor-relational planning approach. A central element in ANT is the network defined by Latour (2005) as 'sets of associations between elements which are always mobile and fuzzy, going everywhere, but are specifically in need to create and maintain'. Thus the network is in ANT never static or given, but always fluid, organic and multi-dimensional, while different elements can be involved in more than one network with different impacts, consequences and causality. Since no one can oversee all these kinds of fuzzy and changing networks (even not with the vast digital instruments we have got now), ANT proposes to go down to the smallest element itself and to follow the actors themselves, their routines, ambitions, interests and traces. A key element in ANT is however that actors are not only human, but also inhuman; not only a politician, business men or inhabitant, but also infrastructure, available technology or other things could have a major impact on what is happening or not. Or in other words according to ANT there exists a 'radical symmetry' between the social and the material, coined with the term actant. Each of these actants could have a specific impact on (spatial) developments depending on their relations with others and fit within a specific time or situation. ANT, it is therefore not focused on being but rather on becoming, not on *'ready made*

politics', but on *'policies in the making'*. ANT inspired planners are therefore not so much focussed on blueprint plans, but on *'collective spatial becoming'* within evolving and always changing actant-networks. According to ANT, this kind of 'becoming' regularly evolves along four phases of translation - problematization-interessement-enrolment-mobilization (Callon 1986) - or along four stages of 'the collective': wonderment-consultation-hierarchisation-institution (Latour 2004).

However, as such ANT particularly proves its strength in retrospect; how did it come this way? Since planning is mainly a prospective operation the question comes up how to apply ANT proactively; how to induce future situations of becoming with ANT? Precisely for that purpose the idea of the Actor Relational Approach of planning has been developed (Boelens 2009). Here proactive planners could as well serve as intermediaries, bringing actants and settings proactively in association with each other, as well as mediators, mediating the proposed interests of non-human actors, self-reliant actors and contexts towards possibly more resilient co-evolutions. In reference to the four stages of ANT, ARA has distinguished seven proactive translation steps starting from the identification of the unique features or challenge in question, towards the final formal or informal institutionalisation of undefined becoming.

But what is more, in reference to the four ANT stages, and in reference to Jean Hilliers (2007, 2011) contemplations on the work of Deleuze and Guattari, ARA has distinguished four planners' navigation techniques in order to stimulate co-evolving socio-material practices (Sanders 2009):

- **Tracing**, as a kind of *Joint Fact Finding*, by jointly interpreting matters how it has come this way, through systematically following the tracks to the origin of an area, problem, challenge or existing association, in proportion to the framework of the task;
- **Mapping**, as a kind of *Joint Opportunity Seeking*, by jointly looking for new arrangements or possible translations that the traced socio-place

assemblages can live up to; open enough to be adapted to new actors, precise enough to genuinely make a resilient match;

- **Diagramming**, as a kind of *Joint Transformation of the Action fields*, by jointly looking for mutual matches of interest and possible added values in changing circumstances, contributing to several solutions for the mapped challenges or opportunities;
- **Agencying**, as a kind of *Joint Institutionalisation of becoming*, by jointly developing formal and informal agencies to facilitate resilient co-evolutions, through procedures of self-repairing, which are able to change and adapt itself to complex and altering settings.

Actor relational approach in practice

Back to Luchtbal now. When the city felt the need to try a new approach beyond physical masterplanning or participation and received subsidies from the Flemish government, the consultancy firm proposed to follow the four step-approach for Luchtbal, based upon the translation and navigation techniques mentioned above:

- ‘tracing’, the historic, existent and evolving actant-networks in the area to understand their situational specifics;
- ‘mapping’ possible new and innovative actant-networks from there as an educated matchmaking between the traced potentials and new challenges;
- ‘diagramming’ the transformations of actant-networks and their fields of reciprocal and adaptive influence through several bilateral talks and roundtables and
- ‘agencying’, through securing these mediated assemblages in more binding and passive institutional settings, such as laws, regulations, contracts, informal arrangements, etc.

Each of these elements have been developed in an intense interactive process with the residents, interested businesses, politicians and the

project group with the consultant, representatives from the city and the social housing company. But especially the first two elements, and partly the third one played a prominent role in the application of ARA-experiment in Luchtbal.

Tracing the specific assemblages of Luchtbal

The first step was to trace the situational specifics of Luchtbal. We used a mix of methods including a historical analysis, in depth interviews with public officers and residents, a spatial morphological analysis and a survey among 375 residents to understand the particularities of the area. On first sight, Luchtbal seemed to be a generic social housing estate. The project group however discovered four particularities that differentiate Luchtbal: its relation with the port, its green public spaces, the public facilities and its infrastructures.

