K R 8

MASTER THESIS MANAGEMENT IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2023 - 2024

Rebuilding trust

HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS IN GRONINGEN'S REINFORCEMENT TASK

Maaike Creusen, 4874439

Version First supervisor Second supervisor

Maaike Creusen 4874439 **28.06.2024** Harry Boumeester Marja Elsinga

Trilploat - Wat Aans

Wie bring'n Grunn in koart, swing'n op die trilploat. Kiek ik zwait mie kapot, loopt mie langs de bilnoad En alle wichter hier, ja die vind'n het schier. Beweeg die dikke batterij'n in die skinny jeans En dat stil bliem stoan, dat is niks veur mie, Want als het trilt, dan ben ik er als de kipp'n bie.

Keetpop Leermens, ja doar komm wie soam'n. Alle kerels aan 't bier, ja de heule oamd. Nait allenig roegbainders of de grootste sjompm, Zoals in de media, moar ook gewone jong'n. Ben hier in Grunn, woar het beeft en schud, Moar woar noast die ellende ook nog veel gebeurt.

Wie bin hier, wie bin trots op Grunn.

Gooi die scholders er moar onder en dan mot 't lukk'n. 't Is nait 't plan om vandoag de boudel op te jutt'n, Moar om te trill'n tot de bill'n uut de boksem schudd'n

[REFREIN]

Ah Let mien hand'n bie je bil doar. Ik hoop nait dat ze stil stoan. Ik wil er zain schudd'n op die trilploat. Ik wil er zain schudd'n op die trilploat Ik wil die zain schudd'n op die trilploat. Ik wil er zain schudd'n op die trilploat. Ik wil die zain schudd'n op die trilploat. Ik wil er zain schudd'n op die trilploat.

Al die sjompm op TV, dai ze Grunniger vind'n, Dai onverstand van de broez'n en die andere slecht'n Wil ik mie nait met meet'n. Ik ken Nederlands proat'n. Hufst mie nait te ondertitel'n, want de Grunniger toal Spreek ik allenig in Grunn. Ik goa van Pekel noar Stad. Nou heb ik zin in metworst jong, regel moar wat!

Smartphones aan de kant of zet 'm op stil. Nou is het lekker lus goan of Netflix en chill, Meur morg'n weer waark'n, 'k heb 'n putje der bie. Dan goan de hand'n uut de mouw'n, bin gain piezelemiet. Ik beun hier, beun doar, pak mien raive der bie En zal de boudel opknappm tot 't aarg'ns op liekt.

Wie bin hier, wie bin trots op Grunn. Gooi die scholders er moar onder en dan mot 't lukk'n. 't Is nait 't plan om vandoag de boudel op te jutt'n, Moar om te trill'n tot de bill'n uut de boksem schudd'n.

[REFREIN]

Ik zug bewiez'n van de beem'ngs, in de muur graveert stoan. I see evidence of the tremors engraved in the wall. Der is toch nog meer in 't leem, 't ken nait al zo mis goan. Soms wil ik alles wel vergeet'n. Wie hem toch niks verkeerd doan? En toch blief ik schudd'n op die trilploat.

English translation of Triploat - Wat Aans

We put Groningen on the map, swaying on the shaking plate. Look, I'm sweating buckets, it's running down my buttocks. All the girls here, yeah, they find it fun. Moving those thick butts in those skinny jeans. And standing still is nothing for me, Because when it shakes. I'm there in a flash.

Keetpop Leermens, that's where we come together. All the guys on the beer, yeah, the entire evening. Not just 'dregs of society' or the biggest weirdos, As portrayed in the media, but also regular guys. I'm here in Groningen where it trembles and shakes, But where besides the trouble, a lot still happens.

We're here, we're proud of Groningen. Let's put our shoulders into it, and then it should work out. It's not the plan to stir things up today, But to shake until the buttocks tremble out of the pants.

[CHORUS]

Ah Let my hands be on your buttocks there I hope they don't stand still I want to see her shaking on the shaking plate I want to see her shaking on the shaking plate I want to see you shaking on the shaking plate I want to see her shaking on the shaking plate I want to see you shaking on the shaking plate I want to see her shaking on the shaking plate

All those weirdos on TV who call themselves Groningers, With foolish acts and those other stupid figures, I don't want to compare myself to them. I can speak Dutch You don't need to subtitle me, because the Groninger language I only speak in Groningen. I go from Pekela to the city. Now I feel like having mettwurst, mate, arrange some!

Smartphones aside, or put them on silent. Now it's time to let loose or Netflix and chill, But tomorrow back to work, I have an extra job. Then it's time to get hands-on, I'm not a lingerer. I dabble here, dabble there with my tools And I'll fix things up until it resembles something.

We're here, we're proud of Groningen. Let's put our shoulders into it, and then it should work out. It's not the plan to stir things up today, But to shake until the buttocks tremble out of the pants.

[CHORUS]

There's still more to life, it can't always go so wrong. Sometimes I want to forget everything. We didn't do anything wrong after all? Yet, I keep shaking on the shaking plate.









At the age of four, my family moved from Gouda to Groningen, settling in the picturesque village of Haren, merely 6 kilometres away from the city. With its green surroundings yet easy access to city life, Haren provided a serene upbringing. During my high school years, commuting from Haren to Groningen became a daily routine for me. Although seismic tremors already plagued the province – the 2012 earthquake in Huizinge happened during my first year of high school - oddly, they seemed distant. Classmates residing in the province experienced tremors and damage to their houses, yet in Haren, we remained untouched. The only moment when the earthquake problem came to mind, was a few years later, when we'd passionately sing along to 'trilploat', a popular song crafted by the band Wat Aans to jest about the seismic turmoil (2016).

Upon leaving for Delft at seventeen to study Architecture, my parents moved to a newly constructed house in Haren. Within a brief span of less than two years after its completion, the emergence of cracks and misalignments between thresholds and doorframes brought the stark reality of earthquakes to our doorstep. After a lot of administrative efforts by my dad, a meager sum of €5000 was allocated for repairs. Neither the cracks nor doorframes were ever fixed. From that moment onwards, my awareness of the seismic dossier heightened, but it lingered in the background amid the demands of my academic pursuits in Delft.

Nonetheless, my attachment to Groningen persisted. When it came time to select a subject for my master's thesis in Management in the Built Environment, the theme of 'tackling housing inequality' immediately captured my attention. The discovery of an article discussing the impact of earthquakes on Groningen's housing market reaffirmed my inclination to explore this domain - an inherent draw to my 'roots.' In Groningen, inequality has always been noticeable. At first, it showed differences between the northern provinces and the busy Randstad area. But there have also been long-standing divisions between the city of Groningen and its surrounding province ('stad en ommeland'). With the earthquakes, new differences appeared between people with and people without earthquake damage to their homes. But even within the category of people with earthquake damage, large inequalities exist between neighbours, tenants and home owners. Groningen has - both literally and figuratively - become a fractured province.

These inequalities fascinated me, especially the 'newfound' inequalities within the category of people with earthquake damage to their homes. The earthquake file portrays a stark focus on homeowners, but where do housing associations and tenants fit into this narrative? I decided that I wanted to dedicate my thesis to the role that housing associations play in the earthquake-affected region of Groningen. I enlisted the help of Harry Boumeester and Marja Elsinga as supervisors. Harry, with his expertise in 'housing systems', had previously conducted research on the effects of earthquakes in Groningen on the intention to move, and Marja, specializing in 'housing institutions and governance', hails from Groningen herself. They turned out to be the perfect match for my research. Via Peter de Vries, I landed a graduation internship at Kr8, a collaboration between multiple housing associations with properties in the earthquake-affected area. From January to June 2024, I got the chance to develop my research within the context of housing associations Groninger Huis and Wierden & Borgen.

This thesis report, titled 'Rebuilding Trust: Housing Associations in Groningen's Reinforcement Task,' reflects a year of dedicated work. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Harry Boumeester and Marja Elsinga for their invaluable guidance throughout this journey. They not only ensured the academic rigor of my research but also nurtured my personal growth, keeping the thesis writing process enjoyable. I am also profoundly thankful to the Kr8 board members - Anita Tijsma, Laura Broekhuizen, Matthieu van Olffen, Harry Oosting, Onno Bremmers, and Elles Dost - for providing me the opportunity to combine this thesis with an internship at Kr8. Your openness and willingness to include me in all meetings and executive discussions greatly enriched my learning experience. Thank you to the colleagues at Groninger Huis and Wierden en Borgen for welcoming me so warmly into the office. Lastly, I would like to extend my gratitude to Peter de Vries for facilitating my entry into Kr8 and for his consistent involvement and readiness to review my work. And of course, to Geja Hagedoorn, whose guidance and support made my time at Kr8 both productive and enjoyable. Despite her demanding schedule, I could always rely on her to connect me with the right individuals. Your support has been instrumental in this journey.

- Maaike Creusen

TABLE OF CONTENT

p.7 Preface

p. 12 1. Research context

p. 16 2. Research design

- 2.1 Problem statement and research aim
- 2.2 Relevance
- 2.3 Target audience
- 2.4 Research questions
- 2.5 Research elements
- 2.6 Research methods

p. 22 3. Literature study

p. 23

21 Sphara	1. Fortha	undrog in	Groningen
ST Shuele	I. Lai uiy	juakes III	GIOIIIIgen

- 3.1.1 Brief history natural gas extraction in Groningen
- 3.1.2 Material damage
- 3.1.3 Immaterial damage
- 3.1.4 Parties involved
- 3.1.5 Parliamentary inquiry
- 3.1.6 The commencement of the post-closure phase
- 3.1.7 Initiatives
- 3.1.8 Conclusion

р. 35	3.2 Sphere 2: Role of housing associations in the Netherlands
-	3.2.1 Brief history - social housing in the Netherlands
	3.2.2 Parliamentary inquiry
	3.2.3 Revision of the Housing Act in 2015
	3.2.4 Revision of the Housing Act in 2022
	3.2.5 National Performance Agreements

- 3.2.6 Wetsvoorstel Versterking Regie op de Volkshuisvesting
- 3.2.7 Conclusion

 p. 41
3.3 Sphere 3: Management strategies for enhancing liveability 3.3.1 Defining liveability 3.3.2 A hierarchy of needs 3.3.3 Liveability versus sustainability 3.3.4 Enhancing liveability in the Dutch social housing sector 3.3.5 The 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' by Aedes 3.3.6 Conclusion
p. 48
4. Housing associations in the earthquake-affected region 4.1 Housing association's part in the reinforcement task

- 4.2 Explorative talks the approach
- 4.3 The Kr8 partnership
- 4.4 Effect on the operations of individual housing associations
- 4.5 A challenge in the social domain
- 4.6 Housing associations' perspectives on their role
- 4.7 Achievements
- 4.8 Enhancing liveability in reinforcement projects
- 4.9 Conclusion

p. 64 5. Liveability challenges of tenants in Groningen

- 5.1 Liveability assessment on different levels
- 5.2 Measuring the effects of gas extraction on liveability
- 5.3 The approach of Kr8
- 5.4 Data analysis the approach
- 5.5 What do tenants say?
- 5.6 Results in relation to Maslow's hierarchy of needs
- 5.7 Conclusion

p. 78 6. The Woonactieplan

6.1 Rationale behind the Woonactieplan

- 6.2 Core themes and strategies
- 6.3 Alignment with survey data
- 6.4 Current state
- 6.5 Debates on the next step
- 6.6 Focus group the approach
- 6.7 Focus group findings
 - 6.7.1 Activity 1: theme ranking
 - 6.7.2 Activity 2: liveability statement
 - 6.7.3 Other
- 6.8 Conclusion
- 6.9 Step-by-step guide to area-based working*

p. 96 7. Conclusion

- 7.1 Summary
- 7.2 Research findings
- 7.3 Conclusion on the main question
- 7.4 Practical implications
- 7.5 Limitations and suggestions for future research

p. 106 Bibliography

Appendix

A. The 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' by Aedes

- B. Question list explorative talks
- C. Informed consent form
- D. Data management plan
- E. Human research ethics checklist
- F. Data analysis Kr8 survey forms
- G. Summary data analysis
- H. The Woonactieplan
- I. The 'praatplaat Woonactieplan' by Kr8
- J. Timeline Kr8 associations





Research context

Over the past decade, the province of Groningen in the Netherlands has been subject to a series of earthquakes resulting from gas extraction activities. Over 1,600 earthquakes have occurred in the Groningen field, with new ones happening every month. By the end of 2023, there were over 397,454 damage reports filed, with over 20,000 yet to be resolved (Groninger Bodem Beweging, 2023). In 85,000 cases, multiple damages were reported (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). Where swift and adequate resolution could have contributed to managing the issues, the opposite has occurred: prolonged damage settlement processes generate so much worry and hassle that they lead to health problems among residents of the earthquakeaffected region. The dissatisfaction in the province is profound, and trust in the government and all other involved authorities has plummeted to zero.

After years of dedicated efforts by the Groningen people to have their concerns recognized, the year 2023 proved to be a crucial turning point in what has become known as 'the earthquake file'. In 2021, a parliamentary inquiry into gas extraction in the Groningen field was launched. After two years of extensive investigations, the parliamentary committee tasked with the investigation released its final report, titled 'Groningers Above Gas,' in February 2023 (Provincie Groningen, 2023a). The main conclusion read that: "The interests of Groningen's residents have systematically been overlooked in the natural gas extraction process. This negligence has had devastating consequences for them" (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). The report sheds light on the paradox of Groningen's natural gas reserves, telling a tale of how 60 years of gas extraction in Groningen has brought the Netherlands substantial financial gains (totalling over 363 billion euros), but cost the people of Groningen dearly.

