MARCH 2014

THE FUTURE OF THE CITY

THE POWER OF NEW CONNECTIONS

Council
for the Environment
and Infrastructure

About the Council for the Environment and Infrastructure
The Council for the Environment and Infrastructure *(Raad voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur, Rli)* advises the Dutch government and Parliament on strategic issues concerning the living and working environment. The Council is independent, and offers solicited and unsolicited advice on long-term issues of strategic importance to the Netherlands. Through its integrated approach and strategic advice, the Council strives to provide greater depth and breadth to the political and social debate, and to improve the quality of decision-making processes.

Council for the Environment and Infrastructure (Rli)
Oranjebuitensingel 6
P.O. Box 20906
2500 EX The Hague
The Netherlands
info@rli.nl
www.rli.nl

MARCH 2014

THE FUTURE OF THE CITY

THE POWER OF NEW CONNECTIONS

The Dutch version of the advisory report contains an additional analytical section.

CONTENTS

ADVICE

AN ADVICE ON THE FUTURE OF THE CITY

1 Context

The Council for the Environment and Infrastructure (RIi) has drawn up this advisory report on the future of the city for two reasons. First, cities are becoming increasingly important as hubs in the global economy: the clustering of people, companies and amenities in cities provides countless economic opportunities. Around the world, urban economies are more productive, faster growing and more innovative (Raspe, 2012) and large urban regions, not nations, have become 'the competitive unit of the global economy' (Katz & Bradley, 2013). Agglomeration has proven to be an important success factor in international competition. On this point, Dutch urban regions are somewhat lacking: with a polycentric structure of mostly midsized towns, Dutch urban regions are, by international standards, rather small in terms of size and density. If this situation does not change, in the long term the Netherlands will risk losing its earning capacity to the competition. In this advisory report, the Council argues that it is necessary to compensate for this lack of size and density and to look at competition and cooperation between cities from a fundamentally different perspective. Complementarity is the key to this. It means exploiting the ties between urban regions and using each other's strengths to compensate for a lack of size and density. This idea is developed further in this report.

The second reason for this advisory report is the greater opportunity for community-based initiatives. Residents and businesses want to shape their environment themselves, independently of government or other institutions. This 'self-organisation' has always existed, both within and outside cities, but now that the government is taking a step back and the limits to what market forces and economies of scale can achieve have been exposed, more room is opening up for community-based initiatives. This change is fundamental: it is unlikely that we will ever return to the dogma of the welfare state or the neoliberal state. Nevertheless, individuals and local communities will not necessarily fill the vacuum left by government: a hands-off government does not necessarily imply a hands-on society. In this advisory report, the Council argues that self-organisation is more than what happens when the government stops doing something; it is about the ability of the city or urban region to continually adapt to changing circumstances. This advisory report will expand on how tomorrow's city can take advantage of this self-organising capacity.

The Council feels that the two developments outlined above have major implications. On the one hand, they imply greater urgency for government authorities to work with each other and with other parties, such as the business community, research institutes, individuals and civil society, at the regional level. On the other hand, there is a need to accept differences and abandon the principle of distributive justice. But neither of these may be taken to extremes. The Council will argue that differences are only acceptable if they do not run counter to the public interest and only if constitutional rights regarding universal equal opportunities are guaranteed. In the same vein, cooperation can only be fruitful if clear ground rules are established. This is elaborated further in the report.

As these developments occur within the context of a financial-economic crisis in the Netherlands, these are often conflated in the public debate. However, the Council feels that the underlying trends are more fundamental and independent of the level of economic growth, although the crisis has made them more visible, and that in the longer term they will have an impact on the future of the city. The scope of the advisory report therefore extends beyond the current financial-economic crisis.

2 Main Question

In view of the fundamental changes outlined above, the Council set out to identify the strengths of Dutch cities and find a pathway to future prosperity.

The main question addressed in this advisory report is:

> *Given the two fundamental developments (possible loss of earning potential due to a lack of size and density; more room for community-based initiatives), what are the strengths of Dutch cities and how can these be developed further, used better and mobilised in the future?*

This advisory report views cities as it does urban regions: areas containing cities of various shapes and sizes, together with their surrounding countryside and with a diversity of more and less urbanised environments (see also Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu [IenM], 2012, p. 130). These are the places where flows of people, goods and information converge and where, more than elsewhere, face-to-face contacts, confrontations and transactions occur. They are, in other words, 'nodes of economic, social, cultural and political interaction' (Van Engelsdorp Gastelaars & Hamers, 2006, p. 14). The twenty-first century city is a regional city and is not defined by its morphological footprint or urban density. In this advisory report the terms 'city' and 'urban region' are used synonymously.

The main research question was investigated by exploring four challenges facing the city in the future (see Part 2 of the Dutch version of this advisory report): economy and knowledge; flows and the city; transformation of the built environment; and public space. The challenges are interrelated and will determine, to a great extent, what our cities will look like in the future. The Council realises that these four challenges only capture part of urban reality and that other challenges, such as urban poverty, are undeniably relevant for tomorrow's city. Nevertheless, in keeping with its statutory mission, the Council has chosen to concentrate on the physical environment as a carrier of economic and social processes. This advisory report therefore focuses on the implications of the four challenges for the physical environment.

The conclusions and recommendations about the strength of the city in this advisory report are based on the analysis of the four challenges in Part 2. These are (1) self-organising capacity, (2) complementarity within and between urban regions, (3) taking advantage of the city's assets and, to fully profit from these qualities, (4) good leadership. These four points are discussed below. The Council then sets out different courses of action as recommendations for the parties involved. These recommendations are directed primarily at the national government. This is because although it hardly pursues any explicit urban policy, the national government still pursues policies relevant for cities. The recommendations are also directed at the municipalities, provinces and NGOs.

3 Conclusies

3.1 The city as a self-organising system

Dutch cities and urban regions are buzzing with new activity and initiatives. In addition to their daily routines, individuals, companies and NGOs are active participants in society. They organise and operate neighbourhood reading rooms, establish meeting places in empty buildings, create community gardens or set up energy cooperatives. Together, and sometimes in conjunction with government, they contribute to the fabric and the life of the city.

This development can be understood against a background of shifting relationships. Where the government was seen as unable to efficiently and flexibly respond to changing economic circumstances, responsibilities have been handed over to the free market, but the market has also proved to be far from perfect. Moreover, the shift from a dominant state – which for a long time took care of education, health care, housing and welfare – to an overriding role for the market has had far-reaching implications for civil society. Under the political pressure for liberalisation, the landscape of countless small organisations with close ties to the local community has been gradually transformed into an unwieldy assembly of large, professional, privatised or autonomous organisations running

their own turf. These are now more often a hindrance than a help to community-based initiatives, which is ironic considering that this is how they originated (Reijndorp, 2012). The long and deep-rooted tradition of individual initiative in the Netherlands – Big Society Dutch Style – is faltering and must adapt to changing circumstances.

Community-based initiatives

The current vacuum created by an ailing market and a more hands-off government with reduced budgets leaves more room for community-based initiatives. Individuals, companies and cultural institutions are forming new alliances, sometimes in conjunction with government agencies. Countless community-based initiatives are eager to take responsibility for public services and to modernise them, but only on their terms. They have their own ideas about the nature of the problems and the best way to solve them. Self-organisation does not automatically mean that cooperatives or other forms of community organisations can or will do exactly what governments want, such as filling the gap left by government cutbacks. Community-based initiatives can arise from completely different ideals (e.g. sustainability) and innovations, or from a desire to promote alternatives, but they are not by definition good or desirable, as some disregard the principles of constitutional democracy or contravene planning and other regulations.

Although self-organisation is anything but new, it now manifests itself in a novel way. In the past, groups would organise themselves along traditional confessional, ideological or political lines, but today new social groupings are appearing around common issues, viewpoints or interests. At the same time, community-based initiatives can make use of digital information sources and digital networks to forge new alliances and crossovers between sectors and communities, enabling them to reach more people faster and increase their impact. People can meet outside the outmoded professional strongholds (such as public-service institutions, bureaucracy and professional associations) via online forums, where they can exchange knowledge, take initiatives, and invent and roll out new services (Van der Lans, 2012). In short, the growing diversity of lifestyles (desires) and digital networks (opportunities) provides fertile ground for new forms of self-organisation. Old and new forms of social engagement exist side by side.[1]

1 The proliferation of community-based initiatives may at first glance seem incompatible with reports that clubs and organisations are having trouble finding volunteers, but these two trends can coexist. In 2003, the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) found that changes in society might contribute to a mismatch between supply and demand, even if the willingness to do volunteer work has not diminished. A number of groups that were traditionally well-represented in volunteer work are vanishing due to changing life patterns, demographic change and fluctuations in the labour market (Van der Pennen, 2003).

Another take on the self-organising city

The developments outlined above necessitate a new way of looking at the city, one that does not necessarily put governments, politicians or – more frequently nowadays – community-based initiatives on centre stage. Contrary to what is often assumed in the current debate, self-organisation is not just something that happens when the government stops doing something. It is more than that. It is part of the potential of a city to continually adapt itself to new circumstances. The activity of the urban population forces cities to change and evolve. The city is, in other words, a self-organising system containing all kinds of activities: planned and unplanned, orderly and chaotic.[2] Just like citizens, businesses and NGOs, local governments are also just actors within this system and the city is the 'continually changing result of this self-organisation' (Reijndorp, 2012, p. 4). Nevertheless, some form of control is still needed to harness this energy: self-organisation must be accompanied by organisation. Another way to put it is that 'good improvisation requires structure and preparation' (Boutellier, 2010). We will return to this in Section 3.4.

Reflecting on implications and rethinking prevailing beliefs

Viewing the city as a self-organising system means revisiting some enduring beliefs about the city. This requires going beyond the often-heard call for learning more about community-based initiatives – as useful as that may be (see Part 2). What is needed is a rethinking of traditional ideas about the city and self-organising systems to generate debate on new divisions, shifting roles between actors, new categories of public space and new conceptualisations of accessibility. The Council has prepared this advisory report to initiate this debate. In so doing, the Council draws on new insights emerging in disciplines concerned with urban development and urban society.

1. New divisions and potential ties

A common concern raised in the debate on self-organisation is that it widens social disparities. Not everyone has the skills or social capital needed to start a community-based initiative (Uitermark, 2012; Raad voor Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling [RMO], 2013). New divisions can arise when some groups in society cannot participate in or contribute to new initiatives. On the other hand, these initiatives also have great potential to create new social ties because they stimulate interpersonal contact. An important question is how these potential divisions and ties should be assessed in the self-organising city.