The port

Pivotal in the history of Luchtbal has been its relation to the port and the port-related industries. In fact, Luchtbal owns its existence to the port, as the large scale and labour-intensive port production activities needed labourers nearby. However, over time, industries closed and the link between the social housing estate and the production activities gradually weakened. In their place new large scaled commercial activities, and facilities such as the fire station, sports and car retail and a cinema complex (Kinopolis) replaced the production halls. Next to that new, temporal and informal uses are gradually taking up the new voids. But these facilities attracted not so much employment for the old Luchtbal dock workers, but attracted large crowds of visitors and users from all over the region, even from across the Flemish borders. At the moment the potentials of these vast numbers of visitors and users are hardly exploited; they come and go without lingering on in the area itself.

Green Public Space

A second characteristic is the vast amount of green public spaces in Luchtbal. Designed as a modernist city, Luchtbal still has many open - though formal - green spaces. In the history of Luchtbal, these green open spaces and corridors played an important role in the social and urban fabric of the neighbourhood, as spaces were collectively used for recreation and farming. But over time, the uses and therefore socio-material intertwining's diminished as the population shifted and ethnic diversity increased. Green spaces are now underused and desolate, and rely heavily on the public sector for their maintenance. Through the network between public maintenance actors and the green spaces, open space has over time co-evolved into an object of maintenance rather than an object of public encounter.

Mix of public facilities

Third, unlike many other social housing estates in Western Europe, there is a large supply of public facilities in the area. There are many schools, including a sport and a swimming school, a community and cultural centre, a child day-care centre, a home for the elderly, a sports hall, and sport fields. From the survey, the project group noticed that many of the existing public facilities are hardly used by the residents, but mainly by neighbouring residents or other visitors from outside Luchtbal. As a result, the network of public actors, external users and facilities has co-evolved into spaces that support external networks, rather than local networks.

Infrastructures

Last but not least and as mentioned before Luchtbal is surrounded by large infrastructures. These large infrastructures decrease in many ways the environmental qualities of Luchtbal, but also provide many opportunities. Luchtbal is highly accessible by various modes of transport: it has two railway stations, it is a main entrance point of the city by car and in the near future, a new tram connection with the city and the northern village of Eekeren will improve the (public) accessibility even further. However, until

now the car has always been the main mode of transport. Therefore within Luchtbal, an over-abundance of asphalt is apparent, while at present an increasing number of inhabitants do not even own a car.

Although these characteristics have been found essential for the history and evolution of Luchtbal, these four characteristics are only loosely coupled with actors living in Luchtbal. Moreover, strong relations exist only with external actors and actants. The project group thought that –meditated by them – precisely these factors could play an important role in activating various latent (human) actors within and around the area. As such the focus turned to the ambitions, interests, needs and wishes of those local actors.

In addition to non-human factors, also human factors were traced. This was done via focus groups and a survey among residents. Three types of actors were addressed: civic, business and public. Moreover the project group was mainly interested in identifying '*leading*' actors – defined as those actors who are willing to invest (with money, time, legislation, expertise etc.) in their (physical, social, economic etc.) surroundings.

Civic Actors

In this respect actors within the civic society proved to have a highly multiple and diverse background in Luchtbal. Some residents lived there from the beginning for more than 50 or even 60 years, while others are newcomers and immigrants. From the survey we found that most residents were generally stratified with living conditions in Luchtbal. The availability of green spaces is considered the most positive characteristic, whereas traffic noise is the most problematic one. Generally immigrants did live in Belgium already for several years before they moved to Luchtbal. Moreover residents didn't want to move out again because of the apparent bad reputation of the neighbourhood itself. However, some were indeed worried about a possible negative spiral of the neighbourhood and others

had the perception that they were discriminated. But the vast majority throughout the neighbourhood (natives and ethics, young and old) only experienced a lack of good communication between the various groups and wanted better opportunities to live together. Surprisingly (in reference to the large number of potential transnational communities), the residents were in this respect also highly focused on the neighbourhood; only with regard to work, shopping and other non-daily activities they orient themselves to (the greater region of) Antwerp as a whole. Accordingly, the respondents were mainly focused on improving the public, communal spaces; firstly with regard to better and more appropriate shops in reference to the changing population and needs, and furthermore in better sport facilities ,economic activities and small business opportunities, activities for the elderly, young people and investments in the maintenance and security of the public domain. Approximately one third of the respondents of the survey would be willing to contribute (their spare time, experience and knowledge) to this program. So the project group labelled them as possible 'leading actors'.