"It's no longer just about trembling cups in the cupboard" concludes Tom van der Lee, chairman of the committee. The committee asserts that the repercussions of gas extraction extend beyond mere structural damage: impacting the region's business appeal, hindering property sales due to structural issues, and altering the region's character via extensive reinforcement efforts (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). Prolonged insecurity has led to stress and health issues among Groningen residents, exacerbating disruptions within communities. Inequality in the

damage settlement process, influenced by factors like location and reporting time, has engendered envy and suspicion among neighbours, intensifying disparities in the villages. Moreover, the significant divide between renters and homeowners becomes starkly evident, with renters receiving minimal attention in the earthquake file. This situation, as described by the parliamentary inquiry committee, is deemed 'disastrous'.

According to the committee, the earthquake issue in Groningen has been systematically underestimated for decades. If the earthquake issue had been taken seriously from the outset, much suffering could have been prevented. As a result, the Netherlands now has a moral obligation to rectify its debt to Groningen (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). While this recognition was of great importance for the people of Groningen, the outcome of the parliamentary inquiry does not change the reality of the earthquakes and all the damage and adverse effects thereof. Moreover, an investigative report cannot restore the trust of Groningen residents. Once broken, trust is not easily rebuilt. The people of Groningen often say 'actions speak louder than words' and 'seeing is believing', emphasizing their need to see real changes rather than just promises.

Because the Groningers were promised the closure of the gas tap many times before. In March 2018, the government announced its intention to cease gas extraction for the first time. Initially, there was a plan for a 12-year transition period - until 2030 - to ensure sufficient availability of cheap gas during harsh winters (NOS, 2023). Under pressure from the people of Groningen, that date was moved forward to 2022. However, this date was not met due to the eruption of the war in Ukraine. When the Russians reduced a large portion of their gas supply to Europe, concerns about supply disruptions led to a delay in deciding on a definitive date. In June 2023, it was announced that the gas tap would close on October 1, 2023. However, the same announcement included the caveat that the gas wells would remain operational until October 1, 2024, allowing for the possibility of limited gas extraction in 'very exceptional circumstances' (NOS, 2023). When temperatures in the Netherlands dropped to around 6.5 degrees below zero in January 2024, it was decided to relight the pilot flame at various gas locations as a precautionary measure (NOS, 2024). This sparked considerable anger in the province.

It wasn't until April 2024 that the milestone awaited by the people of Groningen arrived. On April 16, the Senate voted in favour of permanently closing the gas tap in Groningen (Drent & Braakman, 2024). The House of Representatives had approved the legislation a month prior. This final legislative step cleared the way for the definitive closure of the gas tap. Although the bill still awaits formal signing and publication in the official government journal at the time of writing this thesis, once enacted, gas extraction from the Groningen field will be prohibited. Consequently, the Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij (NAM) can proceed with the decommissioning of remaining gas extraction sites. This process involves sealing the wells with metal plugs and filling them with hundreds of meters of cement (Drent & Braakman, 2024). Should there be a future decision to resume gas extraction in Groningen, it would necessitate the amending of the law. Furthermore, new permits for extraction and drilling would be required, a process that could span years and incur significant costs. The likelihood of the Groningen gas field reopening is therefore small.

The definitive closure of the gas tap in 2024 marks the commencement of a new chapter in the earthquake file. After years of dedicated efforts primarily aimed at getting the gas tap closed, the post-closure phase can now begin. While this development brings hope and relief, many professionals warn that the mere closure of the gas supply does not bring an end to the challenges that continue to afflict the people of Groningen.

First of all because experts predict that earthquakes will still occur in the province of Groningen for years to come. With the shutting down of the gas tap, the primary cause of the earthquakes in Groningen is being eliminated. However, this does not mean that ground movement immediately ceases. There are still pressure differences in the subsurface of Groningen that could lead to new earthquakes over the next few decades. Theodor Kockelkoren, inspector general at the State Supervision of Mines (Staatstoezicht op de Mijnen (SodM)) explains: "It will likely take years, possibly even decades, before seismic activity in Groningen subsides. This prolonged period is attributed to the fact that natural gas extraction has spanned over half a century, resulting in substantial pressure differences within the field. Even if gas extraction ceases, these pressure differences need time to even out, and that process will lead to more earthquakes. So, there are still risks ahead" (Ekker & Start, 2022b).

Secondly, because Groningen faces a substantial challenge in terms of reconstruction. There is a considerable amount of damage that requires repair. This damage is not only material, but also immaterial: individuals who encounter uncontrollable circumstances frequently endure traumatic stress and psychological distress (Jansen et al., 2017). The years of living with earthquakes have left their marks. The Groninger Bodem Beweging (GBB), an organization dedicated to advocating for the rights of those impacted by gas extraction in Groningen, maintains an impressive list of figures on their website. To provide an understanding of the task that still lies ahead (Groninger Bodem Beweging, 2023):

- 7,289 addresses still need to be inspected for their security (24/02/2023).
- More than 2,000 addresses are threatened with demolition (14/10/2023).
- The necessary preventive reinforcement of more than 27,455 addresses has only been achieved for 41,7% (11/2023).
- Approximately 20,000 Groningen residents have health problems due to all the problems surrounding claims (settlement) and financial uncertainty (31/05/2022).
- On average, sixteen deaths occur in Groningen each year due to earthquake-related health issues.

These statistics find backing in several recent studies, including the parliamentary inquiry, 'Gronings perspectief', and monthly data released by the 'Nationaal Coördinator Groningen' (NCG). As a result of the extensive material and immaterial damage, the liveability of the province has diminished. At the core of the post-closure phase therefore lies a fundamental question: how can the process of rebuilding, not only of structures but also of trust, be effectively shaped? What steps should be taken to navigate the way forward from this point? Precisely this inquiry forms the central focus of this master's thesis, taking the perspective of housing associations.





CHAPTER 2

Research design

2.1 Problem statement and research aim

The earthquake problem in Groningen has received significant attention within the current body of literature. While there has been extensive research on both material and immaterial damage, the predominant focus of prior research has been on mapping out the consequences. When it comes to mitigating these consequences, there has often been a singular focus on governmental responses, leaving a significant gap in our understanding of the role played by other relevant stakeholders such as housing associations in the area. Remarkably, despite being responsible for approximately 30% of the affected homes, the specific contributions of and challenges faced by housing associations in mitigating the extensive consequences of this crisis remain inadequately explored.

This thesis seeks to bridge this gap in knowledge by conducting an investigation into the role that housing associations play in addressing the (im)material damage caused by earthquakes and enhancing liveability in Groningen.

2.2 Relevance

This study is closely linked to recent developments. On the one hand, it is situated within the context of the parliamentary inquiry into gas extraction in Groningen - the results of which were formally disclosed in early 2023 – and the adoption of the bill to close the gas tap on April 16, 2024. On the other hand, it connects with the 2022 update to the Housing Act, which offers housing associations more space to consider the concept of 'liveability'.

In particular, this research ties in with the recent efforts of six housing associations in the earthquakeaffected area. United under the Kr8 partnership, the associations have initiated the development of a Woonactieplan (housing action plan) in response to the parliamentary inquiry. This plan, that is currently being formulated (the latest version dates from September 2023), aims to provide a comprehensive framework detailing the specific measures necessary to ensure a safe and pleasant future living environment for tenants in Groningen.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyse and comprehend the Woonactieplan, including its current composition, objectives, and projected means of attainment. The ultimate goal is to be able to formulate practical recommendations to the Kr8 partnership that can refine or strengthen the Woonactieplan.

2.3 Target audience

The main target group for this research comprises the six housing associations united under the Kr8 partnership and the Huurders Platform Aardbevingen Groningen (HPAG), given their central involvement in creating the Woonactieplan. Importantly, this research is carried out in combination with an internship at Kr8, making the Kr8 associations not only a primary target audience but also the clients who directly benefit from the insights and recommendations generated through this study. In addition, collaborative partners of the housing associations are also important recipients of this research, as they play an important role in the implementation of plans. Lastly, sharing the research with the general public can serve as a means to raise awareness and gather support for earthquake mitigation initiatives in Groningen among a broader public.

2.4 Research questions

The main question that this thesis wants to answer is:

'What strategies could housing associations employ to address both material and immaterial damage and enhance liveability in the earthquake-affected region of Groningen?'

The following sub-questions are explored to support the main research question:

- 1. What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?
- 2. How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act?
- 3. How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?
- 4. How does the earthquake problem in Groningen affect the operations of housing associations, and what perspectives do they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues?
- 5. What earthquake-related liveability challenges do tenants in Groningen encounter and what are their expressed needs and wishes?
- 6. What strategies to enhance liveability are delineated by the Kr8 associations in the Woonactieplan and how do these align with the findings of the survey?
- 7. What is the current status of the Woonactieplan and what is the preferred course of action?

2.5 Research elements

This research distinguishes itself from prior investigations into the Groningen earthquake problem through the integration of three distinct and pivotal elements, as visually represented in **figure 1**. These elements establish the structural framework for this research. First and foremost, it entails the comprehensive gathering of sources that shed light on the impact of earthquakes in Groningen (sphere 1). Secondly, it encompasses the exploration of sources offering insights into the role of housing associations in the Netherlands (sphere 2). The third sphere unites these initial two domains, focusing on management strategies for enhancing liveability. At the intersection of the three spheres lies the core of this research.

The conceptual framework of this research can be found in **figure 2**. The conceptual framework derives from the observed material and immaterial earthquake damages in Groningen, assuming a direct relationship between these damages and the decline in the area's liveability. At the heart of the framework lies the Woonactieplan, devised by six housing associations operating in the earthquake-affected region, with the primary goal of improving liveability. This plan is integral within a larger institutional context, forming part of performance agreements between the municipality, tenants organisations, and housing associations. Further elaboration on each vector will be provided in other sections of this report.



Figure 1: The three pivotal elements of this research (own work)



Figure 2: The conceptual framework (own work)

2.6 Research methods

To comprehensively investigate the role of housing associations in addressing both material and immaterial damage resulting from earthquakes in Groningen, a *mixed-methods approach* is employed. First, a (preliminary) literature review is conducted to achieve a comprehensive grasp of all three spheres for the purpose of their integration. This process specifically addresses the first three sub-questions. Moreover, the literature review aides in the development of a theoretical and conceptual framework, positioning the research within the broader discourse. To address the remaining sub-questions, additional qualitative and quantitative methods are employed.

Within the scope of sub-question 4, a combination of *quantitative* and *qualitative* methods is used to assess how the earthquake problem affects the housing associations in Groningen. First, data from the NCG's dashboard is referenced to explore the impact of the earthquakes on the portfolios of the housing associations. It is important to note that no new statistical analyses will be introduced, and the quantitative approach remains limited in this respect. Secondly, explorative talks are conducted with the directors of the different housing associations to understand the impact of the earthquakes on the operations of housing associations in Groningen and gain insights into the perspectives that they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues. In these explorative talks, the directors are also asked about their views on the challenges for tenants, to lay the groundwork for sub-question 5. A detailed description of how the explorative talks are processed can be found in Chapter 4.

Within the framework of sub-question 5, a primarily *quantitative* approach is employed to assess the earthquake-related liveability challenges experienced by tenants in Groningen, as well as their expressed needs and wishes. This is achieved through the analysis of an existing survey administered to 263 tenants of the various Kr8 associations in May 2023. The survey is designed to investigate what tenants perceive as essential for living safely, comfortably, and proudly in Groningen. Despite the survey being conducted a year ago, its results have not yet been thoroughly processed. Given its relevance to this research endeavour, integrating the dataset seamlessly aligns with the investigative objectives. A detailed description of how the survey data is processed can be found in Chapter 5.

Regarding sub-question 6, a *qualitative* approach will be utilized to analyse and comprehend the Woonactieplan more comprehensively. Initially, a document analysis of the most recent version of the Woonactieplan is undertaken to illuminate its current structure, objectives, and anticipated methods of achievement. Subsequently, an evaluation is undertaken to assess the alignment between the Woonactieplan and the survey outcomes.

As the ultimate objective is to formulate practical recommendations for the Kr8 partnership to refine or strengthen the Woonactieplan, the research's concluding phase revolves around evaluating the current status of the plan and determining the preferred course of action through a focus group. This relates to sub-question 7. The focus group fosters a focused and interactive discussion, encouraging a comprehensive exchange of insights and perspectives among stakeholders. Further details regarding the setup of the focus group can be found in Chapter 6.

A summary of the proposed methods and their purpose can be found in **figure 3**.

Figure 4 provides a visual summary of the proposed method(s) per sub-question.

