

FOREWORD TO THE THEME ISSUE 'POST 65'

Fifteen years ago *Bulletin KNOB* devoted a thematic issue to 'new heritage' in response to a perceived need for more and, in particular, different research into architectural development and heritage preservation in the twentieth century. The editors felt that contemporary historiography was incomplete owing to a strong focus on architectural innovation and relatively little attention to renovations, traditional works and the cultural processes involved in evaluating new heritage. In short, it was time for a revision of both the historiographical picture and architectural heritage. The primary focus of that thematic issue was prewar architecture, with a brief foray into post-war reconstruction based on the 'top 100 heritage buildings' from the years 1940-1958. Time was not on our side, however; with a second tranche of post-war heritage buildings from the period 1959-1965 on the horizon and the envisaged historiographical revision barely begun, a new heritage offshoot made its appearance: Post 65. The designation encompasses everything built after 1965, with a provisional cut-off year of 1990: a period of unprecedentedly high construction output and of major social developments that found expression in contemporary spatial planning and had a defining effect on the physical living environment. This most recent new heritage is substantial and diverse and, on top of that, much of it is due to be renovated, retrofitted for sustainability, redeveloped or repurposed. Every reason, therefore, to take a good look at the architecture, urban design and land development from this period and in so doing accumulate the knowledge needed for an approach that does justice to the inherent cultural-historical values.

In recent years interest in the Post 65 period has soared – among historians, policy makers, designers, developers, residents and other stakeholders. A lot of knowledge has already been accumulated and made available via studies of architecture, housing, urban renewal, spatial planning, landscape, urban design, building typologies, specific locations and projects, individual designers, and other sub-topics. This has in turn generated insights into the spatial heritage of this period and into how it is dealt with. This growing stream of publications includes *Bulletin KNOB* articles with a Post 65 theme: on the new council chamber in The Hague, Piet Blom's structuralist architectural drawings, a postmodern interior designed by Alessandro Mendini and urban renewal in Amsterdam's Dapperbuurt. Since there were more articles on this period in the pipeline, we decided to bring them together in a thematic issue and to invite a number of writers to contribute. Our aim is to shed light on several different aspects of Post 65

heritage while also focusing on topical issues. We hope that this thematic Post 65 issue will increase the knowledge and appreciation of spatial heritage from the Post 65 period and contribute to the discussion about strategies for making use of this in transformation projects. It endeavours to do this via the kind of historical analyses familiar to readers of the *Bulletin*, complemented by reflections from contemporary heritage and design practice.

The articles in this issue are grouped into three topics. The first of these deals with the wider spatial context, that of urban planning and the landscape. Noor Mens and Hugo van Velzen in their study of the spatial development of Capelle aan den IJssel distinguish several, partly overlapping phases, from large-scale, repeat-pattern housing schemes in the 1960s, through districts that attempted to resist that monotony but were just as large-scale, to imaginative, villagey subdivision patterns and home zones, and ending in the rationalist planning and architecture of the 1980s. This is followed by two shorter reflections on the significance of Post 65 heritage at this level of scale from the perspective of the social and spatial challenges of today. Anita Blom sees a role for users in the necessary transformation of Post 65 housing schemes. Resident participation can in her view result in a more widely supported approach to the renewal of these districts, and to greater grass-roots involvement in the construction and management of future residential areas. Natascha Lensvelt notes that the Dutch landscape is on the cusp of a transition in which parks, neighbourhood green space and recreational areas will be increasingly co-opted into the drive to enhance biodiversity, improve water quality and raise groundwater levels. She believes that research into the integrated thinking and working methods of Post 65 garden and landscape architects could help us in this endeavour.

The second topic encompasses various aspects of the architectural production of this period. Sanne Tillema discusses the work of the architectural couple Thieme and Brita Thieme-Domela Nieuwenhuis. She describes their equality-based collaboration and analyses a number of projects from their oeuvre, much of which has meanwhile been compromised or disappeared altogether. Sanne van Drenth examines the Centraal Wonen co-housing concept and organization, locating it between the early 1970s, with its emancipatory and socio-critical movements, and the rationalist 1980s when the bulk of the CW projects were realized. Sara Duisters surveys the use of fibre-glass-reinforced polyester (FRP) in architecture, sketching the social changes that underlay this phenomenon and discussing several experimental prototypes realized between the 1950s and 1970s.

The third and final topic concerns the perception and treatment of Post 65 architecture and the issue of its evaluation. Bernard Colenbrander's thought-provoking essay turns the spotlight on the life expectancy of recent architecture. Arguing that the functionalist fixation on efficiency has carried through into the treatment of existing buildings, Colenbrander uses three current cases to show what different outcomes this can have. Marylise Parein, Ine Wouters and Stephanie Van de Voorde apply the Brussels method for evaluating architectural heritage to two Post 65 building complexes, with special emphasis on their materiality. They point to the importance of an integrated approach and the acquisition of in-depth knowledge of materiality to arriving at a correct interpretation of heritage values and criteria. Evelien van Es, Lara Voerman and Sarah Gresnigt explore the extent to which existing architectural heritage evaluation criteria are applicable to the post-1965 period. They argue for a different approach, one in which lived experiences are recorded and citizens – alongside experts – play an active part in the process of selection and evaluation.

On behalf of the editors:

Noor Mens, Kees Somer, Kim Zweerink