Business Actors

Parallel to the resident survey, the project group explored the ambitions of leading actors in the business communities as well. It was executed by the consultant, firstly through an extensive actor-analysis on Internet (investigating year reports, investment strategies, news items etc. on possible involved actors within and around Luchtbal in reference to the unique selling points of the area) and secondly in primordial bilateral interviews with some twenty of those leading actors. From these explorations the project group concluded that there were hardly any (leading) business actors within the neighbourhood itself. Nevertheless they also concluded that in the (direct) surroundings of the neighbourhood, several leading business actors could be identified, which could possibly become involved in a co-evolutionary 'investment strategy' for Luchtbal, also for their sake.

Public Actors

In the third place, the project group organized several brainstorms with the main servants and officials of the involved departments of the public society: the Housing department, the Economic and Shopping department, Mobility & Infrastructure, Youth & Education, Sports and the department of the Public Domain. The main objective of these brainstorms was to inform and to be informed. Secondly the project group opted for an open mind, discussing possible new and/or innovative solutions. Especially with regard to the public domain and the youth & education workshop new ideas evolved with regard to a so-called 'green Luchtbal carpet', including ideas on self-management, block-wise urban farming experiments, community schools, additional sporting facilities and a more informal use by the growing number of adolescences of temporarily left-over spaces. The same kind of dynamics and new commitment occurred at the brainstorm with the economic and shopping department, with regard to for instance the realization of a container park for start-ups and incubators, new financial models for self-producing neighbourhood retail, a weekly Mediterranean market, repair stores in combination with ideas for a recycling shop. Next to that extra emphasis was put on an integrated event programming, in combination with a green image branding of the neighbourhood.

Mapping

Figure 3: Opportunity map. Source Urban Unlimited, city of Antwerp

With these challenges in mind the project group turned to the tool of 'opportunity mapping'. Here the focus turned especially to new, promising cross-overs not only in technical-physical sense, but also in the sense of new, surprising alliances. Because on the one hand there is a real threat for a further physical isolation of the neighbourhood as a result of its main infrastructure plans and restrictive planning measures in the direct surroundings, which would further isolate Luchtbal. On the other hand there

were also promising opportunities to come up with proposals, which could serve the needs, ambitions and interests of various (leading) actors as well.

First the *Social Green Carpet Luchtbal opportunity map* concentrated on a re-use and a collective appropriation of the public space in the area, to initiate a new dynamic outdoor daily live in the neighbourhood again. It focused on resident's (instead of public) maintenance of the courtyards in the Garden city and the formal green areas in high-rise Luchtbal. Temporarily self-management of a green agora by the adolescent youth, the development of a green (car free) bike/run course through the neighbourhood, including adjacent amenities, allotments and the refurbishment of the green areas according to the principle of participatory budgeting, could improve social control and (mutual socio-material) 'belongingness' of the neighbourhood itself.

Second the *Luchtbal FOYER* concentrated on the existing, but down run athletic course in the South of Luchtbal, in cooperation with the Sports retailer Decathlon, Kinopolis, the Luchtbal Theater and the International Seaman House. Intention was to revitalize and upgrade the athletic course for multipurpose sport activities for the neighbourhood, but also as a test-zone for the customers of Decathlon, play grounds for the adjacent schools, show off area for semi-pro African soccer teams. It was flanked by an upgrade of the indoor sport hall, a yearly street Olympics event, 24-hour leisure programme with Kinopolis, including the physical connections in-between, as a reciprocal adaptive part of the existent isolating infrastructure plans.

Third the *Luchtbal Central opportunity map* focused on the development of new retail functions and low cost space for the informal economy. New retail functions were sought that are adapted to local needs, such as a thrift shop, a fresh market and a low cost supermarket.

Finally, *the Luchtbal School campus* grouped a set of opportunities that aimed to share space between schools, public and private actors in order to stimulate a multifunctional use of existing infrastructure.

Each of these opportunity maps have been discussed in three roundtables of some 12-15 leading actors, roughly divided into 1/3rd of the business society, 1/3rd of the civic society and 1/3rd of the involved public society. Invitation criterion was their potential 'involved and/or leading actor status', proved by the first investigations mentioned before. And although these 'leading actors' hardly knew each other, each of the roundtables resulted into a lively debate about the projects and spatial opportunities presented. It resulted in a list of some 50 possible cases on the short (<2015), mid (2015-2020) and long term (>2020) in which each of the involved actors could perform its own role in a communal investment program with regard to finance, time, expertise, law, institutional arrangements and the like. One became aware of each other's potentials. Although some of the presented proposals could only count on little support, others were firmly embraced, or even extended and/or elaborated according to individual and/or communal views

Diagramming

After the mapping phase, extensive and long discussions were needed to develop self-organizing new collectives around these opportunities towards real business cases. The project group advised the municipal administration to facilitate a co-evolutionary implementation of the most promising cases. However during this diagramming process the project group met some important challenges with regard to the different actor-groups.