Approach	Method	Purpose
Qualitative	Literature review	To achieve a comprehensive grasp of all three spheres for the purpose of their integration, to form a robust theoretical framework, and to place the research in the broader discourse.
Qualitative	Explorative talks	To understand the impact of the earthquakes on the operations of housing associations in Groningen and gain insights into the perspectives that they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues. Also get a first impression of the challenges faced by tenants in Groningen.
Quantitative	Data analysis	To explore the impact of the earthquake on the portfolios of the housing associations and to assess what earthquake-related liveability challenges tenants in Groningen encounter and what their expressed needs and wishes are.
Qualitative	Document analysis	To comprehend the Woonactieplan, including its current composition, objectives, and projected means of attainment.
Qualitative	Focus group	To share and validate the research findings with pertinent stakeholders and collectively think about what is next.

Figure 3: Methods and their purpose explained (own work)

Sub-question/method	Literature review	Explorative talks	Data analysis	Document analysis	Focus group
1. What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?	Х				
2. How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act?	х				
3. How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?	Х				
4. How does the earthquake problem in Groningen affect the operations of housing associations, and what perspectives do they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues?		x			
5. What earthquake-related liveability challenges do tenants in Groningen encounter and what are their expressed needs and wishes?			Х		
6. What strategies to enhance liveability are delineated by the Kr8 associations in the Woonactieplan and how do these align with the findings of the survey?				X	
7. What is the current status of the Woonactieplan and what is the preferred course of action?					X

Figure 4: Method used per sub-question (own work)





CHAPTER 3

Literature study



SPHERE 1

Earthquakes in Groningen

3.1 Sphere 1: Earthquakes in Groningen

Guiding the exploration of sphere 1 is sub-question 1: *What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?*. The earthquake problem in Groningen is frequently characterized as a 'creeping crisis', signifying a challenge that has remained dormant for numerous decades. Due to its long-term nature, complexity, and the involvement of numerous stakeholders, it is quite easy to become disoriented. This chapter strives to provide a brief summary of the crisis. Before anything meaningful can be said about the present, one must know about the past. That is why this chapter starts with an exploration of the history of gas extraction in Groningen.

3.1.1 Brief history - natural gas extraction in Groningen

In the northernmost reaches of the Netherlands lies the province of Groningen, sprawling across 2,325 square kilometres and accommodating a population of 596,075 residents (CBS, 2023). In 1959, the discovery of a gas field beneath Slochteren revealed that Groningen lay on top of one of the world's largest gas reserves (Sintubin, 2018). Encompassing about 39% of the province's land area, the Groningen gas field stretches across five municipalities (see figure 5): Eemsdelta, Midden-Groningen, Hoogeland, Groningen and Oldambt (Leidelmeijer & van Kamp, 2003). The gasrich area mainly covers rural landscapes dedicated to agriculture, featuring a network of natural and artificial waterways, such as embankments and raised housing structures known as mounds (van der Voort and Vanclay, 2015).



Figure 5: The Groningen gas field (<u>https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/</u> <u>Groningenveld</u>).

The gas reservoir, located approximately 3 kilometres below the surface, is embedded within porous sandstone. To extract the gas, this sandstone needs to be compressed. Typically, this process is gradual, resulting in slight surface sinking that is inconspicuous and not considered worrisome. However, hindsight has proven otherwise. Throughout the last decade, the Groningen gas has transformed from being a blessing to a curse. Verdoes and Boin (2021) divide the tale of Groningen gas into four distinct chronological phases: an initial incubation period (1959-1986), a phase marked by a gradual increase in precursor events that gathered attention (1986–2012), a significant surge in attention and inclusion on governmental agendas (2012–2018), and a final phase culminating in a comprehensive response - the official decision to close the gas fields (2018 - 2023).

<u> 1959 – 1986</u>

In 1959, the discovery of the Slochteren gas field was an unexpected (economic) blessing for a country still in the process of rebuilding after World War II. Four years later, in 1963, the Dutch State Mines (a state-owned entity operating under the Ministry of Economic Affairs) and the NAM (a joint venture between Shell and ExxonMobil) entered into an agreement to jointly oversee the extraction, transportation, and sale of the gas (OVV, 2015). The NAM received a long-term authorization for gas extraction and was simultaneously tasked with ensuring safety and bearing the consequences of the extraction process. It was in this same year that gas extraction from the Groningen field commenced.

In approximately 1971, the NAM (Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij) commissioned a statement, informing the people of Groningen that the gas extraction from the Groningen field could potentially result in soil subsidence. The announcement reflected a sincere belief that this subsidence wouldn't trigger earthquakes or cause any damage (Scholtens, 2018). However, despite these assurances, the first minor seismic events were experienced by Groningen residents in 1976 (Verdoes & Boin, 2021).

1986 - 2012

In December 1986, an earthquake with a magnitude of 2.8 struck in the vicinity of a small gas field in Assen (Drenthe). This seismic event had sufficient strength to be registered by the sensors of the KNMI in Utrecht, situated approximately 150 kilometres away (Kester, 2017). Over the subsequent years, an increasing number of earthquakes were recorded, sparking concerns

among both Groningen residents and members of the parliament. In 1991, the Minister of Economic Affairs initiated a comprehensive investigation involving various disciplines to explore the possible link between these earthquakes and natural gas extraction. After two years, the investigative committee unveiled its results, marking the initial acknowledgment of the potential for gas extraction to cause earthquakes. However, the report indicated that these earthquakes were not expected to exceed a magnitude of 3.3 and, therefore, were not deemed a significant cause for concern (OVV, 2015).

In 2006, an earthquake with a magnitude of 3.5 hit the Groningen villages of Westeremden and Middelstum. This event led to a further decline in the trust of local residents in the NAM. In response, an advocacy group - the Groninger Ground Movement (Groninger Bodem Beweging or GBB) – was established in 2009 (OVV, 2015). Up until this point, national newspapers had shown little interest in the risks associated with gas extraction. All this changed in 2012, which delivered a so-called trigger event.

2012 - 2018

On August 16, 2012, the village of Huizinge was struck by an earthquake with a magnitude of 3.6. To date, this earthquake remains the most forceful and persistent to have impacted the province of Groningen. Although an earthquake of this magnitude might appear relatively mild, the existing soil conditions and the shallow depth at which the earthquakes occur, can result in significant property damage (Jansen et al., 2017).

Following the earthquake in Huizinge, the SodM launched an investigation. This study confirmed an increase in the frequency and intensity of earthquakes, directly linked to gas extraction. Importantly, the study also determined that it was impossible to predict the maximum magnitude of future earthquakes (SodM, 2013).

In January 2013, the KNMI affirmed the results of the SodM study (OVV, 2015). The report gathered significant media attention and brought the issue of gas extraction-related earthquakes to the forefront of the national political agenda (Schmidt et al., 2018). In the wake of the report, the SodM advised the Minister of Economic Affairs to swiftly decrease gas extraction in order to minimize the potential for more frequent and more intense earthquakes (OVV, 2015). Instead, a record amount of gas – 53,26 billion NM3 - was pumped from the ground in 2013 (see **figure 6**). This surge was influenced by the economic downturn, as Groningen gas served as a crucial revenue source for the Dutch government. In total, the income for the State from gas extraction from the Groningen field amounts to approximately 363 billion (Provincie Groningen, 2023a).

The foregoing led to substantial public backlash. Environmental groups, concerned citizens, and various advocacy organizations strongly criticized the close relationship between gas production companies and the Dutch state (Schmidt et al., 2018). They raised concerns about whether these entities could be relied upon to prioritize the safety of local residents over their financial interests in ongoing gas production.



^{*}A gas year runs from October 1 to September 30 Figure 6: Gas extraction in the Groningen field (NLOG, 2023).

2018 - 2024

In January 2018, after an earthquake with a magnitude of M3.4 struck the village of Zeerijp, the message was clear (see figure 7). The Minister of Economic Affairs decided, finally, that the extraction of gas would have to be terminated to ensure the safety of the region (Tweede Kamer, 2017-2018). Since then, a political battle has ensued, with ongoing efforts to shut off the gas supply. In March 2018, the government announced its intention to cease gas extraction for the first time. Initially, there was a plan for a 12-year transition period - until 2030 - to ensure sufficient availability of cheap gas during harsh winters (NOS, 2023). Under pressure from the people of Groningen, that date was moved forward to 2022. However, this date was not met due to the eruption of the war in Ukraine. In June 2023, it was announced that the gas tap would close on October 1, 2023. However, the same announcement included the caveat that the gas wells would remain operational until October 1, 2024. It wasn't until April 2024 that the milestone awaited by the people of Groningen arrived. On April 16, the Senate voted in favour of permanently closing the gas tap in Groningen (Drent & Braakman, 2024).

The definitive closure of the gas tap in 2024 marks the commencement of a new chapter in the earthquake file. After years of dedicated efforts primarily aimed at getting the gas tap closed, the post-closure phase can now begin. While this development brings hope and relief, many professionals warn that the mere closure of the gas supply does not bring an end to the challenges that continue to afflict the people of Groningen.

First of all because experts predict that earthquakes will still occur in the province of Groningen for years

to come. Various sections within the earthquake-prone region experience varying degrees of impact (van der Voort and Vanclay 2015). The south of the Groningen field is especially vulnerable. In 2017, the KNMI (Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute) determined that the seismic threat had decreased by up to 0.05g in the northern part of Groningen, while it had increased by a maximum of 0.05g in the southern part. **Figure 8** illustrates the seismic hazard map for the province, indicating these patterns.



Figure 8: Seismic hazard map Groningen (KNMI, 2017)

Secondly, because Groningen faces a significant challenge in terms of reconstruction.



Figure 7: Number of earthquakes in the Groningen field and their magnitude (KNMI, 2023)

3.1.2 Material damage

The gas extraction activities and accompanied tremors have led to extensive damage in the housing sector (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). The vulnerability of Groningen's buildings to damage arises from a trifecta of factors: the shallow depth of earthquake occurrences, the unique composition of the ground, and the absence of earthquake-resistant construction measures (Jansen, 2019). The damage extends beyond occasional cracks in walls and floors. Entire buildings are progressively deteriorating due to a complex interplay of factors (Sintubin, 2018). Each minor earthquake exacerbates the sinking of houses and widens existing cracks in the walls. As a result, the people of Groningen perceive the ongoing decay of their built environment as a 'disaster in slow-motion'.

In the earthquake response framework, a clear distinction is drawn between damage requiring repairsuch as visually disruptive cracks-and structures needing (preventive) reinforcement due to foundational issues that could pose genuine safety risks or lead to ongoing damage. Damage repair is managed by the Instituut Mijnbouwschade Groningen (IMG), while reinforcement is managed by the Nationaal Coördinator Groningen (NCG). It is important to realize that the damage area is much larger than the reinforcement area. For example, the damage area also includes parts of the city of Groningen and the northern tip of Drenthe, while the reinforcement area is truly located in the 'core' of the earthquake-affected area, around the villages where the strongest earthquakes have occurred. Often, a home that needs to be reinforced also has damage that needs to be repaired. In that case, the IMG and the NCG collaboratively manage the project. To offer insight into the scope of the challenge confronting both organizations, the following figures are extracted from their respective online dashboards.

According to the IMG dashboard, the total number of damage reports as of February 2024 was 408,798. Within the IMG, a distinction is made between different types of damage for which compensation can be obtained. There is physical damage, loss of value, immaterial damage, and acute unsafe situations. Physical damage accounts for the largest domain, with 218,212 reports as of February 2024. Of the total number of damage reports received by the IMG, 390,038 have already been processed. Over 18,000 reports still need to be processed (IMG, 2024).

The task for the NCG is considerably smaller. In November 2023, the NCG reported that 27,455 addresses require reinforcement (NCG, 2023). The NCG refers to addresses rather than buildings, because multiple households or businesses can reside in one building; this means multiple addresses in one building. Think, for example, of an apartment complex or a commercial building. The numbers therefore represent the number of addresses. Completion of the reinforcement task is not expected before 2028 (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). **Figure 9** illustrates the status of the 27,455 addresses in the reinforcement process from November 2023. According to the figure, 11,451 addresses meet the safety standard, accounting for 41.7% of all the 27,455 addresses requiring reinforcement.

It is important to emphasize that this thesis is solely dedicated to the reinforcement endeavour. This choice is informed by the thesis's examination of the earthquake problem in Groningen from the perspective of housing associations. While these associations do not administer compensation for damages, they do assume an active role in the reinforcement process. Furthermore, reinforcement has a significantly higher impact on liveability compared to damage repair, thereby accentuating the criticality of addressing this facet.



Figure 9: Current state of the reinforcement process (NCG, November 2023)

3.1.3 Immaterial damage

The preceding section has provided insight into the extent of material damage caused by earthquakes. However, it's essential to recognize that the impact extends beyond material losses. Numerous studies have highlighted the profound effect of earthquakes on the residents of Groningen. This is due, in part, to the deep emotional attachment individuals often have to their homes, leading to significant distress when these homes are damaged or destroyed (Jansen, 2019). Additionally, the failure of both responsible private and public entities to act swiftly and effectively has also caused considerable suffering among affected individuals (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). Many individuals are reported to be experiencing a decreased quality of life, heightened anxiety, feelings of insecurity, and disruptions to their daily lives as a consequence of the earthquakes (Kr8, 2020). According to van der Voort and Vanclay (2015), significant stressors include property damage, declining housing prices, vulnerable dykes, feelings of insecurity, health issues, distrust, and resentment. Moreover, the earthquakes have affected residents' 'sense of belonging'. This last aspect encompasses both how citizens perceive the liveability of their surroundings and the environmental conditions in which they live (Macke, 2022).