The Council stresses that the emergence of divisions and the resulting differences and diversity is integral to clearing the way for the self-organisation of citizens, companies and social organisations. These may be physical divisions (e.g.

2 To help understand the notion of 'the city as a self-organising system', a parallel can be drawn with the functioning of ecosystems. As ecosystems are always linked to other ecosystems, so too are self-organising systems in cities linked to self-organising systems in other cities. This is not confined to a single scale.

between the quality of the built environment, see also the Rli advisory report *Quality without Growth*, 2014b) or divisions between people.[3] To a certain extent increased social divides are unavoidable; self-organisation and differentiation are two sides of the same coin.

Differences are inevitable when fostering community-based initiatives, but these must be consistent with the principle of equal rights and the rule of law under the constitution (see also RMO, 2013). Which differences are acceptable and which are not should be decided in the political debate. The Council feels that this issue has not yet been properly debated in the cities, while more attention has been given to how the government should deal with these differences (Raad voor het openbaar bestuur [Rob], 2012; Scientific Council for Government Policy [WRR], 2012). The white paper *Doe-democratie* [DIY democracy] poses the question of whether the government should apply the principle of distributive justice when some groups are more capable of taking initiatives than others (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties [BZK], 2013, p. 21). This generally concerns public procurement procedures involving social enterprises. Can the government set lower standards on qualifications or certification in such cases? The national government realises that the discussion has barely started. It is also unclear how differences and applying specific solutions in individual cases are compatible with a government that works with general rules and entitlements: 'The implications of this for DIY democracy have not been sufficiently thought through. The national government does not have a ready-made answer for this. A first step would be to set goals instead of rules and be more aware of differentiation and variation' (Ministerie van BZK, 2013, p. 49). We will return to this point in Recommendations 4.1 and 4.4.

2. Changing roles

The proliferation of community-based initiatives is expected to increase in future, producing more diversity in partners, financing, goals and operations, while advances in technology have allowed the scale of social participation to increase dramatically. Gradually, a distinction is emerging between initiatives focused on maintaining services (e.g. keeping facilities open that the government wants to close, such as reading rooms or swimming pools) and those that are almost entrepreneurial. The latter want to ensure that their initiatives, such as city farms and local energy production, are commercially viable.[4] This second group can

3 Differences between neighbourhoods in the degree of self-organisation are not necessarily a result of the relative vulnerability of these neighbourhoods. There appears to be no direct correlation between neighbourhood characteristics and their level of self-reliance. For example, over seventy residents' cooperatives are active in the socially vulnerable neighbourhood Het Oude Westen in Rotterdam. This is not to say that no differences exist between neighbourhoods, but these differences can be explained by other factors. A history of social action in a neighbourhood and the presence of active individuals seem to help keep momentum going in neighbourhoods, but how this exactly works is still unclear (Van der Zwaard & Specht, 2013).

4 Maarten Hajer, in discussion with Justus Uitermark at a seminar on the self-organising city at the PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency on 5 September 2013. Community-based initiatives can have a business case, but set social goals rather than profit maximisation as their objective.

be considered the new social entrepreneurs. What does this shift from citizen to entrepreneur or volunteer signify? It is not clear where social entrepreneurs fit on the government/market or government/citizen continuum. The roles of politicians and local officials are also changing, and their mentality needs to change along with it. The greater variety of community-based initiatives and the related shifts in roles demand a rethinking of existing regulations and instruments: are these suitable for new situations and new roles or are they barriers to the development of community-based initiatives? We will return to this in Section 3.4 and Recommendation 4.1.

3. Public access
Community-based initiatives need space, both literally (buildings and open space) and figuratively. There are two aspects to this. First, attractive places are needed in neighbourhoods where different groups can mix. These places, such as libraries and community centres, are vital incubators for community-based initiatives. Too often people fail to grasp that when these kinds of facilities are closed, the 'trusted public spaces' crucial to the development of neighbourhood community-based initiatives are lost (Van der Zwaard & Specht, 2013). Indeed, many new facilities or services would have never have been realised or could not function without the social and physical infrastructure that had been built up over the years. The Council therefore feels that municipalities should conduct a well-considered policy on services and amenities (see also Recommendations). Second, when the city is viewed as a self-organising system, it becomes clear that the supply and demand of urban space needs to be rethought. There is much demand, but often not much money. The new perspective also includes looking for legal and financial tools to enable people to use vacant public buildings for other activities, thus creating new meeting places. For policymakers, this means reconsidering principles of public access, public versus private, appropriation and exclusion. Section 3.3 focuses on using existing assets and returns to this point.

The new perspective requires clear decisions
In invoking the perspective of the city as a self-organising system, the Council is calling for a fundamental change in the way we think about the city and urban regions. If the self-organising capacity of urban regions is to be strengthened, government must accept this new reality and respond differently to the three trends described above. Each of these presents its own challenges for the self-organising city. First, widening social divides require political decisions about how much difference and what sort of diversity is acceptable. Second, shifting roles may require a change in regulations, instruments or mentality. Finally, the issue of public access requires decisions on how public space can be used as a space for public interaction. Because the perspective of the city as a 'self-organising system' deviates from how elected officials and government officers usually view the city, this will demand conscious decision-making on their part. The following sections build a case for the utility and necessity of taking these decisions.

3.2 From unhealthy competition to complementarity

A situation has emerged in the Netherlands in which municipal governments compete with each other to attract businesses and residents through local policies directed at stimulating the development of business parks, offices, homes and facilities (retail and cultural). This competition for businesses and residents is based on the assumption that it will bring benefits like job creation. Once chosen, the path of intermunicipal competition is self-reinforcing: there is no choice but to compete because that is what your neighbours are doing (VROM-raad, 2006). The Council feels that this mechanism of spatial development is no longersustainable, for two reasons.

1. A race to the bottom

Although competition can be beneficial, in the Netherlands it has created a race to the bottom in development. The side effects of this competition are oversupply and vacancy of property, which in turn presents more formidable urban redevelopment challenges, as well as more of the same bland building stock.[5] In order to stop this race to the bottom, various coordination schemes on urban development were introduced and regional partnerships (both formal and informal) were set up throughout the country. These initiatives sought to achieve more balanced development through regional agreements on the allocation of new homes, land for businesses and retail development among the municipalities. Sometimes this was supported by a regional vision.

The problem now is that the development schemes that formed the basis for cooperation and complementarity between municipalities are falling by the wayside. Because of economic restructuring and population shrinkage, some areas have hardly any demand left to share out – sometimes the demand is even negative. Local authorities are beginning to realise the full implications of this. In many parts of the country, regional agreements are being made (or pursued) to trim back plans for new development and write down values on existing property. The Council views this as a step in the right direction and a necessary precondition for vibrant urban regions. At the same time, few places have actually succeeded in closing agreements that mandate self-restraint or grant development rights to their neighbours. As this will only happen if participants realise that these actions will deliver a collective benefit, new arrangements need to be found to reward cooperation and distribute costs and benefits fairly. A change in mentality is needed at the next tier of government, as well as a willingness, where necessary, to use existing coercive planning instruments (currently under the Spatial Planning Act (Wro) and later under the Environment and Planning Act (*Omgevingswet*)). A more fundamental question is whether this interpretation of complementarity will be sufficient in future or whether another basis needs to be found.

5 The oversupply of business parks and offices in the Netherlands is rooted in the competition between municipalities, but is driven by other factors as well. Two of these are the Dutch system of active land policy and a refusal to use coercive planning instruments (see also Louw et al., 2004; VROM-raad, 2006; Janssen-Jansen & Mulders, 2012; see also the Rli advisory report *Quality without Growth*, 2014b).

2. Structure and scale of Dutch cities

The second reason why competition for businesses and residents is unsustainable concerns the spatial structure and scale of Dutch cities. Research on international competitiveness has shown that size and density of urban areas positively correlate with the productivity and growth of firms. In comparison to their European counterparts, agglomeration forces in Dutch urban regions are weak: the individual cities are a bit too small and not dense enough. To raise their earning potential Dutch cities will have to increase their agglomeration power, but it is unlikely that cities within the Dutch urban structure can compete internationally on size and density, quite apart from the affordability of such ambitions. The Council sees more potential in an alternative strategy of 'borrowed size', which is more appropriate to the polycentric urban structure of the Netherlands, with its many well-connected midsized cities. This strategy too is grounded in the notion of complementarity: lack of size and density are compensated for by making use of facilities, amenities or qualities in other regions (PBL, 2012; Raspe et al., 2012; Raspe, 2012).

Complementarity not optional

From the two arguments discussed above, it is clear that complementarity is not an option but a necessity for the future of the city. Municipalities need to stop competing with each other for development. The Netherlands will only be able to compete internationally if Dutch cities and regions work together.[6] Dutch cities cannot go it alone; they need each other. They need to cooperate with and borrow from their neighbours. Borrowed size means taking advantage of the size and density of other urban areas, both near and far – in fact, making use of the polycentric structure of the Dutch urban landscape to compensate for local inadequacies. The competitive position of urban regions can be improved by better external and internal connectivity. Moreover, complementarity also reduces the risk of producing a collection of similar regions because it stimulates diversity.

Taking complementarity as the guiding principle means focusing on territorial qualities (such as physical and spatial assets and human capital). Regions should take more advantage of their specific qualities, identity and complementarity in relation to other regions. This will be different for every region and will depend on a good understanding of region-specific and sector-specific strengths and weaknesses. Although research has shown that complementarity between urban regions cannot be influenced as easily as was thought – due to the complex interaction between concerns and interests at the micro level (firms and individuals) and conditions at the macro level (e.g. legislation and regulation) – municipalities can still create the spatial conditions necessary for complementary to emerge (Salet & Janssen-Jansen, 2009). What is important is the realisation

6 For the Council, this does not mean letting go of economic competition but ceasing unhealthy competition between urban regions. Ending internal competition is necessary for meeting the external competition.

that each urban region has its own economic development opportunities, and that each is in its own league.

Taking complementarity as the guiding principle also means accepting the differences between places (on different scales), both within and between urban regions: one region is good in one thing, the other in another. The Randstad is a different type of region than Heerlen-Aachen-Hasselt, just like Groningen-Assen is not Eindhoven-Leuven. One must continually assess at which level complementarity should be sought. Does the principle that each neighbourhood should have its own elementary school still count in shrinking regions? Every city has a sports centre, but do they all need a skating rink as well?