- Mobilization of civic actors: although the survey had indicated sufficient willingness to participate, and the project group had done additional efforts to outreach to different groups, participation in activities and

certainly engagement of private actors remained low. Moreover, those that participated were often the same local leading actors that already participated in past participation activities of the cities, and whose stakes and interests were already clearly articulated. As the Luchtbal area has had a history of failed masterplans, there was some distrust about the intention of the city and scepticism about the actor relational approach among these actors. Furthermore, the city administration did not really want to invest in building new relations with civic actors. It was argued that the social workers in the neighbourhood were sufficiently aware of the problems and interest of the inhabitants, so there was no need to set up new links.

- Mobilization of business actors: initially the business actors showed considerable interest to participate and to invest in some of the projects that have been mapped. However, it soon also emerged that some actors tried to settle ongoing conflicts over building permits with the city administration via the project group. Therefore, the city administration soon blocked initiatives taken from the project group to engage business actors within new business cases.
- Mobilization of the public actors: mobilization of public actors proved to be most successful. New networks between the mobility planners, spatial and social planners, cultural actors and social workers have formed around a considerable number of projects from the project list. However, the successful mobilization of public actors proved to be a barrier for the mobilization of the two other groups. Public actors and local social workers were very sceptical on the capacity of local residents and business actors to take initiatives, and there was thus little openness to stimulate the formation of arrangements.

Outcome

Two years after the implementation of the actor relational approach, mainly the green carpet and the Luchtbal Foyer have been successful. The central park, including the self-management area for the elderly youth, has been realized. Furthermore, the city and several citizen associations have taken initiatives to realize a temporary playground, community gardening, sport infrastructure, and a wooden bicycle track on an unbuilt plot of the social housing company, respectively the old run-course. Moreover there are several periodic festivals and community meetings organised in the area, resulting in a new vibe physically as well as socially.

5. Discussion: practising theories, theorizing practice

We would like to end with some reflections on the practising of post structural theories towards possibly new theorizing of practicalities. The actor relational approach in Luchtbal was organised as an experimental application of an actor relational approach for urban regeneration of post war housing estates. Based upon our own experience, the outcome of this planning process has been only partially successful. We will discuss step by step.

The theoretical lens of the ARA approach allowed us to see particular places as the co-evolution of actors and actans in actor-networks. This lens allowed us to come up with a specific diagnosis. In Luchtbal we have found only assemblages with almost exclusive external actors: the network between port actors and port infrastructure, the network between the oversupply of green spaces and amenities and public actors who maintain and programme them, economic actors and the warehouses and shops along the Noorderlaan and the network between (external) car users, public infrastructure providers and Luchtbal's extensive car infrastructure. The story of Luchtbal rather reads as a process of degenerating networks than a co-evolution of networks. So from the tracing exercise the ambition rose

to restore and to create local assemblages that could contribute to a more resilient and robust area.

The process of mapping could activate some of the residual potential of actors and the roundtables created a stimulating momentum. The executed approach showed that below the apparent surface, also within these deprived, mono-functionalistic, modernist neighbourhoods, high levels of self-organization and self-determination can evolve. Furthermore the approach showed that self-organization could contribute importantly to the ambitions and plans of other (leading) actors in and around the neighbourhood. As such the deprived and poor people in these neighbourhoods could play a major role in a co-evolution of the area, which would not only improve their self-esteem, but could also lead to actual physical improvements and to new socio-economic opportunities.

The subsequent steps of the actor relational approach, namely diagramming and agencying proved to be more difficult steps. We observed that especially the position of the public authority formed a main obstacle in the valorisation of the identified opportunities and the formation of new assemblages. When losing control over planning outcomes, old bureaucratic and technocratic routines take over again; Moreover, when initiatives were taken by non-governmental actors, these were easily hijacked by public officers from the city or from supra-local governments and integrated in governmental routines. As a result the process turned into a classic path dependent, public coproduction process, guided by the main concerns of one actor, the public authority. This gave rise to frustrations with several leading actors.