Perhaps the most comprehensive research into the psychosocial impact of gas extraction on residents of the province of Groningen is the study 'Gronings Perspectief' (Groningen perspective). This study examines both damage compensation and reinforcement efforts. Led by Prof. Dr. T.T. (Tom) Postmes, the research has been conducted by the University of Groningen since 2016. The research is structured into different phases. Results from Phase I (2016 - 2017), Phase II (2018 – 2020), and Phase III (2021 – 2022) have already been published in report format. Phase IV began in 2023 and will continue until 2026. The initial results from this phase were published in April 2024. The research utilizes a variety of methods, including questionnaires, interviews, data linkage, and group discussions, engaging both residents and professionals in the region. The questionnaire is distributed at least twice a year to the 'Groninger Panel' managed by the Sociaal Planbureau Groningen (Groningen Social Planning Bureau). This panel comprises 7,000 individuals who provide a representative cross-section of the province's residents. It yields tangible findings that can inform policy and actions. Key questions addressed in the research include: How do residents'

perceptions of safety, trust, health, and future prospects evolve within and beyond the gas extraction area? What factors contribute to residents' vulnerability regarding gas extraction issues? And what opportunities exist to enhance policy and implementation?

The three reports paint an impressive picture. The final report of Phase I revealed that in the period 2016 -2017, 410,000 residents of Groningen lived in postcode areas where earthquake damage had been recognized by the NAM/CVW. At that point in time, 68,343 adults had already experienced multiple damages to their homes. If children were included, approximately 85,000 people were affected. What made this number even more shocking was that it was revealed that multiple damages, in particular, posed an increased risk of stress-related health issues. According to the report, residents with multiple damages experienced increased work absenteeism and a higher likelihood of burnout. Additionally, they reported a decline in social and physical functioning. Residents with damages felt increasingly hopeless, progressively angry, and increasingly powerless. Distrust towards authorities was high (Postmes et al., 2018).

The final report of Phase II (2018 - 2020) began with some positive findings. Since mid-2019, there had been an increase in positive emotions, such as hope and feelings of control. However, this improved mood was mainly observed in people with single damages. Fortunately, there was also good news for people with multiple damages; their health gap decreased. Unfortunately, there were also some worrying developments to observe. In three out of the four neighbourhoods and villages examined, social cohesion had decreased. This decline appeared to be partly associated with the burden (and sometimes conflict) posed by the reinforcement for many residents. Another notable finding was that people involved in the reinforcement operation often felt less safe, especially during planning and implementation, compared to residents whose homes were not being reinforced but who were otherwise in a similar situation. One possible reason was that residents became more aware of risks through the reinforcement process. Another possible explanation was that the reinforcement operation was an additional burden that caused stress and increased uncertainty for residents (Stroebe et al., 2021).

The conclusion of Phase III (2021 – 2022) emphasized that residents were mainly affected by procedures, uncertainty, and waiting. Additionally, moving was

THÍS OLD HOUSE MAS BUILT ON DREAMS ON DREAMS HICH BECAME NGHTMARES

1



highlighted as being burdensome and unpleasant. Regarding reinforcement, it became evident that it impacts the interactions between people. Although occasional positive effects were mentioned (addressing problems together), the issue of gas extraction did not contribute positively to the atmosphere in villages. The reinforcement task resulted in negative comparisons between residents (jealousy, envy, dissatisfaction, prioritizing other situations, questioning why one house was affected and another was not, loud voices receiving priority), tensions, and even aggression and conflicts. While in the interviews conducted in 2016 (mainly about damage procedures) a lot of solidarity with other residents was observed, tensions and conflicts were reported more frequently in this latest version. The inequality felt is significant (Dückers et al., 2023).

The research conducted by Gronings Perspectief highlights the challenges individuals face in addressing the earthquake problem. In a study conducted by Jansen et al. (2017), various coping strategies adopted by residents in the earthquake-affected areas are explored. Coping, in this context, pertains to how people manage stress in their lives. For instance, when it comes to earthquakes, one strategy could involve considering relocation or moving. Other coping mechanisms include accepting the circumstances, assigning blame or passively waiting in uncertainty and powerlessness (Stroebe et al., 2021). The choice of coping strategy depends on several factors, including the specific situation, individual characteristics, and how a person perceives the earthquake risk. In the case of Groningen, a diverse range of coping strategies is observed, with a noteworthy number of residents opting to remain in the area. The people of Groningen exhibit resilience and determination, which can be attributed, in part, to the significant proportion of elderly residents who are deeply attached to their neighbourhood (Jansen et al., 2017).

3.1.4 Parties involved

The preceding sections shed light on the evolution of the narrative surrounding natural gas extraction in Groningen. It has transitioned from being viewed as a success to a complex issue that has adversely affected not only the built structures, but also the people of Groningen. Investigative journalists Heleen Ekker and Reinalda Start of NOS have dedicated the past 10 years of their careers to scrutinizing the so-called 'earthquake file'. They acknowledge that their investigative efforts have seldom been met with such profound uncertainty.

In their podcast 'Gronings gas: gewonnen of verloren' (Groningen gas: won or lost?) about secret agreements between the government and multinationals about their cooperation, desperate victims and frustrated researchers, they try to provide clarity. From the various episodes, it becomes obvious that the long duration and the many parties and agencies involved make it a complex file in which it is easy to lose overview.

Many parties share the same experience. In the year 2020, the Groninger Gasberaad, a coalition of social organizations operating in the earthquake-affected region, issued a critical report titled 'Boudel op Rieg.' This report pointed out a significant absence of centralized control: *"It is unclear what decisions are made where, by whom and on what basis. There is no coherence, no coordination, no transparency, unclear governance and blurry decision-making lines. But many different actors are involved, adding to the complexity"* (Top et al., 2020). To visualize the complexity of the situation, the Groninger Gasberaad created a stakeholder map (see figure 10).

The <u>NAM</u>, depicted in grey, is a key figure in the earthquake file. In 1963, the Dutch State Mines (a state enterprise overseen by the Ministry of Economic Affairs) and the NAM (a partnership between Shell and ExxonMobil) entered an agreement to coordinate gas extraction, transportation, and sales. This accord granted the NAM a lasting concession for gas extraction and made it responsible for safety and liable for extraction-related consequences. To this day, NAM continues to bear the same responsibility. The state's engagement in the earthquake file is also significantly comprehensive. Each decision ever made in gas extraction required the endorsement of both the state and the two oil companies, known collectively as 'Het <u>Gasgebouw</u>'. In sum, it is believed that a group of fewer than 10 individuals collectively made all decisions (Ekker & Start, 2022a).

In sharp contrast to this limited number, a multitude of parties are engaged in the realm of claims management and recovery. The vast majority of the stakeholders shown in the map are advocacy organizations, advisory bodies, consultation/collaboration bodies, implementation organizations and research & education organizations (Top et al., 2020). Over time, a substantial bureaucracy has emerged in connection with the earthquake file. The initiatives, damage protocols, regulations, and institutions aimed at managing and expediting damage resolution have



Figure 10: Authorities involved in the (consequences of) gas extraction (Top et al., 2020)

been swiftly evolving one after another. In response to ongoing issues with claims handling, an initiative was launched in 2014 to transfer the responsibility of claims handling from the NAM. Initially, this task was entrusted to the specially established implementing organization 'Centrum Veilia Wonen' (CVW) (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). However, before the CVW could even get properly started, criticism emerged regarding the organization's independence. It was noted that Arcadis, a major shareholder of the CVW, had strong ties to the NAM (Klijnstra, 2019).

Following the earthquake near Huizinge in 2012, which exposed the potential for earthquakes to cause significant damage and pose safety risks to residents, the need for preventive reinforcement became a focal point of action. Initially, this responsibility was also

entrusted to the CVW. However, in 2015, it was decided that a separate organization should be established for this purpose. This resulted in the establishment of the 'Nationaal Coördinator Groningen' (NCG). The NCG was tasked with the reinforcement operation, while claims handling continued to be managed by the CVW (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023).

Over the years, the CVW came under scrutiny multiple times. The CVW was accused of being focused on minimizing compensation for damages caused by gas extraction. After the earthquake in Zeerijp in January 2018, Wiebes decided to establish the 'Tijdelijke Commissie Mijnbouwschade Groningen' (TCMG) to transfer the handling of damages from the CVW to the government (Klijnstra, 2019). The TCMG later transitioned into the 'Instituut Mijnbouwschade Groningen' (Institute for Mining Damage Groningen) (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). To this day, the NCG bears responsibility for the reinforcement operation while the IMG is responsible for the claims handling.

The bureaucracy, paperwork and the fact that claim reporters often feel treated with distrust lead to ambiguity, uncertainty and frustration among residents. Reports suggest that in some cases, the most annoying thing is not the damage to the house itself, but the bureaucratic hassle it entails (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). People often face the distressing reality of waiting for years for damage assessments and repairs. Unfortunately, during this extended waiting period, new damages frequently occur. Some residents are so discouraged that they no longer report the damages they experience. As one resident expressed, "It feels like an endless cycle of ongoing damage, making it difficult to determine where to even start with repairs, especially when the foundation is compromised, and new damage continues to accrue. The entire process gets mired in years of bureaucratic disputes and conflicting assessments" (Kolthof, 2019). The enduring disagreements have severely shaken the faith of Groningen's residents in the government and other involved instances.

3.1.5 Parliamentary Inquiry

When the state's credibility was on the line, it became evident in The Hague that the situation was intensifying and demanded a governmental reaction. As per the findings of Schmidt et al. (2018), when a policy sector experiences a significant and rapid decrease in its legitimacy, it is referred to as an institutional crisis. On March 3, 2015, Esther Ouwehand of the PvdD initiated a motion calling for a parliamentary inquiry into natural gas extraction in Groningen. A parliamentary inquiry is the most powerful tool at the disposal of the House of Representatives when it comes to thoroughly investigating a specific issue (Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023b). Despite initial deferrals, the motion was eventually declined by the House of Representatives in February 2017 (FluxEnergie, 2017).

Prompted by the severe earthquake in Zeerijp in 2018, Tom van der Lee (GL) and Henk Nijboer (PvdA) took up the cause once more. Their motion for a parliamentary inquiry into gas extraction in Groningen received unanimous approval from the House of Representatives in March, 2019 (NOS, 2019). Following the required committee. In addition, the government introduced the

preparations, the inquiry committee was formally established and commenced its work in February 2021.

For this inquiry, the investigative committee requested documents from 50 diverse stakeholders and individuals, crucial in shaping the decisions taken. They received a total of 631,500 digital documents and 10 meters' worth of physical records. Through 69 public hearings and 126 private discussions, the committee extensively consulted representatives from governmental bodies, oil companies, and various societal groups, delving into their perspectives. Furthermore, they directly engaged with affected individuals, gathering insights into their personal experiences (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023). After two years of extensive investigations, the parliamentary committee tasked with investigating natural gas extraction in Groningen released its final report, titled 'Groningers Above Gas,' in February 2023 (Provincie Groningen, 2023a). The main conclusion of the report read that "the people of Groningen have consistently been overlooked in the process of natural gas extraction, leading to severe and *harmful consequences for them"* (Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023a).

April 2023, the committee conducted In а comprehensive presentation of their findings during a two-day debate held in the House of Representatives. This debate served as a platform for the committee to share their discoveries, insights, and conclusions regarding the natural gas extraction in Groningen. Following the debate, the House of Representatives took a significant step by approving a motion that explicitly supported the committee's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations (Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023a). Subsequently, the House of Representatives also requested a response from the government. The government's response to the committee's findings was delivered in Groningen on Tuesday, April 25.

In this response, the government issued a sincere apology to all victims who have suffered from physical, mental, and social harm, as well as feelings of fear, stress, and insecurity due to gas extraction and the management of its consequences (Tweede Kamer, 2022 2023). To address these grievances, the government _ initiated a comprehensive plan titled 'Nij Begun' (Gronings for New Beginning) comprising 50 specific measures that align with the recommendations of the

'Tijdelijke Wet Groningen' (TWG), a law establishing the reinforcement task as a public responsibility. This law, which took effect on July 1st, 2023, also aimed to provide residents with more clarity on the reinforcement process and their own role in it. Together, these measures aim to make the processes of repairing damage and implementing reinforcement more empathetic, accessible, and humane for those affected. Lastly, the government called upon the Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij (NAM) to assume responsibility. To ensure compliance, the government has mandated by law that NAM must deliver yearly progress reports on the situation in the Groningen region, complemented by regional discussions held every six months (Tweede Kamer, 2022 – 2023).

The parliamentary inquiry was officially concluded with a two-day debate in the House of Representatives in June 2023. During this final debate, Members of Parliament engaged in discussions with Prime Minister Mark Rutte and State Secretary for Mining Hans Vijlbrief (Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023a).

3.1.6 The commencement of the post-closure phase

The final report of the parliamentary inquiry signifies a significant step in recognizing the often-neglected concerns of the Groninger's, who have too long been overshadowed by financial considerations. Together with the closure of the gas tap, 2024 appears to mark the beginning of a new phase in the earthquake file: the post-closure phase. While the recent developments offer hope, it is crucial to recognize that they represent only the initial steps in a broader journey toward comprehensively resolving the ongoing crisis. As the Gasberaad wisely emphasizes in their report 'Boudel op Rieg', *"acknowledging the issues is one thing; outlining a clear vision for how things should be is an entirely different challenge"*(Top et al., 2020).