A recent report on the earning capacity of the Netherlands by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) underscores these two points: accepting differences and building on existing regional assets. According to the WRR, 'Regional economic policy should take all these differences into account, and when needed, exploit them. Economic activity will have to come mainly from making smart connections between what is already there' (WRR, 2013, p. 335).

A new take on complementarity: connections

The Council therefore argues that complementarity is an essential ingredient for the future of the city. The question is how it can best be achieved in a situation in which the model of intermunicipal competition has been proven unsustainable, but a cooperative model based on the coordination of development programmes alone is inadequate. One cannot simply reverse the logic and say that intermunicipal competition (which did work in times of growth) must be replaced by cooperation and sharing losses now that a period of uneven growth and decline has set in. Moreover, allocating urban development quotas (planned complementarity) will probably not be so important in future.

The Council feels that complementarity needs to be approached differently. Rather than reallocating development rights or losses, it should be about parties working together to realise the benefits of complementarity. In the Council's view, the basis for this cooperation and complementarity consists of excellent multimodal infrastructure connections (public transportation, car). Committing to connectivity, both within urban regions as well as with powerful regions outside, and to good governance (between governments, firms and knowledge institutes) will enable neighbouring municipalities and cities to 'borrow' each other's strong points. Of course, 'borrowing' is just one half of the relationship: ideally neighbours both borrow and lend. In view of this reciprocity, a more accurate term for this approach is a 'shared-size strategy'.

Infrastructural connections are an important precondition for this shared-size strategy, and since interaction depends on these connections, they become

absolutely vital in the self-organising city. These connections not only consist of the physical infrastructure (roads, rail, waterways) but also – and especially – the data infrastructure. Advances in technology are affecting the behaviour of people in cities, and consequently the economy of cities. For example, 3D printers will enable consumers to become producers, which will impact local production chains and logistics (Peek, 2013; see Chapter 5 in Part 2). Digital technologies will open up new opportunities for community-based initiatives.

The Council's stance regarding the importance of infrastructural connections is supported by the current National Policy Strategy for Infrastructure and Spatial Planning. This states that urban regions should be internally and externally well-connected in order to harness the agglomeration potential of the Dutch spatial structure (Ministerie van IenM, 2012, p. 19). This policy focuses on optimising existing connections instead of large-scale expansion. Since the network is largely in place and no fundamental expansions are planned, it is even more important to use the current network more efficiently. However, the emphasis in national policy on using and linking different transport modes without reference to the spatial development potentials of the nodes in the network is a lost opportunity. Multimodal locations can be strengthened by increasing urban density, in other words, by transit-oriented development. This will increase potential ridership and with it, the value of the connection. It also makes good use of existing resources, something we will elaborate in Section 3.3. A step in this direction can be found in the recent letter from Melanie Schultz van Haegen, the transport minister, of November 2013 on the Multi-Year Plan for Infrastructure, Spatial Planning and Transport (MIRT). In this letter, the minister states that the MIRT programme will pay more attention to improving the integration of transport and urban development projects. The letter also acknowledges that linking markets, urban regions and networks in the Netherlands and abroad will facilitate the borrowing and sharing of knowledge, amenities and facilities. In discussions with regional and local government, the national government has made agreements with the northern and southern parts of the Randstad and the Eindhoven region to draw up a spatial development strategy to strengthen the functional relationships in and between these regions in order to make optimal use of the infrastructure networks (Tweede Kamer, 2013b, p. 1-2).

A vision for the future

Complementarity and good connections between regions will create an interconnected urban landscape of big and small (and sometimes cross-border) urban regions that need each other and make use of each other's strengths. Dutch urban regions can compete in the global marketplace, but not primarily on the basis of their own regional urban capital (size and density), but on the basis of their connections and effective cooperation with other regions, either neighbouring or further afield. The key to this is connectivity, not just in the form of physical infrastructure but also through partnerships between

firms, universities, governments, citizens and NGOs. This strategy retains the advantages of the Dutch polycentric urban structure of larger and smaller cities while achieving the mass needed to compete internationally. Urban regions tend to have a hierarchical structure. In the Netherlands the historical relations between the cities have produced an urban centre of gravity in the northern and southern 'wings' of the Randstad. Creating good connections with other urban regions, for example from the southern wing to Brabant and Antwerp, can generate a greater 'mass' of economic activity and generate more jobs, allowing the Randstad to prosper in future. The Randstad's primary gateways are the Port of Rotterdam and Amsterdam Schiphol Airport. These two 'mainports' enable it to borrow size internationally, such as from the German hinterland (Rotterdam) or from destinations around the world (Schiphol, which has a relatively small local market). Section 4 translates this argument for complementary into a number of specific recommendations.

3.3 Less new construction, more transformation

Transformation is an age-old phenomenon: cities and urban environments are continually being adapted to meet the changing needs and desires of their users. More recently, however, the way this transformation has manifested itself has changed. Current economic conditions and regionally differentiated demographic developments seem to have put an end to the era of large-scale transformation. In future, urban transformations will be smaller in scale and involve more bottom-up processes. Large-scale demolition and construction are making way for more selective and adaptable projects and reuse of existing buildings and structures. The driver of development is not new construction, but transformation. This means that urban space should be treated differently, with more attention to existing qualities.

The traditional alliance between government and the private sector is giving way to new types of cooperation around small-scale initiatives. The government has much less money available and circumstances dictate that it assumes a more hands-off approach. Besides, large property developers whose profitability depends on economies of scale and standardisation can no longer finance big projects. Small developers, local businesses, housing associations and individuals are becoming increasingly important.

Stakeholders are on the right track…

The countless community-based urban initiatives being taken by citizens, companies and NGOs are part of this transition. Parties such as housing associations, residents, urban planners and designers and developers are taking on different roles in urban transformation. Housing associations, in addition to their normal duties of maintaining and renewing their housing stock, are now taking part in initiatives where groups of people contract developers to build their homes, and are also cooperating with municipalities to offer 'fix-it-up

homes' to enterprising individuals. Urban planners and designers are working with residents to give vacant land temporary uses. Property developers and owners are transforming offices into student housing and finding new uses for listed buildings. More and more, governments are stimulating such initiatives by holding competitions, setting up knowledge labs or by temporarily adapting the rules.

All across the country municipalities are discovering new ways to stimulate and facilitate transformation, rehabilitating their accounts by writing down the values of land and buildings they own or (with others in the region) scrapping plans for new development.[7] Although the need for this is increasingly acknowledged, in practice it is still proving difficult to agree on who will be the first to take the loss.

Owners (investors, banks and landlords) are also increasingly writing down property values. Lack of expertise in this area, especially regarding the appraisal of vacant buildings, remains an obstacle on the road towards reuse and transformation. Appraisers in the Netherlands, unlike those in other countries, tend not to react immediately to market fluctuations, but instead extrapolate historical trends to the present. Appraisers usually work on the basis of comparable local transactions, but when such information is unavailable, they extend their scope to include other regions or other kinds of property. In so doing, they have to provide solid arguments. The fact that appraisers and accountants have drawn up a report with recommendations is, in the Council's view, a step in the right direction (Platform Taxateurs en Accountants, 2013; Berkhout, 2013).

Other auspicious developments for using existing resources include the attempts to link upkeep and development together, for example through new maintenance schemes (e.g. Design, Build, Finance, Maintain and Operate (DBFMO) contracts), cooperation between various municipal services or more strategic asset management. This will give the management and quality of assets a more prominent place in the planning cycle. The Council feels this is a positive development.

…but more is needed

More attention for asset management, more room for other – smaller – players, writing down building and land values are all necessary steps for the future of the city. But this will not be enough in the long term. Transformation and

7 A 2012 study found that municipalities incurred a loss of €2.9 billion on development land between 2009 and 2011. This was followed by another €1.1 billion loss in 2012 (excluding losses in public-private partnerships). Although municipalities are continuing their write-downs and taking losses, they still have a way to go. It is expected that they will still have to accept a further €0.7 to €2.7 billion in losses (Tweede Kamer, 2013a; Tweede Kamer 2013c; Tweede Kamer, 2013d; Deloitte Real Estate Advisory, 2012, 2013). At present six municipalities that have been placed under prudential supervision mainly because of problems with their land development agencies. Minister Schultz van Haegen concluded in her letter to parliament of December 2013 that many municipalities are feeling the pain of these losses, and a few may find it difficult to handle additional losses in future. This does not give cause for a fundamental change in policy (Tweede Kamer, 2013d).

asset management needs to be approached in a fundamentally different way. More room needs to be given to inspiring community initiatives for urban transformation, many of which are already being developed and deserve a future.

It is expected that an overabundance of urban space will become available in the future. People will have to find solutions for outdated and empty factories, offices and even public buildings. Although it remains vital to find new commercial uses for existing buildings, this alone will not solve the long-term problem. What is needed is a reconceptualisation of occupants, supply and demand and asset management. All kinds of novel initiatives will certainly be needed to match the private supply of property to public demand in the short term, but in the long term it is also necessary to rethink legal titles. At present, a square or park is 'public space', maintained and supervised by the local authority, while public buildings may be owned by municipalities or their land development agencies. More and more initiatives are resulting in a partial or conditional privatisation of public space. Clubs and societies are perfectly able to take good care of parks, like they do for allotments, while still keeping them open to the public. Surely it would be possible to treat certain public buildings like public space and have them maintained and supervised like the public open space or square outside? This is already happening for parking buildings. Vacant public buildings should not automatically be seen as private space, but as potential public space, only enclosed. Thinking about the future of cities in the Netherlands requires thinking about other ways to literally give community-based initiatives a place in the city.

An essential precondition for transformation is a government that not only stimulates but also sets limits. Transformation of existing urban areas will only work if provincial or municipal authorities curb urban sprawl. The government must therefore make choices about what should be allowed and what should be prohibited. This argument will be elaborated further in the next section.

3.4 Attributes of good governance

The above picture of the city as a self-organising system – with a shift from intermunicipal competition to complementarity, less new construction and more transformation of existing stock – requires a rethink of the concept of good governance. The urban dynamic needs to be well understood and well managed; self-organisation and organisation are two sides of the same coin. How should the parties involved design the city government of the future?