According to ARA, the governments is not so much a neutral arbiter, nor an objective investor for the interest of the general welfare, but it should be regarded as an actor itself with its own interests, goals and ambitions; challenging or possibly co-evolving with other ambitions. Planners and civil

servants should indeed serve; not directing developments in prefixed directions, but just facilitating as intermediates between various leading (f)actors of importance, in order to attain resilient assemblages. Within the present multi-dimensional and multi-actor complexities, fragmentations and volatilities, it is more than ever their duty to look these multi-actors, dimensions up in all their volatilities, trying to engage them within and through more relational modes of spatial developments And this needs a major reset towards truly co-evolutionary processing.

Reference List

- Belsey, C. (2002) *Poststructuralism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boelens ed. (2001) *Netherlands Networkcountry: Towards a new approach in urbanism and city planning*, Rotterdam: NAI-publishers, ISBN 90-5662-179-3 (192 pages).
- Boelens (2006) Beyond the plan; towards a new kind of planning; in: *DISP, ETH-Zürich 4-2006*, pp. 25-40.
- Boelens, L. (2009) *The Urban Connection An actor-relational approach to urban planning* 010 Publishers.
- Boonstra (2015) *Selforganization and Planning*; PhD Utrecht University (forthcoming)
- Callon, M. (1986) Some elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay, in: J. Law (ed) *Power, Action and Belief, a new sociology of knowledge?* pp. 196-229, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Callon, M. , Lascoumes P., and Barthe Y. (translated by Graham Burchell), (2009) *Acting in An Uncertain World: An Essay on Technical Democracy*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, and London, UK
- Castells, Manuel (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society: Volume I of The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, Cambridge/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, Manuel (1997) *The Power of Identity: Volume II of The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, Cambridge/Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, Manuel (1998) *End of the Millennium: Volume III of The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, Cambridge/Oxford: Blackwell.
- De Roo, G. , Silva E.A. (eds.) (2010) *A Planners' Encounter with Complexity*, Ashgate, Farnham
- De Roo G, Hillier J, Van Wezemaal J (eds) (2012) *Planning & Complexity: Systems, Assemblages and Models*, Farnham: Ashgate.

- Durrant, R. , Ward T. (2011) Evolutionary explanations in the social and behavioral sciences: Introduction and overview; *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 16 pp. 361-370
- Ehrlich PR, Raven PH (1964) Butterflies and plants: a study in coevolution, *Evolution*: 18 586-608.
- Hall, P. (1997). "Regeneration Policies for Peripheral Housing Estates: Inward- and Outward-looking Approaches." *Urban Studies*, 34(5-6), 873-890.
- Hillier, J. (2007) *Stretching beyond the horizon: A multiplanar Theory of Spatial Planning and Governance*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hillier, J. (2011) Strategic Navigation across Multiple Planes: towards a Deleuzean-inspired methodology for strategic spatial planning. *Town Planning Review*, 82(5): (September)
- Kleinhans, R.. (2005) Sociale implicaties van hestructureringen en herhuisvesting, TU/OTB, Delft.
- Latour, B. (2004) *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy Books*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*; Oxford: Oxford
- Law J. (1986) On power and its tactics; in: *Sociological review* 34, pp. 1-34.
- Law, J. (2004) *After Method: Mess in social science research*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Murdoch, J. (2006) *Post-Structuralist Geography: A Guide to Relational Space*, SAGE Publications.
- Ouwehand, A, Davis S. (2004) *Operatie geslaagd, vervolgingreep noodzakelijk*, OTB , Delft.
- Rydin Y. et al. ed. (2015) Introduction in *Materiality and Planning: exploring the influence of Actor-Network Theory*; Routledge (forthcoming)

- Sanders, W. (2009) Unmappables: Connecting people to possible worlds; in: Boelens, L. (2009). *The Urban Connection An actor-relational approach to urban planning* 010 Publishers, pp. 166-179)
- Slob, A., Van Kempen, R, Bolt, G. (2008). *Na de sloop. Waterbedeffecten van gebiedsgericht stedelijk beleid*. Den Haag: NICIS Institute.
- Teisman, G., Van Buuren, A., and Gerrits, L. (2009) *Managing Complex Governance Systems – Dynamics, Self-Organization and Coevolution in Public Investments*, Routledge: New York, London
- Thrift, N. (1996) New Urban Eras and old Technological Fears; Reconfiguring the Goodwill of Electronic Age, *Urban Studies* Vol. 33, no.8.
- Van Beckhoven E. , Van Kempen, R. (2006) Towards more social cohesion in large post-second world war housing estates? A case study in Utrecht, the Netherlands, *Housing Studies* 18 (6), pp. 853-875.