In a masterclass on the social impact of gas extraction in Groningen (2022), N. Busscher and S. Hupkes speak about three distinct aspects of recovery: material, procedural and relational recovery. All three must be included in the development of future policy. Busscher & Hupkes (2022) state *"policy decisions have frequently prioritized technical expertise, while aspects related to residents' experiences, their impact on health, and their implications for trust, have been inadequately incorporated into policy development". Perhaps, this may not be due to unwillingness, but rather a challenge of implementation. After all, how can one effectively address procedural and relational recovery?*

According to the report by Dückers et al., (2023), the solution must be sought in engaging with people, having conversations from start to finish (at the kitchen table), involving people, personal contact, being honest about what you know and don't know, setting realistic expectations, and keeping promises.

3.1.7 Initiatives

The question of what steps to take from this point onward is currently a prominent topic of discussion and consideration. In recent years, several initiatives have emerged:

In 2019, the 'Nationaal Programma Groningen' (NPG) was established, a partnership between the government, province and municipalities that is intended to offer future perspective to the region again. In total, 1.15 billion euros have been made available for the NPG (Busscher & Hupkes, 2022). The partnership makes connections between ideas, parties and money (Nationaal Programma Groningen, n.d.). Every year, the NPG reports on the progress of projects and the expenditure of resources in the form of an annual report. In addition, their program is evaluated annually by an independent party: a partnership of E&E advies, Sociaal Planbureau Groningen and Aletta Advies (Nationaal Programma Groningen, n.d.). The program will continue until 2030. 'Toukomst' (Gronings for future) is a part of the NPG program designed to solicit ideas from residents to chart a forward path for Groningen. Over 900 innovative concepts were put forth, leading to the development of 59 well-defined 'Toukomst' projects distributed across diverse categories such as 'tourism, culture, and heritage,' 'family, sports, and health,' 'education and training,' and 'energy and sustainability.' Of the total budget of €1.15 million, nearly €100 million have been allocated for the realization of these projects (Nationaal Programma Groningen, n.d.).

In response to the parliamentary inquiry, the government has initiated the drafting of a comprehensive policy framework for the Groningen region, including North Drenthe, for the next three decades, as outlined in the Nij Begun chamber letter of April 2023 (Bureau PAU & Hajema Communicatie, 2023). This is a separate program, independent of the NPG. The framework delineates four key pillars: the Economic Agenda, the Social Agenda, a Recovery Agenda for Groningen (focused on damage recovery and reinforcement), and a Sustainability Agenda. The intention is for residents, social organizations, schools, knowledge institutions, housing associations, the Public Health Service (GGD), businesses, etc., to form a 'broad coalition'. Together, they must work on a number of concrete objectives, such as improving liveability, educational quality, and poverty reduction (Drent, 2023). For the agendas, an amount of €100 million euros will be made available each year from 2026 to 2055. For the program's initiation, municipalities will receive a one-time allocation of €250 million in both 2024 and 2025 (totalling €500 million). This funding is provided because the agendas are still in the development phase. While completion is anticipated before 2026, there remains a necessity for supporting promising initiatives in the interim (Bureau PAU & Hajema Communicatie, 2023). Overall, the government has earmarked €3.5 billion euros for Groningen over the next thirty years (RTV Noord, 2023).

In November 2023, Henk Nijboer was appointed as the 'Kwartiermaker' (initiator) to develop the Social Agenda. His role involves assessing existing elements and identifying remaining needs, while also ensuring coherence among the various agendas and the NPG (Provincie Groningen, 2023b). Another individual assigned a key role in planning for Groningen's future is Enno Zuidema. Since September 1, 2023, he assumes the position of 'Regiobouwmeester' in the earthquakeaffected area (a local alternative to the national 'Rijksbouwmeester'). Both provide advisory opinions on architecture and the urban environment, whether solicited or unsolicited, and maintain an independent position (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken, n.d.). Within the reconstruction task, Enno Zuidema will guard the spatial quality and the preservation of Groningen's identity. Naturally, he engages residents, architects, contractors, municipalities, and the province in this collaborative endeavour (Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Klimaat, 2023b).

In addition to these government initiatives, various other organizations share profound concerns about Groningen's future. In April 2023, over thirty social organizations, educational institutions, and entrepreneurs put forward their joint vision in a report titled 'Plan voor de Groningers' (Plan for the Groningen Residents). It is essential to note that this isn't an allencompassing strategy; rather, it places its primary emphasis on the physical infrastructure and the immediate living conditions of Groningen's residents and business owners (Kr8 et al., 2023). Whether or not money has been allocated for this plan is unclear. The government is, however, allocating 395 million euros to double the N33 between Zuidbroek and the Eemshaven

and 85 million euros to extend the railway line to Stadskanaal. This will enable the train to continue from Veendam to Stadskanaal (Drent, 2023). The region has been requesting both investments for years.

In summary, Groningen is set to receive a substantial amount of money over the next thirty years. While there are numerous parties interested in accessing these funds, there is a lack of comprehensive plans to ensure their effective and fair distribution. Given the complexity of interests involved, the key challenge lies in coordinating these resources, avoiding duplication, and ensuring the feasibility of plans made by the different stakeholders. The hope is that the agendas can contribute to achieving these goals. Although housing associations may not receive as much attention, it is essential to highlight their significance, as they own approximately 30% of the homes requiring reinforcement (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023).

3.1.8 Conclusion

This part of the literature review focused on the exploration of sphere 1 and the connected subquestion: *What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?*. The initial insights can be summarized as follows.

The recent parliamentary inquiry into gas extraction in Groningen has brought recognition of the issues faced by Groningen residents. From the final report, it becomes clear that 60 years of natural gas extraction have not only led to material, but also immaterial damage. People have suffered greatly from the stress caused by the earthquake damage and its poor handling. The extensive amount of material and immaterial damage has caused a decline in liveability.

The closure of the gas tap in 2024 marks the beginning of the post-closure phase, where various stakeholders, including housing associations, are working to provide support and chart a future path for the region. Future policy should focus on three different areas of recovery: material recovery, procedural recovery and relational recovery.



SPHERE 2

Role of housing associations in NL

3.2 Sphere 2: Role of housing associations in the Netherlands

Guiding the exploration of sphere 2 is sub-question 2: How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act? In the Netherlands, housing associations are tasked with providing 'social housing'. This term relates to dwellings with a rent cap, known as the liberalization limit, making them affordable for households with limited financial resources (Rijksoverheid, n.d.-b). While initially confined to this role, housing associations' responsibilities have evolved over time, only to later undergo reductions. Although this chapter doesn't aim to offer a comprehensive historical account, understanding the historical background of the housing association system in the Netherlands is essential for providing context to recent legislative changes and grasping the evolving role of housing associations.

3.2.1 Brief history - social housing in the Netherlands

In the 19th and early 20th century, many Dutch people lived in appalling conditions. Not only in the city, but also in the countryside (Beekers, 2012). When the economic crisis hit in 1880, the countryside was the worst affected. Thousands of people moved to the urban areas in the hope of earning a living. Without clear regulations, thousands of homes were built at a rapid pace, often of poor quality. The dirt, the stench and the overcrowding in the city are visually described by historian Auke van der Woud in his book 'Koninkrijk vol sloppen' (Van Der Woud, 2010). Due to a lack of fresh air and light, many residents of these neighbourhoods suffered from diseases such as cholera and typhoid.

At the time, the government did not see it as its duty to intervene. Within the upper classes, however, the realisation began to dawn that improving the living conditions of workers could reduce slums and related problems. In 1851, a number of socially minded wealthy inhabitants of Amsterdam appealed to prominent fellow citizens to contribute money for a yet to be established 'Vereeniging ten behoeven der Arbeidersklasse te Amsterdam' (VAK) (Beekers, 2012). At the inaugural meeting on February 21, 1852, it was decided that the prime objective was to 'acquire and build properties that would provide workers and their families with a good and healthy place to live at a low rent' (Oprichting eerste woningbouwvereniging, 2020).

This initiative set the precedent for the first housing associations in the Netherlands. Over the years, more housing associations followed, spread across the

Netherlands. Not only the wealthy citizens took the initiative; working-class citizens also increasingly joined forces to set up their own associations.

<u>The 1901 Housing Act</u>

With the introduction of the Housing Act of 1901, the initiatives gained a legal framework and with it, the possibility of government support. The Housing Act is therefore often seen as the mainstay of housing association work. However, the government support came accompanied by a system of close surveillance and check. The law left little room for the nineteenth-century associations of wealthy citizens and workers. These associations were overshadowed and died a silent death. Instead, a new, semi-public sector emerged. This was the beginning of a process of state-ification: associations came 'in line with the state' and their social autonomy and vitality were severely curtailed (Beekers, 2010).

Government control

After the Second World War, the state-ification process reached a peak. The enormous housing shortage prompted the government to intervene on a large scale. In doing so, the government included housing associations. However, these associations were hardly involved in the development of construction plans and only 'received' the homes built by the government at a late stage. The associations became merely the implementers of government housing policy; financially and administratively, the associations were no longer free (Beekers, 2010).

From the 1960s onwards, the distance between the associations and residents became even bigger. The primary focus of housing associations was on the realization, rental, and maintenance of housing. Tenants were increasingly regarded as 'housing consumers', at most a discussion partner, not the bearer of the association's work (Beekers, 2010). The debate about the organisational form of housing associations played on in the 1970s, at the time of democratisation (Beekers, 2010). Housing associations had a growing desire for the government to take a step back.

Changing dynamics

In the 1980's, the government subsidies subsided and installed remote supervision. As a result, housing associations gradually gained more independence (Hoekstra, 2017). While this shift was generally viewed as a positive development, it also brought challenges. Not all housing associations could achieve financial
self-sufficiency, and as a result, an average of ten associations merged or ceased to exist daily between 1980 and 2000 (Hakfoort et al., 2002).

Amid fewer restrictions and heightened autonomy, the housing associations that did manage to survive found themselves with the freedom to explore diverse opportunities during the 1990's, as long as they operated within the domain of public housing (Ten Holter Noordam, 2022). In 1992, a set of so-called 'performance fields' was established by the government to definitively resolve any uncertainties regarding the roles and responsibilities of housing associations. Housing associations were mandated to concentrate their efforts on the following aspects:

- Quality of housing;
- · Rental of homes;
- Consultation with tenants; and
- Ensure financial continuity, whereby supervision of implementation by the government (then mainly the municipalities) was retrospective and remote.

(Ten Holter Noordam, 2022).

At this point in time, the concept of liveability was not yet part of the responsibilities of housing associations. It was only with the enactment of the 'Bruteringswet' in 1996, which signified the peak of financial autonomy for the associations, that conversations about this subject began to gather momentum (Hoekstra, 2017). Since this act involved social funds, there was a requirement for a social return, which not only led to extensive debates but also triggered an investigation by the House of Representatives. These developments resulted in the addition of 'liveability' as a new performance field in 1997 (Ten Holter Noordam, 2022).

The addition of liveability as a performance field marked a substantial transformation in the role of housing associations in the Netherlands, shifting their focus from primarily ensuring housing quality to improving the overall quality of life within entire neighbourhoods (Ten Holter Noordam, 2022). The problem, however, was that the concept of liveability lacked a clear definition, which hindered its effective implementation.

Problems in the housing association sector

The marketization and neo liberalization of the Dutch social rental sector became evident in the substantial rise in the salaries of directors at social rental housing providers, which sparked public outrage (Hoekstra,

2017). Moreover, several instances of mismanagement and fraudulent activities came to light between 2009 and 2012 (Ten Holter Noordam, 2022). The most prominent and widely recognized of these cases is the Vestia scandal. This housing association, the largest in the Netherlands at the time, overseeing 80,000 dwellings, incurred losses of approximately 2 billion euros due to reckless speculation with financial products (Van Gent & Hochstenbach, 2020). Other housing associations like Woonbron, Servatius, Rochdale, De Kleine Meierij, and SGBB also faced financial problems (Den Boer, 2023). Inadequate government supervision was suspected as a significant factor contributing to these problems. In addition, it was determined that the definition of liveability was too vague and broad, leading to problems with its implementation. The situation sparked a social debate about housing associations, highlighting the need to reevaluate the balance between government oversight, professional services, and market forces.

In light of this debate, the so-called 'landlord levy' was introduced: a taxation measure designed to raise funds for the Dutch government by taxing housing associations based on the value of their social rental properties. The levy was first imposed in 2013. Where initially the thought was that this was a temporary measure, it quickly became apparent that the levy was included in the national budget as a structural source of income (Companen & Thésor, 2020). Critics of the landlord levy argued that it would weaken the financial position of housing associations, thus limiting their ability to invest in new construction, renovation, and maintenance of social rental properties. This, in turn, could lead to a deterioration in the quality and availability of social rental housing.

3.2.2 Parliamentary inquiry

In 2012, the CDA took the initiative to request an investigation into the design and functioning of the housing association system in the Netherlands. Following the required preparations, the inquiry committee was formally established and commenced its work in April of 2013.