In general, the Council stresses the importance of municipal cooperation at a regional level. Where in the past a big city was synonymous with a big municipal authority, the above analyses have shown that it will be increasingly necessary to think much more in terms of polycentric urban regions. These regions can be quite different in terms of spatial structure, and this can create a heterogeneous pattern of urban government in future. Individual municipalities

will not necessarily be the most important unit of urban government, but rather several municipalities cooperating at the regional or subregional level. As argued earlier, the Council feels the basis for this cooperation lies at the level at which problems and solutions are found (VROM-raad, 2008; RIi, 2013). The 'regional level' is different for each problem. Cooperation based on substantive issues will therefore mean continually shifting partnerships between continually changing partners (i.e. the 'shifting coalitions' mentioned in VROM-raad, 2008). Cities define the region according to the problem at hand and, in so doing, determine who they should cooperate with. The Council calls on cities to seek complementarity within and between urban regions.

In calling for regional cooperation between municipalities, the Council is explicitly not advocating a change in the state structure or a return to the policy of obligatory metropolitan cooperation. On the contrary, the Council views the constitutional state structure as the basis for enacting regional partnerships. Communication channels need to be improved, however: 'The administrative structure should remain open enough to allow constructive cooperation between different levels of government. The Council argues that the channels need to be opened up further to make it even easier for government authorities to come into contact and cooperate' (RIi, 2013, p. 28). Municipalities working together in a regional coalition will still need to make clear agreements beforehand. A previous advisory report by the VROM Council mentioned a number of things each partnership will need to provide for, including a clause on starting and termination dates, commencement and disengagement, funding, democratic legitimation, conflict resolution and dynamic planning (VROM-raad, 2008).

In a previous advisory report on governance in the Schiphol/Amsterdam metropolitan area, the Council argued that good governance entails a balancing act between the often-contradictory demands of robustness and resilience (RIi, 2013, p. 65). Robust governance offers a degree of simplicity and stability, providing transparency, a clear set of rules on what is permitted and what is not, and the ability to impose order. At the same time, the governance model must also be capable of recognising, supporting or facilitating the development of new initiatives. A certain degree of resilience is needed; otherwise there is a risk of reacting too late to new challenges. Resilience can be described as the capacity to intelligently adapt to unexpected opportunities and threats.

The self-organising city throws the need for such a balancing act in sharp relief and will require great skill from city governments in the coming years. They will need to let go, but not completely. They will need to support citizen initiatives and social enterprises, but without suffocating them. When alternative or new arrangements do not arise more or less spontaneously, local authorities will be faced with the choice of either doing it themselves or waiting and seeing what happens. In the first case they may be criticised for not letting go, while in

the second they run the risk of letting go too much. The Council feels that this situation demands clear political standpoints (by setting down goals and missions in a democratically accountable vision statement: see the Recommendations) but also a fundamental change in mentality among politicians and officials. These need to learn to keep an open mind about new community-based initiatives. One should remember that community-based initiatives do not simply materialise, but are hard work. Participants are only willing to make this effort if it can be reasonably expected that their initiative will be successful. The public deserve clarity from government about this.

The issues treated in Part 2 of the advisory report (economy and knowledge, flows and the city, transformation, public space) also illustrate the necessity of balancing robustness and resilience. For example, if cities take complementarity as a point of departure, this will have immediate implications for political decision-making on the qualities and strengths of their urban region. A change in mentality is needed towards decisiveness (robustness) on the one hand and making concessions when appropriate (resilience). The example of transformation shows that seizing opportunities to deal with vacant property (be it public or private) requires a resilient government, but at the same time also a robust government with clear ideas about what should be permitted. Agreements on the transformation of the existing urban fabric will only work if government authorities, both provincial and municipal, curb excessive urban development. Failing to do this will undermine the prospects for transformation.

The survey of knowledge-related and economic challenges in Part 2 revealed that it is important for governments to participate in new partnerships. Partners can pool their resources and ideas in a 'triple helix partnership' (university, industry, government); the Brainport Eindhoven Region and the Economic Board Utrecht are two examples of this. The long-standing traditional form of government intervention is no longer sufficient. To maintain the competitive strength of the entire region, the partners must be aware of what is happening elsewhere and of developments relevant to their own region. Non-governmental actors in particular, such as businesses and research institutes, have an important part to play in this (Rli, 2013, p. 29). In view of the increasing importance of cooperatives (such as energy co-ops) it should be realised that knowledge and ideas can also be found outside traditional institutions and large established businesses, for example among small and medium-sized enterprises and social enterprises. Forming cross-border triple helix partnerships (either within the region or with other regions) is vital to improving competitiveness. The ability of municipalities to take on this kind of alliance will become increasingly important in future and this too will require a change in mentality among politicians and government officials.

Stimulating and inviting new cooperatives and partnerships can change the relationship between politicians and officials. In order to facilitate

community-based initiatives, officials need local knowledge, and to get this they will need to engage the neighbourhood directly and will find themselves more often on the front lines. Politicians will need to get accustomed to a new kind of official, one that not only shields him politically, but who is also busy facilitating community-based initiatives. The new official needs the support of open-minded politicians and city and provincial councils that are prepared to allow co-creation initiated by civil society partners. As the Council has argued previously, this means that governments have to be responsive to unsolicited proposals (initiatives from non-government parties) and give them room to grow (see also RIi, 2011a).

4 Recommendations

This section presents recommendations on four topics: self-organisation, economy, physical space and good governance. The recommendations are summarised at the end of this section (see text box).

4.1 Use the self-organising capacity of urban society

The capacity of urban society to organise itself needs to be utilised in the city of the future. In order to do this, the following conditions must be met.

Remove barriers to community-based initiatives

The road to community-based initiatives must be cleared of obstructions. Initiatives to improve the living and working environment, whether they come from small cooperatives or large established parties, need to be given equal opportunities. At the moment this is not the case. Current rules on public procurement, for example, can still hamper small, creative or innovative initiatives from businesses or individuals. These obstacles need to be removed.

When public procurement tenders set conditions such as minimum turnover or impose prearranged solutions or quotas for hiring unemployed people, small partnerships and new cooperatives will almost inevitably lose out to large established organisations. By virtue of their size and resources, big organisations enjoy a competitive advantage over smaller initiatives. The Council feels that the government, as a guardian of the public interest, should promote equal opportunities in public procurement. It is therefore important that problems are tendered and not solutions. The Council feels that it is worth considering replacing the current public procurement system, which still stems from the old 'government/market' regulatory model, with a concession model, which would be better suited to the new relations in society. Another route is social procurement, which offers community-based initiatives and social entrepreneurs the opportunity to bid for contracts to carry out municipal tasks and responsibilities (Ministerie van BZK, 2013, p. 38). Yet another option, originating in the UK, is

a variation on this: the right to challenge and right to bid (see text box below). The Council is pleased that this option is actively being investigated. Given the changing relationships in society, such studies, which may be conducted in cooperation with local government, are urgently needed. The Council therefore agrees with the national government that 'we should avoid a situation in which market entry by new players that could offer better public services at comparable or even lower prices and with more citizen involvement is made impossible by the procurement method' (Ministerie van BZK, 2013, p. 57).

Right to challenge and right to bid

The British system is often brought up in the Dutch debate on social procurement. In the UK, groups of individuals have a 'right to bid' on a public building and a 'right to challenge' the delivery of a public service if they feel they could do a better job. Policymakers should seriously consider these initiatives (WRR, 2012b: p. 212; Van der Lans, 2011, p. 50; Ministerie van BZK, 2013, p. 57). This goes beyond social public procurement. The white paper 'Doe-democratie' [DIY democracy] states that, due to the more decentralised administrative culture in the Netherlands, a national 'right to challenge' is not an obvious choice. Nevertheless, the Ministry of Internal Affairs is exploring the feasibility and desirably of a Dutch version of the British system. In addition, as part of the 'innovative procurement' project at the Ministry of Economic Affairs, the national government will request advice on how public procurement practice in the Netherlands can be made more receptive to social innovation and social entrepreneurship (Ministerie van BZK, 2013, p. 57-58).

Another area of concern is the various disincentives arising from the regulations on decentralised energy production. Examples include the complex regulations surrounding sustainable projects and the confusion surrounding statements made in the Energy Agreement in relation to the ruling by the European Court of Justice in June 2013 that households generating more than a given amount of electricity from solar panels should be treated as businesses (see Part 2, Chapter 5).

Getting infrastructure ready for community-based initiatives

For the future of the city, it is vital that existing infrastructure and networks for ICT, water, energy and the like can accommodate community-based initiatives. This infrastructure should be able to process large-scale flows but also serve very local and flexible small producers and consumers. Sufficient reserve capacity must be in place and possibilities for temporary storage added to the network. Redundancy and flexibility are both desirable system attributes. The energy network, for example, needs to be adapted to allow energy flows in two directions (instead of one, as is the case now). Reserve capacity is needed for times with little sunshine or wind. The Energy Agreement acknowledges the need to adapt

the energy network. Another example is the necessity of water management systems to be able to handle extreme high and low water levels. Extra water storage capacity in the city will be needed for periods of high rainfall and various initiatives are already appearing throughout the Netherlands (see Part 2, Chapter 5). For ICT infrastructure, public access to data streams requires attention: open data can break the government monopoly on providing information about urban facilities or over the information produced by these facilities (Peek, 2013).

Room for community-based initiatives
Community-based initiatives deserve a place in the city and it is important to give them the room they need. We should cherish attractive meeting places in neighbourhoods since they are important in fostering community-based initiatives (Van der Zwaard & Specht, 2013, see also Chapter 7 in Part 2). Municipal policy on facility management should be cognisant of existing social and physical infrastructure. Relevant uses need to be found for vacant (or imminently vacant) public buildings in order to accommodate community-based initiatives looking for space. Temporary policy incentives can be useful in the interim: municipalities can work with short-term contracts or offer specialised leases where occupants pay no rent the first year and turnover-based rents thereafter. The Council views the proposed limitations on housing associations to prevent them from owning public property without any residential function as a barrier to community-based initiatives (see also RIi, 2014a).

Accept differences in public-sector activity
By definition, accommodating community-based initiatives means that differences will emerge. Policymakers will need to decide how to deal with these differences. Who will defend the interests of those who cannot organise themselves? Extra municipal investments may be appropriate in vulnerable neighbourhoods where problems seem insurmountable, social cohesion is fragile and residents lack the necessary skills (see Van der Zwaard & Specht, 2013).