In October 2014, the final report, entitled: 'Ver van huis' (far from home), was presented to the chairman of the House of Representatives. The findings were strongly critical, suggesting that the preceding years' incidents could indeed be linked to a system that was not functioning adequately. In the words of the committee, *"the housing association system has significantly strayed from its original purpose and requires a substantial overhaul."* (Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2014). Within their report, the committee detailed a multitude of issues, pinpointed their root causes, and put forward several recommendations aimed at strengthening the system. The recommendations are listed in the list below. The most important ones are in bold:

- 1. Achieving a cultural shift
- 2. Back to the core task: limiting (ancillary) activities
- 3. Limiting the scope of work
- 4. Limiting the scale
- 5. Central framework, locally binding agreements
- 6. Increasing municipal influence: enhancing democratic legitimacy
- 7. Strengthening the position of tenants: increasing social legitimacy
- 8. Independent and integrated external government oversight by the Housing Authority
- 9. Strengthening and professionalizing internal oversight
- 10. More balanced housing association governance
- 11. Strengthening the role of the auditor
- 12. Increasing auditability and transparency
- 13. More incentives in the safeguard system
- 14. Expanding financing options and duty of care
- 15. Restructuring the safeguard system
- 16. WSW as the guardian of the safeguard
- 17. Integrity: tackling fraud and self-enrichment firmly
- 18. Experimenting with alternatives for housing associations

(Tweede Kamer, 2014 - 2015).

3.2.3 Revision of the Housing Act in 2015

A year after the publication of the final report, the recommendations of the Parliamentary Inquiry into Housing Associations were taken into account in the major revision of the Housing Act that came into effect on July 1, 2015. The amendments were made in the Housing Act as well as the underlying 'Besluit Toegelaten Instellingen Volkshuisvesting' (Btiv) and the 'Regeling Toegelaten Instellingen Volkshuisvesting' (Rtiv) (Den Boer, 2023).

The primary goal of the revision was to achieve a cultural shift and refocus housing associations on their core task: constructing and managing rental properties for people with lower incomes (Bres advocaten, 2015). Simultaneously, this suggested constraints on supplementary activities. Themes like liveability ceased to be considered a responsibility of housing associations. To realign the focus of housing

associations with their core mission, a maximum investment limit for liveability was implemented, capped at 100 euros per dwelling per year.

The revised Housing Act furthermore highlighted significant distinctions. One notable change included the creation of a Housing Association Authority (AW) tasked with sector oversight. The AW has a primary mission of guaranteeing that housing associations are committed to providing decent and affordable housing for people with limited incomes (Rijksoverheid, n.d. -a). To achieve this, the AW exercises oversight over the conduct and financial operations of housing associations. It has the authority to impose sanctions on these associations, including fines or the appointment of a supervisor, in cases where it deems necessary. The AW issues regular reports on the financial state of the housing sector as a whole (Rijksoverheid, n.d. -a). Another significant change involved bolstering the influence of municipalities and strengthening tenants' rights. This was achieved through the creation of what is commonly referred to as the 'local triangle,' a collaborative effort between municipalities, housing associations, tenant organisations (see figure 11) (Van Gent & Hochstenbach, 2020). This local triangle serves as a foundational element for achieving positive public housing outcomes at a local or regional level. Within this collaboration, 'performance agreements' are established. These guidelines pertain to aspects such as liveability, sustainability and social real estate (Bres Advocaten, 2015).

The period between 2015 and 2022 was relatively 'quiet'. The Housing Act of 2015 was evaluated in 2019, amended in 2020, and came into effect in its new form on January 1 2022



Figure 11: Visualisation of the local triangle (own work).

3.2.4 Revision of the Housing Act in 2022

In this latest iteration, the Housing Act became more simple and workable. Unnecessary details were removed, rules were simplified or clarified and a new set of changes was introduced. Housing associations found themselves granted more flexibility in pursuing supplementary activities. For example, the previously imposed maximum investment limit for initiatives aimed at enhancing liveability was abolished, and housing associations were authorized to contribute to initiatives fostering community cohesion, such as neighbourhood gatherings or events (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2021). Furthermore, the revised Housing Act mandated the creation of municipal housing visions and allowed housing associations to assist directly involved private owners in making their houses more sustainable.

Since 2022, there has been a noticeable shift in focus. This has been further underscored by the decision to abolish the landlord levy as of January 1, 2023. Critics had expressed their concerns from the beginning about how the landlord levy would weaken the financial position of housing associations, thus limiting their ability to invest in new construction, renovation, and maintenance of social rental properties, negatively affecting the quality and availability of social housing. But over time, more points of criticism were added. According to Companen & Thésor (2020), the landlord levy is contradicts one of the main objectives of Dutch housing market policy by de facto targeting only non-profit providers of social housing. Additionally, Professor Dr. Sweder van Wijnbergen (2020) points out that the landlord levy deviates significantly from concepts and bases that are compatible with the Dutch tax structure. It is neither an income tax nor a wealth tax and therefore cannot be integrated into the tax structure. Van Wijnbergen (2020) points to the fact that the levy was introduced in a time of crisis, when the budget deficit was threatening to spiral out of control. Emergency measures may be justifiable in such crisis situations, but such panic policy is not appropriate in the current stable economic conditions, according to Van Wijnbergen (2020). Ultimately, the decision was made to abolish the landlord levy.

One of the parties that has long advocated for this abolition was Aedes, arguing that the funds should benefit tenants who rely on social housing rather than going to the state (Aedes, 2022b). Between 2013 and 2023, housing associations in the Netherlands paid over \in 16.7 billion in landlord levy. To illustrate

the impact of this amount, Companen & Thésor (2020) provided a mathematical demonstration. According to their report, housing associations could have:

- Doubled the construction output of social rental homes, effectively building approximately 93,500 additional homes, or
- Offered their tenants an average rent that is €70 lower, saving each tenant/household €840 per year.

3.2.5 National Performance Agreements

The abolition of the landlord levy meant that housing associations would have approximately €1.7 billion in investment capacity freed up annually. In June 2022, Minister De Jonge of Housing and Spatial Planning established the 'Nationale Prestatieafspraken' (National Performance Agreements) with the Woonbond, het Rijk, de VNG en Aedes to determine the allocation of these funds. It was decided that this money would be directed towards:

- Doubling the construction output of social rental homes (from approximately 15,000 per year to nearly 30,000 by 2030. The goal is for housing associations to build 250,000 social rental homes in the period from 2022 to 2030);
- Rent moderation and reduction for the lowest incomes;
- Extensive sustainability efforts for over 675,000 homes;
- Phasing out E, F, and G energy labels in the housing association sector after 2028;
- Home improvements and addressing moisture and mold issues;
- Creating liveable, safe, and socially cohesive neighbourhoods.

(Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2022).

To achieve the last goal of creating liveable, safe, and socially cohesive neighbourhoods, a total of 600 million euros will be allocated. Enhancing liveability requires housing associations to invest not only in improving housing quality but also in the overall liveability and social management within the neighbourhood. In total, associations will allocate an additional €75 million annually to this endeavour until 2030 (Aedes, 2022a).

Presenting these agreements to the public, Minister de Jonge said: *"We are facing significant challenges that we can only tackle together. The national performance*

agreements are more than just agreements. They **3.2.7 Conclusion** demonstrate that housing is back on the agenda. This allows housing associations to regain the space to do what they were founded for: building and maintaining affordable and sustainable homes for those in need." (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2022).

Wetsvoorstel Versterking 3.2.6 Reaie op de Volkshuisvesting

Just under a year after the establishment of the national performance agreements, it appears that the government is taking on a more assertive role. In a recently proposed legislation titled 'Versterking Regie op de Volkshuisvesting' (strengthening government oversight on housing), the government's aspiration to reclaim control over housing policy is embodied. It asserts that such control is imperative to effectively address contemporary challenges, as articulated by Minister De Jonge, which include the need to accelerate new housing construction amidst rising costs, address sustainability concerns in the existing housing stock, and provide housing for vulnerable groups due to decentralization in the social domain (Companen & Thésor, 2020).

By embedding housing responsibilities of all levels government in legislation, the government of strengthens its ability to regulate housing (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2023). The proposed measures empower authorities to better manage the quantity and location of construction, ensuring an adequate supply of affordable housing. Additionally, the proposed law streamlines procedures to expedite construction and introduces mechanisms to prioritize housing for specific vulnerable groups while ensuring equitable distribution across regions. Lastly, it reinforces and makes enforceable local performance between municipalities. agreements housing associations, and tenant organizations, thus enhancing collaboration and accountability in addressing housing needs (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties, 2023).

The legislation is currently awaiting approval from the Raad van State. After that, it will still need to pass through the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is therefore not yet known how this will affect housing associations and their duties and responsibilities in the future.

This part of the literature review focused on the exploration of sphere 2 and the connected sub-question: How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act?. The initial insights can be summarized as follows.

Since the establishment of housing associations in the 19th century, the Dutch housing association landscape has been characterized by a consistent state of evolution and fluctuating power dynamics. Historically, the government wielded significant control, but from the 1990s onward, housing associations achieved greater authority. With the introduction of the 'Bruteringswet' in 1996, housing associations became financially independent.

The incorporation of liveability as a distinct performance field in 1997 brought about a reconfiguration of the role played by housing associations in the Netherlands, transitioning their primary focus from the sole provision of housing quality to the broader objective of enhancing the overall quality of life within neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, this did not turn out as hoped. Subsequent to instances of misconduct within the corporate sector, a critical parliamentary inquiry in 2015 compelled housing associations to return to their fundamental mission: the provision of housing.

Iin 2022, the tables turned once again when the latest update to the Housing Act and the abolishment of the landlord levy provided housing associations with increased flexibility. Now, housing associations have the freedom to participate in a broader spectrum of activities, with a renewed emphasis on enhancing liveability.

The government does, however, aim to reassert greater control over addressing the housing crisis. This becomes visible in the initiative to introduce the 'Wet Versterking Regie op de Volkshuisvesting' that is currently awaiting approval from the Raad van State. The anticipated implications of this legislation on role allocation remain uncertain. Nevertheless, parallels can be drawn between recent developments and those observed between 1997 and 2015, characterized by a broadening scope of responsibilities for housing associations, penetrating deeper into the social domain, and eliciting corresponding governmental responses.



SPHERE 3

Management strategies for enhancing liveability

3.3 Sphere 3: Management strategies for enhancing liveability

Guiding the exploration of sphere 3 is sub-question 3: How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?. The fact that associations now have more opportunities due to legal changes is a positive development. However, there is still a lack of clarity concerning the scope and definition of liveability. What exactly is 'liveability?'. And how can housing associations engage with it?

3.3.1 Defining liveability

The concept of 'liveability' emerged as a significant theme within the field of urban studies during the 1980s, notably introduced by Donald Appleyard in his seminal work 'Liveable Streets' (Paul & Sen, 2020). Since its inception, the concept has undergone a nuanced and intricate evolution, becoming a focal point of considerable scholarly interest and discourse within academia. Within the existing body of literature, the definition of 'liveability' exhibits a notable lack of uniformity, encompassing both objective and subjective dimensions. Broadly speaking, 'liveability' pertains to the perspectives on the quality of life within any human-created living environment (van Kamp et al., 2003). It is not uncommon for the term 'liveability' to be employed interchangeably with other constructs such as (i) well-being, (ii) standard of living, (iii) happiness, and (iv) Quality of Life in academic discussions (Sheikh & Van Ameijde, 2022).

Paul and Sen (2020) highlight that, in numerous instances, scholars and organizations have developed their interpretations of 'liveability' grounded in the distinctive viewpoints and contexts of their research (Paul & Sen, 2020). In their report 'Kwaliteit van de Leefomgeving en Leefbaarheid: Naar een begrippenkader en conceptuele inkadering' (Quality of the Living Environment and Liveability: Towards a conceptual framework and conceptual framing), Leidelmeijer & van Kamp (2003) present a diverse array of definitions that have been ascribed to the concept of 'liveability' over the years. For instance, Veenhoven (1996) posited that *"Liveability = habitability = quality of* life in the nation: the degree to which its provisions and requirements align with the needs and capacities of its citizens." Newman (1999) suggested that liveability "encompasses the human requirement for social amenity, health, and well-being, encompassing both individual and community well-being". Meanwhile, Marsman and Leidelmeijer (2001) emphasized the the inherent diversity in the needs and preferences of

"waardering van de woonomgeving door de bewoners" (the appreciation of the residential environment by its inhabitants).

Paul and Sen (2020) shed light on the historical divergence in approaches to assessing liveability between Eastern and Western contexts. In the Western context, traditional assessments of liveability have primarily focused on quantifiable factors, such as transportation infrastructure, transit-oriented development, and economic considerations. In stark contrast, Eastern perspectives have underscored the significance of socio-cultural elements in conjunction with physical attributes when evaluating the liveability of cities and regions. This duality in the conceptualization of liveability has now garnered global recognition. Broadly speaking, liveability is conceived as the cumulative effect of socio-physical and socio-cultural factors that collectively elevate living standards (Paul & Sen, 2020).

However, Ruth and Franklin (2013) advocate for a 'balance' rather than a mere summation of sociophysical and socio-cultural factors. They argue that a genuinely liveable city necessitates the harmonious coexistence of two fundamental elements: the characteristics of its population and the environmental qualities defined by its physical and biological attributes. The authors argue that a significant body of empirical data suggests that urban planning and architectural decisions have the capacity to mold the economic and social characteristics of urban settings. This influence extends to factors like housing arrangements, income distribution, crime prevalence, environmental pollution, and the general guality of life. Conversely, transformations in social and environmental factors can impact residents' access to vital resources and services, public health, safety, and the demographic composition of urban regions (Ruth & Franklin, 2013).