Two issues are important in this regard. First, one must realise that vulnerable neighbourhoods are not necessarily the same things as disadvantaged neighbourhoods (see also footnote 3); they are specific areas within neighbourhoods and are limited in size and number. Second, there are limits to the differences that can be tolerated. The Council proposes two conditions: the constitutional right of equal opportunity must be guaranteed and the differences must not undermine the public interest.

As important as accepting differences is the need to accept the extra workload on public administrations; new flexible partnerships are simply part of the network society (RIi, 2013). These new players in the city, such as new community cooperatives (e.g. collective property development), enterprises and urban farms, deserve a place. They are 'eager to have more say over the environment in which

they live and work and to stamp their mark on the city' (Nirov|Platform 31, 2012, p. 64). Existing players, such as energy, waste and water companies and technology companies, should also be invited to become partners in new cooperatives. One advantage these parties have is that they are accustomed to thinking (and budgeting) for the longer term, something that is needed for a resilient and vital city of the future (VROM-raad, 2010; Nirov|Platform 31, 2012). A long-term perspective can also act as an important counterweight to the four-year electoral cycle.

Social-service providers: know your customer
Despite the criticisms, the role of social-service providers is far from played out. Nevertheless, these organisations still need a makeover. These large (and often unwieldy) organisations, such as housing associations, schools and care providers need to reconnect with the public. There are many different ways to do this, for example, by talking less with umbrella organisations or professional bodies and more with residents or parents' associations, or by adopting a professionalism based on substantive problems instead of the sector or profession. Helping out community-based initiatives is part of this reorientation. The Council has noticed that this is already occurring in different places. Inspiring initiatives include universities joining with municipalities to set up business incubation centres to bring together knowledge and enterprise, and housing associations facilitating temporary initiatives.

4.2 Use complementarity as a guiding principle

Urban regions in the Netherlands will inevitably need each other in the future. Only by working with and borrowing from their neighbours (either next door or further away) will urban regions be able to compete internationally. The key to this is complementarity and to achieve it steps need to be taken now. These steps are explained below.

Infrastructure as basis for complementarity in and between urban regions
Both complementarity and the strategy of borrowed size rely on good infrastructural connections within and between urban regions. This view is echoed in the National Policy Strategy for Infrastructure and Spatial Planning (Ministerie IenM, 2012). The Council endorses this, but exploiting the network of road, rail and water connections alone is not enough. Of course this is important, but even more important is how infrastructure and urban functions are combined. Modalities should be considered in relation to the potential of particular places, which is the underlying concept of initiatives such as StedenbaanPlus (an integrated series of transit-oriented development projects in the province of Zuid-Holland). The national government's infrastructure efficiency programme *Beter Benutten* should be oriented more towards integrating transport and urban development, with better linkages between modalities, such as a regional public transportation system that ties in well with the road network. The national

government, provinces and municipalities should make a concerted effort to improve links within and between transport modes and improve networks in multimodal nodes, and to view this in terms of the potential of places.

Ideally, the strategies of 'borrowed size' and 'borrowed qualities' involve exchange: a give and take between regions. This does not always happen. The Council realises that improving infrastructure connections between two regions (and better use of existing connections) can also have a detrimental effect (e.g. when residents use the improved transport connections to make use of facilities and amenities in a neighbouring region, eventually undermining the viability of those in their own region). This can have implications for efforts to achieve complementarity within and between regions, and therefore for the acceptance of differences.

Complementarity as a guiding principle in national spatial economic policy
At present, national spatial economic policy focuses on bolstering about ten 'top sectors', without any further spatial or place-based elaboration. This approach is inadequate for the future of the city. In order to achieve the metropolitan mass and density necessary for international competitiveness, the national government should embark on an explicit strategy of borrowed size and complementarity between urban regions. That will require a spatial economic strategy for the Netherlands based on strong, complementary urban regions and crucial connections at different scales. This must address the question of when to strengthen intrinsic agglomeration capacities and when to borrow from neighbours.

The Council agrees with the WRR (2013) that the coordination of economic development is primarily a responsibility for subnational governments. According to the WRR, at the regional level it is often easier to bring all relevant parties on board, point out the right direction and keep abreast of new developments (local knowledge). Moreover, Dutch regions differ and require a customised approach (WRR, 2013, p. 15). Although the elaboration of regional economic policy is first and foremost a matter for parties within the region, the national government still has a responsibility. It must connect its top sector policy to the region, especially since clusters of sectors, including top sectors, transcend local and regional jurisdictions. The distribution of top sectors (whether in so-called 'valleys' or not) does not match the administrative boundaries of municipalities or provinces. Furthermore, top sectors are rarely tied to a single region (Raspe et al., 2012). The national government should try to prevent unhealthy competition between urban regions as much as possible, and at the same time do justice to regional diversity.

When drawing up a national spatial economic policy, the relationship between economic competitiveness and environmental quality should not be ignored. The Council feels that a long-term perspective on economic development should

acknowledge the importance of environmental quality in spatial economic planning. The economic significance of environmental factors like natural and cultural heritage and landscapes should not be underestimated (see also RIi, 2011a).

Complementarity as a guiding principle for municipal policy
Not only the national government, but municipalities too should base their policies more explicitly than is now often the case on complementarity, both between municipalities within a region and between urban regions. To do this, municipalities should gain insight into their own economic strengths and weaknesses within the urban region and foster diversity between and within cities. Each urban region has its own economic structure and environmental qualities. The challenge is to identify them, or to 'find your game changer' (Katz & Bradley, 2013, see also Part 2). If you are a blue-collar city where most people have a vocational education, work with that instead of trying to become, for example, a 'creative city' for the highly educated. Municipalities need to realise that their unique selling points go beyond the economic sectors active in the city or competitiveness factors such as accessibility, size and density. They are also about factors such as health care, education, sports, landscape and culture. Municipalities should support places and environments in the city with their own identities and qualities and that means accepting differences: there is no urban average. Complementarity – and therefore difference – also applies within cities.

After surveying their regional-economic and environmental qualities, cities should develop a strategy of 'borrowing from their neighbours'. It should be decided on a case-by-case basis which elements should be strengthened and which borrowed. Cities should have realistic ambitions and play in their own league, which may mean focusing on complementing what other cities and regions have to offer (see Part 2). It is not always necessary to be the best. Municipalities should decide which neighbours to borrow from and the scale at which to do this by examining their own strengths and weaknesses. As discussed in Chapter 4 in Part 2, it is possible to borrow at different levels (with neighbouring areas, but also internationally with areas over the border). There is no one best scale. The Eindhoven region, for example, already borrows heavily from Schiphol Airport in the Amsterdam metropolitan region. In most cases, the daily urban system is an appropriate scale for this, as the urbanisation advantages of proximity (i.e. informal, coincidental, planned and unplanned contacts) tend to manifest themselves at this scale.

Financial base: a regional fund
More complementarity between urban regions and more intrinsic capacity raises the question of how this can be paid for. The Council argues that there is more than one way to arrange this (see also RIi, 2011a). Considering the perspective on the future of Dutch urban regions presented above, the Council

feels that a financial arrangement should be sought that will stimulate regional complementarity and cooperation between governmental tiers and between sectors. One way to do this would be to set up regional funds supported by annual contributions from the national government, provinces and municipalities. The parties could decide the source of contribution themselves. For example, funds could be diverted from national investment programmes such as the Multiple Targeted Subsidy Schemes (BDU), municipal funds or municipal property tax (OZB). The three levels of government would then need to decide, through a process of consultation and negotiation, how the resources should be used. Criteria could be set beforehand (such as a regional dimension) to determine which projects would be eligible for support. The fund could be used to assist urban transformation and the redevelopment of business parks or regional infrastructure.

In order to prevent arbitrary funding decisions, it is important to have a long-term vision and a dynamic regional agenda. The proper approach is to first create a vision, then set an agenda, establish a fund, and only then spend the money. When compiling the agenda it may be useful to consider the experiences gained with the area agendas in the MIRT programme: this agenda is dynamic and updated periodically. It has no formal status and contains no new policy, but is a translation of national, provincial and municipal policies (sometimes in regional partnership).

Several regions in the Netherlands, such as Groningen–Assen, Parkstad Limburg and the Eindhoven region, have already set up a regional fund to support regionally relevant investments. These are mainly supported by municipal contributions, although the national government has also supported Parkstad Limburg and the province Groningen–Assen. This support helps trigger the participation of municipalities (Feijtel et al., 2013, p. 6, 9). This stimulus would be enhanced if national or provincial support were the rule rather than the exception.

The Council realises that it can be hard to set up this kind of tripartite consolidated fund because overseeing institutions (parliament, provincial council, municipal council) want to control financial contributions. Nevertheless, the Council feels that this option should be seriously explored, because a solid financial basis for regional cooperation is essential for the future of the city. The regional fund advocated here would stimulate this kind of cooperation, although its exact shape is still unclear and will need to be investigated further. To assist this, the Council offers three suggestions for setting up a regional fund. First, the contributions at the three levels of government (national, provincial and municipal) need to be truly consolidated. Regional priorities can be set freely if contributions are not earmarked for all kinds of predetermined purposes. Current funding sources are allocated according to policy area (such as transport or land use), which restricts cooperation and frustrates integrated solutions such as

transit-oriented development. A consolidated fund would stimulate intersectoral cooperation. Second, the size of the fund needs to be more or less proportionate to the size of the projects in order to prevent the regional fund from becoming overloaded. Third, consideration should be given to only allowing municipalities with a healthy land development agency to participate in the fund. This will give all parties a relatively equal footing, something that is conducive to cooperation. This point will be discussed again in Recommendation 4.4 (regional equalisation).

4.3 Use existing assets in the city

An important challenge for the future of the city is how to use existing assets. This point is elaborated in the following recommendations.

Write-downs a precondition for transformation

The oversupply of office space and business parks in particular (and in some regions, housing) and the lack of demand has made it imperative to cut back urban development plans and write down privately owned property values. Aside from the realities of the economic and financial crisis, the national government has not taken enough heed of demographic and economic developments. The Council feels that the national government has a moral responsibility to do everything it can to help subnational governments reduce the number of plans in the pipeline.[8] An important precondition for this is having adequate structures for regional cooperation. For one thing, sharing adversity is much harder than sharing wealth.

The Council also feels that the national government has a role to play in raising awareness about the possibility (and impossibility) of writing down private property values. Excessive book values are often an impediment to rezoning land and to transformation. In the debate, it is often claimed that some owners (and possibly some banks and investors too), often against their better judgement, are simply waiting for better times. It is gradually beginning to dawn on everyone that this strategy is no longer tenable. A practical difficulty regarding the appraisal of vacant property is that if no comparable transactions are available in a local market, it becomes much harder to determine the current value. The Council views the report and recommendations drawn up by appraisers and accountants as a step in the right direction (Platform Taxateurs en Accountants, 2013). It is advisable to spread the word about this alternative method of appraisal, even to those outside the profession. Writing down commercial real estate will clear the way for rezoning and stimulate the transformation of urban areas. It will also create favourable conditions for reusing urban real estate.

8 As far as residential development is concerned, it is expected that the continued increase in the number of households, particularly one-person households, will create demand for new housing stock in cities up to 2045. The industrial, commercial and retail property markets, on the other hand, have a long-term oversupply. Regional differences are expected to increase as well (Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving [PBL] and Centraal Planbureau [CPB], 2013).

New kinds and categories of public space
The use of public buildings is a further issue. More and more initiatives are leading to the – partial or conditional – privatisation of public spaces. Some public buildings could also be managed and supervised in the same way as public spaces like squares. Vacant public facilities could simply be considered covered public spaces. Thinking about the future of Dutch cities also means thinking about ways to provide physical space for community-based initiatives in the city.

The search for urban places with promise
Governments, businesses, public organisations and individuals need to seek out and offer room for initiatives in promising places in the city. These should be places with a future in which people and organisations are prepared to invest and to offer accommodation to community-based initiatives set up by individuals, businesses and public organisations.

Clear decisions on urban development
If existing urban areas are to be transformed, provincial and municipal policymakers will need to make clear decisions about new development elsewhere. Policymakers need to decide what forms of development are allowed and what is prohibited. These considerations can be included in a regional environmental strategy (see Recommendation 4.4) and require realistic estimates of the financial consequences of these decisions and how they should be covered.

Collective responsibility for problem areas within neighbourhoods
The challenge of transforming existing urban areas should be understood against the backdrop of shifting roles and the increasing involvement of small developers, local entrepreneurs and individuals in all sorts of initiatives. Community-based initiatives for urban transformation will not take root everywhere in the city. Areas with an insufficient degree of self-organisation (not necessarily disadvantaged neighbourhoods) and which face a decline in liveability and safety will require special attention to prevent the emergence of 'self-organisation deserts'. The Council emphasises that these areas will be limited in size and number and will not be whole neighbourhoods or districts. They will be areas where the problems are too big, the social cohesion too fragile and where residents lack the skills and resources needed for community-based initiatives. It is reasonable to make extra investments in these areas.

The Council views such areas as the collective responsibility of the bodies with an interest or responsibility in the area, such as municipalities and housing associations. The latter are obvious partners in view of their high share of property ownership in these neighbourhoods: about 70% as compared to a national share of about a third (CBS, 2011). However, these areas increasingly contain many owner-occupiers too poor to maintain and improve their properties and dysfunctional homeowners associations. It is advisable to investigate what

would happen if housing associations in these areas, after considering the financial consequences of different strategies, were to focus more on the physical environment in and around their property.

4.4 Develop good leadership qualities

Harnessing the power of the city of the future (self-organisation, complementarity, existing qualities) will require leadership that is both robust and resilient. This applies to all levels of government, but especially the regional level: the city of the future is, after all, a regional city.

Wanted: an active government that can lay down rules

A dynamic society is served by clear rules and a clear vision because this lets the different parties know what to expect (Rli, 2011b; Rli, 2013). This requires an active government able to establish rules at all levels of government. This has three aspects: first, government should formulate objectives and tasks in a vision document; second, it should draw up procedures and ground rules; finally, it should make the necessary financial arrangements, such as establishing a regional fund. As this last point has already been discussed, the first two aspects (objectives and tasks, procedures and ground rules) are discussed below.

Vision: formulating objectives and tasks

The most important objectives and tasks should be laid down in a vision document. As argued above, the national government should articulate a vision on the regional economic development of areas and the critical links between and within regions. What form of national urban structure would allow full advantage to be taken of complementarity and borrowed size between the cities? A collective vision is expected from municipalities about the future of their region, based on the economic and environmental qualities of each municipality. In many cases, this may require additional research, including an analysis of 'related variety' (firms in related sectors with a partly overlapping knowledge base, which can therefore exchange knowledge) (see Chapter 4 in Part 2).

The visions advocated by the Council are different from the 'blueprint planning' of decades past. Visions should function as frameworks that articulate objectives and tasks, and provide an inviting perspective. The vision does not define how these objectives should be met. In other words, it is about formulating objectives (or, as the Ministerie van BZK put it in 2013, 'giving goals') and not the means to achieve them. The National Policy Strategy for Infrastructure and Spatial Planning, for example, specifies national interests, but does not elaborate these regionally. Another example is given in the text box below.

Room for the River

In its key planning decision 'Room for the River', the national government made its aim clear by setting a standard: by 2015, the Dutch river system must be able to safely handle a discharge of 16,000 cubic metres per second in the Rhine where it enters the Netherlands at the village of Lobith. According to the principle of adaptive planning, the decision took into account the possibility that even greater discharges could occur later this century (up to 18,000 cubic metres per second). A series of measures was drawn up for the period to 2015 to be carried out by the Directorate General for Public Works and Water Management (Rijkswaterstaat). The government has also secured the necessary funding for these measures. The planning decision allows regions to propose alternative plans, as long as they provide for at least as much discharge capacity as Rijkswaterstaat's plans and not foreclose any future options for lowering water levels further (no regrets). The alternative plans may, in addition to achieving water management objectives, also improve spatial quality by incorporating other regional development goals – e.g. in the areas of transport, agriculture, ecology, landscape and recreation – or by making different use of existing landscape or environmental qualities. The government may then take a 'replacement decision' and use the funds reserved for this stretch of the river in its original plan to implement the regional alternative instead.

The replacement decision has led to a number of prominent examples in which significant improvements in spatial quality have been achieved compared with the original Rijkswaterstaat proposals. The success of this strategy has inspired the WRR to advocate applying the replacement decision more broadly, especially in cases of community-based initiatives. When making a replacement decision, policymakers first indicate which decision they intend to take and then offer individuals, groups, businesses and NGOs the opportunity to come up with an alternative solution within clearly formulated parameters (WRR, 2012, p. 214).

A vision will allow governments to communicate how much support may be given to community-based initiatives. For example, a municipality can decide that certain neighbourhoods are in a position to undertake all kinds of initiatives themselves; in other areas, the municipality can lend a hand to community-based initiatives. This allows the vision to act as a democratically legitimate framework for self-organisation in the city. The Council is not arguing that this document be used to decide which community-based initiatives should be permitted (theoretically all should be if they do not contravene existing regulations or violate the principles of constitutional democracy), but to decide which initiatives should receive support. The vision helps municipalities explain why initiatives in some areas are eligible for support (e.g. with knowledge or resources) but not

those in other areas. Municipalities can also require that only those initiatives that contribute to municipal goals are eligible. The vision therefore prevents the danger of taking ad hoc decisions on support.

The 'environmental vision', a new legal instrument in the Environment and Planning Act (which should come into force in 2018), can be useful in this regard. It is expected that the Act will make this vision mandatory for the national government and the provinces, but optional for municipalities. A group of municipalities can choose to draw up an intermunicipal vision that can exist alongside individual municipal visions. The spatial aspects of the national spatial economic policy advocated in this advisory report can also be laid down in an environmental vision.

Visions come into being through interaction between urban partners and between governments. This process should not take the form of traditional public consultation, but draw on broad public visioning processes such as the one for the Amsterdam Structural Vision 2040. The international literature refers to these broad processes of interaction between governments, businesses and civil society as 'public-private dialogue' (PPD). A vision should not consist of a 'shopping list' of individual wishes, but be the result of a debate on interests and values, or 'a satisfying combination of the interests of different parties' (RIi, 2013). This necessitates an open debate with opposing viewpoints on the decisions to be made. Elected officials must have the courage to take these decisions. Yet another condition is the availability of relevant information, such as recent prognoses.

What happens if the vision developed by a city conflicts with the national environmental vision? The Council feels that the answer to this lies in the environmental vision's status as binding only the authority which prepares it. The environmental vision, like the structural vision in the Spatial Planning Act, is non-hierarchical and does not mandate coordination between different tiers of government. When drawing up a vision, it is each government's own responsibility to take the visions of other governments into account (Ministerie van IenM, 2013). In this sense, the vision of one government can serve as an opening bid for that of another. Frequent contact between administrations and the desire to avoid problems act as mitigating factors; potential clashes between visions can be signalled at an early state and discussed.

Ground rules for regional cooperation and coordination
An important question is how to bring about a situation of complementary and cooperating municipalities as advocated in this advisory report. How do you get the parties to work together when past experience has shown that this is not always easy? How do you prevent parties from reverting to old habits or practices as the economy begins to recover?

The Council feels that the substantive argument for cooperation and complementarity between municipalities will become more and more palpable in the future. If municipalities wish to remain internationally competitive, it is essential that they work together and borrow from each other. Provinces have the responsibility to persuade municipalities about the advantages of regional cooperation. If substantive arguments do not work, the Council sees advantages in setting and enforcing a set of ground rules. The law (now the Spatial Planning Act, later the Environment and Planning Act) allows provinces to include rules on regional coordination in their legally binding ordinances. Other rules could address the oversupply of real estate, for example by only allowing construction when other locations are cleared or if other development plans are withdrawn. These kinds of rules can help municipalities or private parties come up with creative solutions, while at the same time retaining a regulatory framework that protects the wider regional public interest.

Municipalities working together also need to establish rules and guidelines, for example in a joint scheme (see also the list of topics which municipal partnerships need to make agreements on in Section 3.4). This can prevent a situation of 'split incentives' from occurring (i.e. when the benefits of cooperation are enjoyed in one place and the costs in another) and with it, free riders or burden-shifting behaviour. The Council feels that voluntary agreements need to be made about regional equalisation in this regard. This is already allowed, but has yet to become common practice: equalisation between municipalities for housing construction, business parks, offices and retail is still quite rare (Deloitte, 2013). Problems of new housing in particular are seen as problems to be borne by individual municipalities, which should therefore also incur the costs individually. Even though many suffered big losses in the recent past, municipalities generally view equalisation as paying for someone else's problem (Feijtel et al., 2013, p. 5-6). Another way to achieve equalisation indirectly is through a common fund, which would allow costs, such as redevelopment costs, to be shared regionally. This kind of equalisation seems the closest to the regional fund argued for in this advisory report.