The division into socio-physical and socio-cultural dimensions is also discernible in the official definition of liveability adopted by the Dutch National Government. According to the Dutch government, liveability is defined as follows: "The extent to which the environment meets the requirements and wishes of the people who live there. This concerns the physical living environment, the housing stock facilities, social cohesion, nuisance, and (in)safety" (Rijksoverheid, 2022). It is imperative to appreciate that the deliberately comprehensive nature of this definition recognizes individuals across varying geographical locations, time periods, and age groups.

3.3.2 A hierarchy of needs

According to authors Ruth and Franklin (2013), there exists a foundational set of common needs often referred to as the 'first principles' of liveability. At its core, these principles encompass fundamental requisites shared by all people such as access to sustenance, shelter, and safety. Once these fundamental needs are satisfactorily met, individuals and communities naturally progress towards more elevated aspirations and desires, which subsequently must be taken into account in the planning and decision-making processes related to liveability (Ruth & Franklin, 2013).

This theory of a 'needs hierarchy' was originally developed by Abraham Maslow in 1943. It represents a hierarchical pyramid consisting of five levels of human needs, typically depicted as a pyramid with the most basic needs at the bottom and higher-level needs at the top. The levels, from the bottom up, are:

- 1. Biological / physiological needs: These are the most fundamental needs necessary for survival, such as air, water, food, shelter, sleep, and clothing.
- 2. Security needs: Once physiological needs are met, individuals seek safety and security, including personal safety, financial security, health, and stability.
- 3. Social needs: Once security needs are satisfied, people crave a sense of belonging, love, affection, and meaningful relationships with family, friends, and community.
- 4. Ego-related needs: This level involves the desire for self-respect, recognition, status, achievement, and respect from others.
- 5. Self-actualization / fulfilment: At the peak of the hierarchy, self-actualization is the desire to fulfil one's potential, seeking personal growth, self-fulfilment, creativity, and realizing one's capabilities.

(Leidelmeijer & van Kamp, 2003)

A visual representation of Maslow's hierarchy of needs is given in figure 12.

While Maslow's theory was not initially meant to address liveability, it is often referenced in liveability literature to elucidate the layered nature of the concept. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, urban planning complexity, it is not impossible to achieve. In fact,

predominantly concentrated on tackling the biological dimension of liveability, specifically in combating prevalent diseases and epidemics (Leidelmeijer & van Kamp, 2003). The emphasis during this period lay in meeting essential needs such as housing and hygiene. It wasn't until the 1970s that attention shifted towards exploring the broader aspects of liveability. Nowadays, discussions within urban planning and policy predominantly focus on addressing levels 2 and 3 of Maslow's hierarchy when examining the concept of liveability.



Figure 12: Visualisation of Maslow's hierarchy of needs (own work)

3.3.3 Liveability versus sustainability

According to Ruth & Franklin (2013), the contemporary significance of liveability in urban planning and policy practices has risen in parallel with the increasing emphasis on sustainability. In a thought-provoking section, the authors draw a sharp distinction between these two concepts. Sustainability, they argue, is a complex and elusive idea, challenging for individuals to fully grasp, difficult for planners to operationalize, and demanding to implement at local levels. It inherently considers long-term perspectives, assuming a global outlook because, in an interconnected world, any adverse effects on social and environmental aspects beyond a specific region or time frame are likely to rebound as unforeseen and often unintended consequences. In contrast, liveability is portrayed as a concept focused on the present or the imminent future, often tied to specific locations. Liveability, therefore, appears to offer a more immediate and attainable goal.

While sustainability may have a reputation for

various frameworks and guidelines exist to facilitate its operationalization, making it feasible for planners to navigate. In this thesis, it is argued that liveability is much harder to operationalize. Precisely because it concerns the "here", there are no generally applicable (strategies for it. Rather, tailor-made strategies must be used. Furthermore, the assertion is made that liveability is undeniably concerned with long-term * considerations as well.

The aspiration to create healthy and liveable cities is a common policy objective globally. Nevertheless, the practical means to achieve this goal remain elusive. Despite the widespread recognition of the importance of liveability, little research has been dedicated to exploring the efficacy of urban policies in translating this aspiration into tangible outcomes (Lowe et al., 2020). Lowe et al. (2020) underscore the necessity for policymakers to make a more substantial commitment to achieving liveability. They recommend the establishment of specific short-term, medium-term, and long-term liveability targets, coupled with continuous monitoring of the progress of implementation and the resultant community outcomes.

3.3.4 Enhancing liveability in the Dutch social housing sector

Considering the thesis's emphasis on the Dutch social housing sector, it's fascinating to explore the management strategies outlined for housing associations aimed at improving liveability in the Netherlands. The 'Besluit Toegelaten Instellingen Volkshuisvesting' delineates the permissible actions that housing associations can take to enhance liveability, providing insight into the practical application of this concept. Specifically, Chapter V, titled 'activities of Toegelaten Instellingen,' and article 51 specify the defined scope of contributions related to liveability:

- Residential social work, including contributing to the implementation of behind-the-door programs under the responsibility of social organizations and exclusively for the benefit of the tenants of the residential facilities of the 'Toegelaten Instelling';
- Construction and maintenance of small-scale infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of residential facilities or other immovable property of the 'Toegelaten Instelling';
- Contribute to the implementation of plans: to promote a clean living environment, to prevent nuisance and to promote safety; and

Contribute to activities aimed at interaction between tenants of residential facilities of the 'Toegelaten Instelling'.

(Besluit Toegelaten Instellingen Volkshuisvesting, 2023).

*'Toegelaten Instellingen' are associations and foundations with full legal capacity that are admitted by the Authority Housing Associations according to the Housing Act (Den Boer, 2023).

In addition to the specified list of actions, housing associations have further avenues through which they can bolster liveability. These encompass the maintenance of building safety, the dependable provision of water and energy, the promotion of environmental cleanliness, and various other facets that significantly impact the overall liveability of residential facilities (Ruth & Franklin, 2013).

The delineation of permissible actions for housing associations to enhance liveability, as presented in the 'Besluit Toegelaten Instellingen Volkshuisvesting,'offers a valuable framework for practical implementation. Nevertheless, a critical perspective invites scrutiny of the extent to which these activities address the broader, more complex dimensions of liveability. While the document predominantly emphasizes tangible and immediate measures, it is imperative to recognize that these strategies are primarily oriented towards the short and medium term. Therefore, a comprehensive approach to liveability requires not only the fulfilment of these specific actions but also a more profound understanding of the long-term dynamics that truly shape the quality of life in residential facilities managed by housing associations.

3.3.5 The 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' by Aedes

Aedes, the trade association representing housing associations in the Netherlands, places significant emphasis on the theme of liveability and its relationship to the activities of housing associations. Their website outlines Aedes' belief that it is crucial for local stakeholders to establish agreements concerning their commitment to liveability, and for the government to provide ample room for such initiatives. According to Aedes, creating high-quality living environments and liveable neighbourhoods requires a combination of social initiatives and physical improvements (Aedes, n.d.). Within the housing association sector, liveability is often defined by three key elements: cleanliness, integrity, and safety (Aedes, n.d.). Aedes has developed several tools and resources to assist housing associations in achieving these objectives, which are summarized in the 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' (discussion board interventions for liveability), depicted in **appendix A**.

The 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' serves as a platform for engaging in conversations with partners or colleagues regarding local needs and suitable interventions. It categorizes 25 interventions into five distinct themes: resident composition, existing housing stock, new construction, social management, and local cooperation. These interventions can be tailored to various scales, including individual homes, streets, districts, villages, or entire cities (Aedes, 2021). For example, an intervention that fits within the theme of 'existing housing stock' is to "intensively involve residents (in thinking and making decisions) in the maintenance and sustainability of a complex and *immediate living environment"* (Aedes, 2021). The goal of this intervention is to increase a sense of ownership at home and thereby enhancing liveability.

Besides pinpointing effective interventions and actionable steps, the discussion board also offers examples of best practices (Aedes, 2021). For instance, in the city of Nijmegen, the housing association 'Standvast Wonen' has successfully revitalized a neighbourhood with multiple challenges – Malvert - by strategically investing in housing stock maintenance and undertaking renovation, demolition, and new construction initiatives. This approach notably increased the neighbourhood's appeal and overall quality of life (Corporatiebouw, 2019). The specific set of interventions that Standvast Wonen has applied in Malvert are listed under the heading 'Promising combinations of interventions'. While it's engaging to explore these promising combinations on the discussion board, it's crucial to keep in mind that a tailored, area-specific approach is the key. The combination of interventions that worked successfully in Nijmegen might not be universally applicable in other locations. In fact, Aedes recognizes the value of the area-specific approach that is also advocated for in literature, as it directly benefits the residents (Aedes, n.d.).

3.3.6 Conclusion

This part of the literature review focused on the exploration of sphere 3 and the connected sub-question:

How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?

To sum up, there is a multitude of definitions for liveability. Given the focus of this thesis on the Dutch context and its associated legal framework, it makes sense to use the definition provided by the Dutch government: "The extent to which the environment meets the requirements and wishes of the people who live there. This concerns the physical living environment, the housing stock, facilities, social cohesion, nuisance and (in)safety" (Rijksoverheid, 2022). This definition effectively encompasses both socio-physical and socio-cultural dimensions while allowing for flexibility in its interpretation across diverse locations, timeframes, and age groups. Within the housing association sector, liveability is often defined by three key elements: cleanliness, integrity, and safety.

Recognizing the inherently contextual nature of liveability, it becomes evident that there are no universally applicable strategies described in the existing literature. Instead, the literature underscores the imperative for tailor-made strategies, emphasizing the need to account for the unique characteristics and demands of each specific setting. However, Aedes (the trade association representing housing associations in the Netherlands) does provide housing associations with recommendations regarding tools to improve liveability.





Housing associations in the earthquake-affected region

In the previous chapter, the literature review examined three distinct spheres: 1) the impact of earthquakes in Groningen, 2) the role of housing associations in the Netherlands, and 3) management strategies for enhancing liveability. Each sphere was explored independently, for the purpose of later integration. From this point in the report onwards, the convergence of these spheres takes shape. Before delving into the liveability challenges faced by tenants in Groningen, attention is directed towards how the earthquake problem has influenced the operations of housing associations. Firstly, data from the NCG dashboard is examined to illustrate the housing associations' role in the reinforcement task. This involves comparing the number of homes requiring reinforcement with the total housing stock owned by each association. Recognizing the limitations of numerical data in capturing the complete impact, exploratory talks are conducted with the directors of the 6 Kr8 associations. These discussions aim to delve deeper into the nuances of the impact and illuminate the perspectives held by the associations regarding their role. In this manner, the chapter aims to address sub-question 4: How does the earthquake problem in Groningen affect the operations of housing associations, and what perspectives do they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues?

4.1 Housing association's part in the reinforcement task

As of November 2023, the NCG reports 27,455 addresses requiring reinforcement in Groningen. This number includes not only residential homes but also other types of buildings such as schools, hospitals, community centres, office buildings and religious buildings. If only the homes that require reinforcement are considered, thirty percent are owned by housing associations (Woonzorg Nederland, 2022). The majority of this 30% stems from the Kr8 associations: Lefier, Acantus, Wierden & Borgen, Groninger Huis, Goud Wonen, and Woonzorg Nederland. Collectively, these 6 housing associations own 6,669 homes in the reinforcement task. The housing associations in the city own another 1,117 residences in the reinforcement task (NCG, 2024).

Officially, the NCG is responsible for the entire reinforcement task, including rental properties. If we strictly look at the law and the lease contract, it states that a housing association must ensure that they provide a product that is in good condition, and if it exhibits a defect, the housing association must repair it. However, earthquake damage is not considered a defect because, according to Book 7 Article 204, paragraph 3 of the Civil

Code, it can be classified as a factual disturbance by third parties to the enjoyment of the property (personal communication, January 15, 2024). This means that housing associations are not legally responsible for repairing earthquake damage to their properties. The NCG is. Furthermore, in RITV Article 48, it is explicitly stated that housing associations are prohibited from allocating resources to tasks other than those for which they exist, as described in Article 45 of the Housing Act (personal communication, January 15, 2024).

However, to honour the role of the associations and for practical reasons - considering their maintenance plans, portfolio strategies, and perspectives - the preference is for the housing associations themselves to undertake the reinforcement of their real estate (personal communication, February 29, 2024). In many cases, the housing association opts to handle the reinforcement internally. This naturally involves close coordination with the NCG, which provides housing associations with the frameworks and tools necessary for the reinforcement task. Within the NCG, there is a specialized team dedicated to supporting housing associations in this endeavour. Four account managers are employed to maintain contact with the housing associations. Additionally, there are project managers overseeing the progress of reinforcement and its processing in the internal administration. Project support staff provide operational assistance and beyond that, there's a flexible 'outer layer' consisting of policy advisors, legal experts, finance personnel, controllers, and data analysts (personal communication, February 29, 2024).