If regional cooperation between municipalities is to be a success, it is essential that the policy toolbox is properly equipped. Municipalities can already achieve a lot by making regional cooperation agreements and drawing up a regional agenda and regional environmental vision, supplemented by voluntary equalisation. Nevertheless, the Council feels that the tripartite regional fund proposed earlier, which can facilitate cooperation between the three tiers of government and between sectors, can provide the necessary impetus. Such a fund can stimulate new coalitions. The willingness to engage in regional cooperation needs to come from the municipalities themselves out of a sense of urgency. The national government and the provinces can help convince municipalities and encourage (or, if necessary, mandate) regional cooperation.

In its proposals for regional cooperation, the Council emphasises that it is not proposing an overhaul of the system. On the contrary, the current instruments are more than adequate. They just need to be applied!

Wanted: resilient leadership

In near future, more freedom will be needed for new parties and groups in society that work together in a variety of partnerships (e.g. in the public realm and the energy, waste and food sectors) and want to help shape the development of the urban region. Resilient leadership means keeping an open mind towards these new parties, flexible cooperatives and alliances, and inviting them to the table (see RIi, 2011b; RIi, 2013). This also means accepting a heavy administrative burden on local government as a fact of life: flexible partnerships are intrinsic to the challenges of the network society (RIi, 2013). It will be necessary to cultivate a receptive attitude towards community-based initiatives, which will require a change in mentality, a change which will look different in every municipality, province or ministry. Not only is this change needed among politicians and officials, but also within city and provincial councils and parliament. These leaders need to reinterpret their responsibilities and become less antagonistic towards community-based initiatives (see also Denktank van Vereniging Nederlandse Gemeenten, 2013, p. 62).

Regional and local governments should invest in regional or subregional cooperation to strengthen their economic competitiveness. Regional partnerships can be built around substantive problems, both through governmental cooperation (public-public) or triple helix partnerships (public-private). This should occur on the basis of existing regional qualities and aimed at complementarity instead of unhealthy competition.

4.5 In conclusion

In this advisory report the Council makes a number of recommendations for the future of the city. These are summarised in the text box below. The Council is convinced that acting on these recommendations will make the Netherlands better equipped to compete internationally and facilitate the emergence of a new form of urban society.

Summary of recommendations on the future of the city

Self-organisation
If the city of the future wishes to use the self-organising capacity of society, then the national government needs to remove barriers to community-based initiatives and ensure that existing infrastructure and utility networks are suitable to accommodate these. Municipalities need to pursue a well thought-out policy on amenities (oriented towards meeting places), develop a policy on vacant facilities, accept differences within the municipality and give new cooperatives more latitude. Social-service providers are expected to reorient themselves to the public (e.g. less consultation with umbrella organisations and more with groups of existing customers) and welcome and facilitate new community-based initiatives.

Complementarity
To encourage the development of complementary urban regions, both the national government and municipalities should base their policies on the principle of complementarity within and between regions. The national government should expand the current top sector policy to include spatial economic policy on the basis of complementarity and borrowed size. Municipalities should make complementarity the guiding principle in their urban policies, building on their own identities and qualities, their economic potential and a strategy of borrowed size. Policy at all levels of government should be directed at using infrastructure to achieve complementarity. Infrastructure does more than facilitate transport; it can also unleash the spatial potential of places. All layers of government should work together to set up a regional investment programme and a regional fund.

Using existing assets
If the city of the future wishes to make better use of its existing assets, it must pay more attention to their management and give more opportunities to smaller parties. Because writing down vacant property creates favourable conditions for urban transformation, the national government needs to improve access to information on this. The national government should also set up a research programme to develop new models and categories of public space. Governments, businesses, NGOs and individuals should look for places in the city with potential. Using existing assets in areas where self-organisation cannot be counted on should be seen as a collective responsibility. Housing associations are obvious partners in this due to their high share of ownership. From the perspective of the city as a self-organising system and shifting roles, the national government must reconsider which tasks should be performed by civil society (housing associations, health care facilities, educational

institutions). In view of the challenge of transforming existing urban areas, provinces and municipalities need to make clear decisions about what should and should not be permitted, and ensure the transformation of existing locations takes account of other development sites in the region.

Good leadership
Taking full advantage of the development potential of urban areas will require robust and resilient leadership. Governments at all levels must articulate the challenges and objectives in vision documents, which must be based on broad social visioning processes, and establish ground rules and financial conditions. At the same time, government bodies need to develop an open attitude towards new collaborative arrangements and cooperatives, and invest in regional partnerships. This will require a change in mentality. The future of the city lies in regional municipal cooperation and this in turn will depend on effective legal instruments. Municipalities can already achieve a lot by making use of existing possibilities for making regional cooperation agreements, drawing up a regional agenda and regional environmental vision, supplemented by voluntary equalisation. Nevertheless, an extra incentive is needed in the form of a tripartite regional fund to facilitate cooperation between different tiers of government and between sectors. Such a fund can stimulate the formation of new coalitions.

REFERENCES

Berkhout, T. (2013). Hoelang blijven we met vastgoed verstoppertje spelen? *Het Financieele Dagblad*, 20 oktober 2013.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2011). *Een op de drie woningen eigendom van woningcorporatie*. Webmagazine 5 december 2011. http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/bouwen-wonen/publicaties/artikelen/archief/2011/2011-3520-wm.htm [accessed 14 October 2013].

Deloitte Real Estate Advisory (2012). *Financiële effecten crisis bij gemeentelijke grondbedrijven Actualisatie 2012*. Amsterdam.

Deloitte Real Estate Advisory (2013). *Financiële situatie bij gemeentelijke grondbedrijven 2013.* Amsterdam.

Denktank Vereniging van Nederlandse Gemeenten (2013). *Van eerste overheid naar eerst de burger: over maatschappelijke initiatieven die de lokale overheid uitdagen.* Jaarbericht 2013. Den Haag.

Engelsdorp Gastelaars, R. van & Hamers, D. (2006). *De nieuwe stad: stedelijke centra als brandpunten van interactie.* Den Haag: NAi Uitgevers/ RPB.

Feijtel, J., Have, F. ten & Bouwhuijsen, I. van den (2013). *Wie aan boord is, moet meevaren: onderzoek naar regionale samenwerking op het gebied van grondbeleid.* Utrecht: Deloitte.

Janssen-Jansen, L.B. & Mulders, M. (2012). Leegstand, braakliggende terreinen en ontwikkelingsluchtbellen: een nieuw hoofdstuk in de stedelijke ruimtelijke ordening. *Bestuurskunde*, 2012 (1), 33-40.

Katz, B. & Bradley, J. (2013). *The metropolitan revolution. How cities and metros are fixing our broken politics and fragile economy.* Washington D.C.: Brookings institution.

Lans, J. van der (2011). *Loslaten, vertrouwen, verbinden: over burgers en binding.* Amsterdam: Nationale Goede Doelen Loterijen/Stichting Doen.

Lans, J. van der (2012). *De toekomst is aan platforms*. www.socialevraagstukken.nl [accessed 13 October 2013].

Louw, E., Needham, B., Olden, H. & Pen C.J. (2004). *Planning van bedrijventerreinen.* Den Haag: Sdu.

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties (2013). *De doe-democratie: kabinetsnota ter stimulering van een vitale samenleving*. Den Haag.

Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu (2012). *Structuurvisie Infrastructuur en Ruimte: Nederland concurrerend, bereikbaar, leefbaar en veilig*. Den Haag.

Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu (2013). *De zes instrumenten van de Omgevingswet.* Informatieblad Omgevingsvisie. Den Haag. https://omgevingswet.pleio.nl/file/view/20302942/informatieblad-omgevingsvisie [accessed 11 November 2013].

Nirov|Platform31 (2012). *Ruimte voor initiatief: organische stedelijke ontwikkeling.* Den Haag.

Peek, G.J. (2013). Radicale innovaties. *S+RO Stedenbouw en Ruimtelijke Ordening*, 94 (05), 12-15.

Pennen, T. van der (2003). *Ontwikkeling in het lokaal vrijwilligersbeleid: het internationaal jaar voor de vrijwilligers; een jaar later.* Werkdocument 94. Den Haag: SCP.

Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving (2012). *De internationale concurrentiepositie van de topsectoren.* Den Haag.

Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving in samenwerking met Centraal Planbureau (2013). *Welvaart en Leefomgeving: horizonscan*. Den Haag: PBL.

Platform Taxateurs en Accountants (2013). *Goed gewaardeerd vastgoed: 28 aanbevelingen voor taxeren en taxatierapporten*. Amsterdam.

Raad voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2013). *Sturen op samenhang: governance in de metropolitane regio Schiphol/Amsterdam*. Advies 05. Den Haag.

Raad voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2014a). *Langer zelfstandig, een gedeelde opgave van wonen, zorg en welzijn.* Advies 01. Den Haag.

Raad voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2014b). *Kwaliteit zonder groei: over de toekomst van de leefomgeving*. Advies 03. Den Haag.

Raad voor het openbaar bestuur (2012). *Loslaten in vertrouwen: naar een nieuwe verhouding tussen overheid, markt én samenleving*. Den Haag.

Raad voor Maatschappelijke Ontwikkeling (2013). *Terugtreden is vooruitzien: maatschappelijke veerkracht in het publieke domein*. Den Haag.

Raden voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2011a). *Toekomst van het ruimtelijk beleid.* Briefadvies nr. 02. Den Haag.

Raden voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2011b). *Remmen los: advies over versnelling energietransitie*. Adviesnr. 08. Den Haag.

Raspe, O. (2012). De economie van de stad in de mondiale concurrentie. In Raad voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2012) *Essays Toekomst van de stad* (p. 20-24). Den Haag.

Raspe, O., Weterings, A., Geurden-Slis, M. & Gessel, G. van (2012). *De ratio van ruimtelijk-economisch topsectorenbeleid*. Den Haag: PBL / CBS.

Reijndorp, A. (2012). *De 'Rise of the Creative Class' en het einde van 'Organization Man': de veerkracht van de stad*. Rotterdam Maaskantprijs 2012. Rotterdam: Stichting Rotterdam-Maaskant.

Salet, W. & Janssen-Jansen, L.B. (red.) (2009). *Synergie in stedelijke netwerken: tussen competitie en complementariteit.* Den Haag: Sdu Uitgevers / Habiforum.

Tweede Kamer (2013a). *Grondbeleid. Brief van de minister van Infrastructuur en Milieu aan de voorzitter van de Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, van 14 oktober 2013.* Vergaderjaar 2013-2014, 27581, nr. 46.

Tweede Kamer (2013b). *Uitkomsten bestuurlijke overleggen MIRT. Vaststelling van de begrotingsstaat van het Infrastructuurfonds voor het jaar 2014. Brief van de minister en de staatssecretaris van Infrastructuur en Milieu aan de Tweede Kamer van 18 november 2013.* Vergaderjaar 2013-2014, 33 750 A, nr. 25.

Tweede Kamer (2013c). *Beantwoording Kamervragen van de leden Fokke en De Vries over de financiële gevolgen van gemeenten met hun grondpositie. Brief van de minister van Infrastructuur en Milieu aan de Tweede Kamer van 27 november 2013*. Vergaderjaar 2013-2014, 2013Z21452, nr. 655.

Tweede Kamer (2013d). *Aanbieden onderzoek financiële effecten van de crisis bij gemeentelijke grondbedrijven, en agenda grondbeleid. Brief van de minister van Infrastructuur en Milieu aan de Tweede Kamer van 20 december 2013.* Vergaderjaar 2013-2014, 27581, nr. 47.

Uitermark, J. (2012). De zelforganiserende stad. In Raad voor de leefomgeving en infrastructuur (2012) *Essays Toekomst van de stad* (p. 5-19). Den Haag.

VROM-raad (2006). *Werklandschappen: een regionale strategie voor bedrijventerreinen.* Advies 053. Den Haag.

VROM-raad (2008). *Wisselende coalities: naar een effectief regionaal ruimtelijk beleid*. Advies 068. Den Haag.

VROM-raad (2010). *Duurzame verstedelijking*. Advies 076. Den Haag.

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (2012). *Vertrouwen in burgers.* Rapport 88. Den Haag/Amsterdam: WRR/ Amsterdam University Press.

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (2013). *Naar een lerende economie: investeren in het verdienvermogen van Nederland*. Rapport 90. Den Haag/Amsterdam: WRR/ Amsterdam University Press.

Zwaard, J. van & Specht, M. (2013). *Betrokken bewoners, betrouwbare overheid: condities en competenties voor burgerkracht in de buurt.* Rotterdam.

APPENDIX

RESPONSIBILITY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Advisory committee
Prof. Dr P. Hooimeijer, chair
H.M. Meijdam
Prof. A. Reijndorp
A.M.J. Rijckenberg
Prof. Dr Th.A.J. Toonen
P.J.H.D. Verkoelen

Project team
Dr L.B.J. van Duinen, project leader (from 1 January 2013)
Dr V.J.M. Smit, project staff (up to 1 September 2013)
W. Eikmans, project assistant

Additional contributions by
RIi staff
Dr. M.E. Bouwman
A.M.H. Bruines
G.J. Mensing (project leader up to 1 January 2013)
J.H.P. Vrolijk
Other
S. Pekelsma, Simone Pekelsma Urban Research & Consultancy
Dr T.H.C. Zwanikken, Tim Zwanikken Advies

Consulted experts
First expert meeting: 20 September 2012
Prof. Dr O.A.L.C. Atzema, Universiteit Utrecht
H. Beekman, Projectbureau Stadshavens Rotterdam
I.M. Kalisvaart MBA, MAB Development
S. Lindemann, mobiel projectbureau Op Trek
L.M. Sondag, voormalig directeur Van Gansewinkel Groep
Dr S.P. Tjallingii, TU Delft
A.H.M.Th. Vos, Anna Vos Concepts for Urban Change
Dr B.G.M. de Waal, The mobile City

Second expert meeting: 8 April 2013
Dr P. Boekhoud, Hogeschool Rotterdam
Y. de Boer, provincie Noord-Brabant

J.A. Fackeldey, gemeente Lelystad
Th.C. de Graaf, Vereniging Hogescholen
M. de Langen, Stadgenoot
M. Molenaar, Woonstad Rotterdam
W.J. Moorlag, provincie Groningen
H. Roorda, Unie van Waterschappen
H.T.M. Scholten, gemeente Eindhoven
F. Soeterbroek, De Ruimtemaker
I.C. Thepass, Laurens
G. Verduijn, Woonzorg Nederland

Other consulted experts
Dr H.P. Benschop, Trendbureau Overijssel
Prof. Dr R.W. Boomkens, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
H. Bothof, TOP Delft
Prof. Dr J. Brouwer, TOP Delft
R. Bouman, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
A. Bruins, Ministerie van Economische Zaken
Dr E. Buitelaar, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
M.A.T.J. Cramers, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties
A. van Daal, gemeente Den Haag
M.M. Dijkers, NISB
M. Dubbeling, SAB
W.T.N. Eisen, Ministerie van Economische Zaken
E. Fransen, Pakhuis de Zwijger
T. van Gestel, gemeente Den Haag
B.M.E. Geurts, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties
Prof. Dr W.A. Hafkamp, zelfstandig adviseur/Platform31
Dr D.A.F. Hamers, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
J.W.L. ten Hoeve, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
Prof. Dr P.M. Herder, TU Delft
B. Huits, provincie Gelderland
Dr C.J.M. Karsten, Universiteit van Amsterdam
S.P.L. Kessels, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties
Dr M. Kool, Ministerie van Economische Zaken
Y.J.M. van der Laan, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
H. Leeflang, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
F.G. Licher, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties
A. van Lieshout, Christiaan Kappers
K. Machielse, Hogeschool Rotterdam
B. Marinussen, Stadshavens Rotterdam
P.P. Mertens, Ministerie van Economische Zaken
G. Muris, RDM Campus
G.J. Nabers BSc, gemeente Zwolle

M. Piek, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
M.P. Rabbie, Vesteda
A. Ramsair, Atelier Anna Ramsair
Dr O. Raspe, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
M.J. Rimmelzwaan, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
Dr J.R. Ritsema van Eck, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
O.Z. van Sandick, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
M. Schaafsma, Schiphol Real Estate
S. Slabbers, Bosch Slabbers
D.L.M. Slangen, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
Dr D.M.E.G.W. Snellen, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
H.A. Snoeken, Ministerie van Infrastructuur en Milieu
Dr E.J. Visser, Ministerie van Economische Zaken
P.A.H. van der Vorm, TU Delft
I.J. Vossenaar, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties
A.F. de Vries, Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties
M. de Vries, gemeente Den Haag
M. Woutersen MSc, Stad van de Toekomst
Dr P. Zwaan, provincie Gelderland

Authors of the essays commissioned by the Rli for this advisory report
Prof. Dr E.R. Engelen, Universiteit van Amsterdam
Dr D.A.F. Hamers, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
Prof. Dr J. Janssen, Wageningen UR
Dr J.D. de Jong, Re-Bond: onderzoek & advies
Prof. Dr J.T. Mommaas, Universiteit van Tilburg
Dr A.W. Mulder, Haagse Hogeschool
Dr O. Raspe, Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving
Dr W. Schinkel, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
M. Schuilenburg, VU Amsterdam
I. Schutten, Studio Iris Schutten
F. Soeterbroek, De Ruimtemaker
M.G.N. van Steekelenburg, Provincie Zuid-Holland
N.M.J.D. Tillie, TU Delft
Dr J.L. Uitermark, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
M.P.A.M. Verheijen MArch, Hogeschool Rotterdam
P.O. Vermeulen, Gemeente Amsterdam
Dr B.G.M. de Waal, The Mobile City
J.B.R. Wijma, Programmabureau Regio Groningen-Assen

External reviewers
Prof. Dr O.A.L.C. Atzema, Universiteit Utrecht
Prof. Dr J.C.J. Boutellier, VU Amsterdam
Prof. Dr W.A. Hafkamp, zelfstandig adviseur
Prof. J.M. Schrijnen, zelfstandig adviseur

OVERVIEW OF PUBLICATIONS

2014
The future of the city. The Power of New Connections ['De toekomst van de stad, de kracht van nieuwe verbindingen']. March 2014 (RIi 2014/04)

Quality without Growth. On the Future of the Built Environment ['*Kwaliteit zonder groei, over de toekomst van de leefomgeving*']. March 2014 (RIi 2014/03)

Doen en laten, effectiever milieubeleid door mensenkennis.
March 2014 (RIi 2014/02)

Living independently for longer – a shared responsibility of the housing, health and welfare policy domains [*'Langer zelfstandig, een gedeelde opgave van wonen, zorg en welzijn'*]. January 2014 (RIi 2014/01)

2013
Sustainable choices in the implementation of the common agricultural policy in the Netherlands ['*Duurzame keuzes bij de toepassing van het Europees landbouwbeleid in Nederland*']. October 2013 (RIi 2013/06)

Pulling together. Governance in the Schiphol/Amsterdam Metropolitan Region [*'Sturen op samenhang, governance in de metropolitane regio Schiphol/ Amsterdam'*]. September 2013 (RIi 2013/05)

Safety at companies subject to the Major Accidents Risks Decree: responsibility and effective action [*'Veiligheid bij Brzo-bedrijven, verantwoordelijkheid en daadkracht'*]. June 2013 (RIi 2013/04)

Dutch Logistics 2040: Designed to last [*'Nederlandse logistiek 2040, designed to last'*]. June 2013 (RIi 2013/03)

Nature's Imperative. Towards a robust nature policy [*'Onbeperkt houdbaar, naar een robuust natuurbeleid'*]. May 2013 (RIi 2013/02)

Room for Sustainable Agriculture [*'Ruimte voor duurzame landbouw'*].
March 2013 (RIi 2013/01)

2012
Keep Moving. Towards Sustainable Mobility (edited by Bert van Wee).
October 2012 (RIi/EEAC)

Original title
De toekomst van de stad: de kracht van nieuwe verbindingen

Cover illustration
David Rozing / Hollandse Hoogte

Graphic design
2D3D Design, The Hague, The Netherlands

Printing
Ando bv, The Hague, The Netherlands

RIi publication 2014/04
March 2014

Translation
Onderosa Language Matters, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ISBN 978-90-77166-54-3
NUR 740