If you were to simplify it entirely, the collaboration between the NCG and housing associations would seem straightforward. The NCG provides the reinforcement advice, and once it's clear what needs to be done with a property, the housing association takes action. In practice, however, it's much less clear who handles what - where the NCG's responsibility ends and the housing association's begins. The explorative talks suggest that this confusion is partly due to the complexity of the task, especially when operating within the same area or even on the same street. Furthermore, the fact that there is no fixed division of tasks also plays a role. For instance, when it comes to temporary housing for tenants in the reinforcement task; this can be arranged by the NCG, but housing associations can also handle this themselves. As a result, a significant amount of coordination is needed

activities don't conflict with each other. Unfortunately, communication between the NCG, the municipality, and the housing associations isn't always seamless. The challenge is evident in Woltersum, where project leaders are currently tasked with coordinating multiple large crane visits within a single week due to the simultaneous reinforcement of numerous addresses along the same street. Addressing such logistical and coordination challenges is imperative.

Furthermore, it becomes increasingly apparent that for the political dynamics in The Hague often fail to align with the practical realities in Groningen. While • policymakers in The Hague may implement rules and regulations with good intentions, the continual influx of new policies serves to impede rather than advance • progress in the reinforcement task. The refrain *"stop introducing new things and allow us to work without interruptions for a while"* is frequently voiced by • employees of the executing parties.

Despite the challenges, both housing associations and the NCG demonstrate remarkable efficacy in advancing the reinforcement endeavour. According to a reliable source, housing associations have contributed 40% to the total completion of reinforcement efforts to date. Notably, considering that housing associations own 30% of the affected properties, this achievement reflects an overperformance on their part (personal communication, January 31, 2024). Similar to **figure 9**, the NCG maintains a dashboard to track the progress of the Kr8 associations' homes in the reinforcement process. The progress of all Kr8 associations together is shown in **figure 13**.



Figure 13: Current state of the reinforcement process of the Kr8 associations (NCG, January 2024)

Out of the 6,669 homes, 2,300 were already up to standard. 1,218 are currently under assessment, meaning they are awaiting the reinforcement advice (VA) from the NCG. 1,384 are currently in progress, and 1,767 homes have been reinforced (NCG, January 2024).

To understand the task facing each individual housing association, the proportion of homes requiring reinforcement can be compared to the total number of homes owned by each association. This results in the following list:

- Lefier has approximately 30,000 homes. Of these, 1,083 are part of the reinforcement task. This accounts for **3.6%.**
- Acantus has approximately 14,000 homes. Of these, 1,545 are part of the reinforcement task. This accounts for **11.0%**.
- Wierden & Borgen has approximately 7,000 homes. Of these, 1,587 are part of the reinforcement task. This accounts for **22.7%.**
- Groninger Huis has approximately 5,000 homes. Of these, 1,383 are part of the reinforcement task. This accounts for 27.7%.
- Goud Wonen has approximately 1,500 homes. Of these, 778 are part of the reinforcement task. This accounts for **51.9%.**
- Woonzorg Nederland has approximately 43,000 homes. Of these, 293 are part of the reinforcement task. This accounts for **0.7%.**

(NCG, January 2024).

From this overview, several insights can be derived:

- Woonzorg Nederland is the largest in terms of ownership but the smallest in the reinforcement task (this is because Woonzorg Nederland is a housing association operating on a national scale. They have a limited portfolio in Groningen);
- Lefter is the largest housing association in the North, but - next to Woonzorg NL - the smallest in the reinforcement task;
- Goud Wonen is the smallest housing association in terms of ownership but the largest in the reinforcement task;
- Wierden & Borgen has completed the most reinforcement projects so far (529 homes);
- Percentage-wise, Wierden & Borgen is also the furthest along in the reinforcement task (529 is 33.3% of the 1,587 homes of Wierden & Borgen requiring reinforcement). Woonzorg Nederland

holds the second position, with 33,1% (97 of the 293 homes of Woonzorg Nederland requiring reinforcement) being reinforced.

An important caveat to place with this analysis is that these numbers alone are not sufficient to fully understand the impact of the earthquakes on the operations of the various housing associations. For Goud Wonen for example, it may seem like only 51.9% of their homes are affected. However, in the earthquake file, a distinction is made between damage and reinforcement. While 51.9% of Goud Wonen's homes are included in the reinforcement task, all of their homes are located in the earthquake-affected area. (A portion of) the remaining 48.1% likely also has damage, indicating a larger overall impact.

4.2 Explorative talks – the approach

To fully grasp the impact of the earthquake problem, explorative talks were conducted. In total, 31 professionals from 19 different organizations involved in Groningen's earthquake file participated. Amongst these professionals were the directors of the 6 Kr8 associations: Elles Dost (Lefier), Anita Tijsma (Acantus), Matthieu van Olffen (Wierden & Borgen), Laura Broekhuizen (Groninger Huis), and Harry Oosting (Goud Wonen). For Woonzorg Nederland, the explorative talk was held with Onno Bremmers, program manager earthquakes. He has the mandate from the director to participate in regional meetings on his behalf, due to the national scale of Woonzorg Nederland. Where in general, the explorative talks had an informal nature, focusing on cross-referencing information gathered during the literature review and gaining insight into each organization's tasks, responsibilities, and interorganizational dynamics, the discussions with the directors of the six Kr8 associations followed a more structured format.

For the Kr8 directors, a standardized set of questions was compiled (see **appendix B**). Posing the exact same questions to all 6 directors allowed for the subsequent comparison of responses. Applying this same method to other explorative talks wasn't feasible due to the varied roles of the participants. Prior to the discussions, each individual was requested to sign an informed consent form (see **appendix C**). When permitted, the explorative talks were recorded. Subsequently, the recorded conversations were transcribed and analysed. Initially, a set of codes was generated based on the standardized questions (closed coding). After reviewing the transcripts, additional themes that emerged from the discussions were incorporated into the coding process (open coding). This iterative process led to the creation of a list of 12 codes, serving as representative labels for the various topics addressed by the directors. The derived codes are presented below in alphabetical order:

- Challenges for housing associations
- Challenges for tenants
- Collaboration with other parties
- (History of the) Kr8 partnership
- Inequalities
- Interorganizational relationships
- Liveability
- Organization and implementation
- Role of housing associations
- The reinforcement task
- The Woonactieplan
- Trust

The process that ensued was rather 'manual'. Each code was assigned a colour. Then, the transcripts were reviewed again, and all sections corresponding to certain codes were highlighted with the respective colour. This way, passages from different transcripts discussing the same topics could be compared to see if the directors agreed or disagreed with each other. The comparisons were subsequently translated into axis systems, which can be seen in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6. The entire process surrounding the explorative talks is visually summarized in **figure 14**.



Figure 14: Visualisation of the explorative talks process (own work)

4.3 The Kr8 partnership

At the outset, the explorative talks reveal that the earthquake problem poses a challenge to the operationalization of housing associations. Reinforcing houses was a task that none of the housing associations had previously undertaken. Especially in the beginning, there was considerable uncertainty regarding the scope of the reinforcement operation (impact on the portfolio) and how to implement this task within the organization. This uncertainty resulted in a significant 'freeze' reaction. While waiting for the NCG to conduct the assessments and provide clarity on the number of homes necessitating reinforcement or demolition and reconstruction, housing associations in Groningen paused carrying out their portfolio strategy and routine maintenance activities. This also had a negative impact on the progress of sustainability efforts. Associations were reluctant to risk investing money in sustainability measures only to hear in x amount of time that the house would need to be demolished, thus nullifying that investment. Ultimately, this 'freeze' reaction lasted for years because the assessment of homes proved to be a time-consuming process, further complicated by continually evolving standards. Homes that were initially deemed safe were later found to be unsafe under new assessments, and vice versa. Naturally, the deferred maintenance, deferred sustainability and uncertainty regarding safety led to significant dissatisfaction among residents.

It was in the midst of this chaos that the 8 housing associations active in the earthquake-affected area found solidarity. "The questions, uncertainties, and the lack of clarity about how it all should be done brought us *together*, says Matthieu van Olffen, director of Wierden & Borgen (personal communication, January 22, 2024). Originally, it were Lefier, Acantus, Wierden & Borgen, Groninger Huis, De Delthe, SUW, Woongroep Marenland, and Woonzorg Nederland that collaborated with the Huurders Platform Aardbevingen Groningen (HPAG) to form a collective effort known as 'Kr8'. The name of this initiative referred to the core ('kern' in Dutch) of the earthquake-affected region and the involvement of 8 associations. On January 1, 2023, De Delthe and SUW merged to form a new entity named 'Goud Wonen'. Furthermore, effective November 1, 2023, Woongroep Marenland ceased operations, with its housing assets and activities transferred to Acantus, Goud Wonen, Groninger Huis, and Wierden & Borgen. As a result of this merger and separation, Kr8's composition changed from 8 to 6 housing associations.

Although the intensification of collaboration between the different housing associations is a direct result of the challenges of the reinforcement task, it's not as if the associations had never communicated before the development of the earthquake file. Harry Oosting (director of Goud Wonen) recounts the origins of collaboration between some of the associations back to 2008, when the earthquake file did not exist yet (personal communication, January 17, 2024). At that time, the province issued a report on population decline in East and Northeast Groningen. This prompted several associations to come together in the so-called DEAL collaboration, with each letter representing involved: Delfzijl, Eemsmond, а municipality Appingedam, and Loppersum. As the earthquake file emerged, the municipality of Slochteren joined, transforming DEAL into DEALS. This collaboration gained momentum with the start of reinforcement efforts in 2015.

At this point in time, the DEALS municipalities launched the H3V project, a pilot initiated by the associations, the NAM, and BZK to initially reinforce, make sustainable, improve, and restore 150 homes, with plans to expand to 1500 homes. The H3V pilot aimed to gain practical experience with the reinforcement process. This went beyond technical matters to include organization, financing, cost-benefit assessments, funding, etc (Klijn & Deltares, 2015). However, in the meantime, the CVW and later the NCG were established to oversee the reinforcement efforts, which ultimately led to the termination of the pilot. Under the leadership of the CVW/NCG, a large-scale approach was initiated, in which consistent implementation-, technical- and administrative agreements were made for a number of addresses within the reinforcement operation (Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Klimaat, 2023a). These groups of addresses are generally referred to as 'batches'. The addresses within the different batches are spread across multiple municipalities within the earthquake-affected area.

The earthquake issue and the large scale of the reinforcement operation stirred unease at the 'Autoriteit Woningcorporaties' (AW) and the 'Waarborgfonds Sociale Woningbouw' (WSW) - also referred to as the 'supervisors' of housing associations - due to the expected decrease in value of real estate in the area. The AW oversees the behaviour of housing associations and their financial management, while the WSW ensures favourable financing for housing associations through guarantees at the lowest possible costs. With

significant developments in real estate happening in Groningen in light of the earthquake problem, including demolitions and new constructions, the AW and WSW stressed the importance of coordinating activities among housing associations to prevent redundancy and translating the effects of the earthquakes to a portfolio strategy. They actually urged the associations, not only in the 'core' of the earthquake area but also in the broader 'impact area' (value decline also played a role in the city of Groningen), to come together. Based on these discussions, the C14 dialogue was initiated in 2018. C14 stood for all 14 'corporaties' (associations) active in Groningen city and province.

In 2019, the associations established a specialized working group on 'property management' with the aim of harmonizing all portfolio strategies, essentially creating a shared language. Henk Fissering, property management and operations manager at Acantus, aptly notes, *"the challenge of coordinating activities*" is not unique to our region; it's a concern wherever compositions of both dialogues are depicted in figure multiple housing associations operate in one area. 15. While the G13 deals with general topics and operates

crucial for us to synchronize our efforts" (personal communication, January 17, 2024). Periodic meetings were held with AW and WSW to discuss progress and monitor the process. However, the varying impact of the earthquake problem on the different associations within the C14 soon became apparent. In response to this disparity, the Kr8 dialogue emerged as a successor to the previous DEALS meetings. The Kr8 associations presented the result of their joint effort in 2020; a coordinated portfolio strategy titled 'Oog op de Regio' (Eye on the region). The report was well received by the AW and WSW, and since then, they have stepped back and only monitor at the individual level, as is usual.

When the 14 associations reduced to 13 due to a merger (not the one resulting in Goud Wonen but another), the C14 transitioned into the G13, representing the Groningen 13. At the time of writing this thesis, the G13 comprises fewer than 13 members. Similar to Kr8, the name has remained unchanged. The current However, given the high level of activity here, it was at a provincial level, Kr8 concentrates specifically on



Figure 15: Current composition of G13 and Kr8 (own work)

the earthquake file, operating at a more localized level by encompassing only the municipalities affected by the earthquakes. Both dialogues have an informal nature.

The organizational chart of Kr8 is presented in figure 16. The Kr8 board is comprised of the directors from the 6 Kr8 associations (with Onno Bremmers representing Woonzorg NL). This board provides strategic guidance to the Kr8 staff, consisting of a board secretary and two communication advisors. Initially, the aim was to fill these positions with individuals from the respective Kr8 associations; however, due to capacity constraints, this was not realized. Within Kr8, there are four distinct working groups: the reinforcement table (comprising 6 members), the working group portfolio strategy (also comprising 6 members), the working group 'Woonactieplan' (comprising 4 members), and the communication meeting (which includes the communication advisors and representatives from the municipality). All policy deliberations are channelled through the reinforcement table before being allocated to the relevant working group.

4.4 Effect on the operations of individual housing associations

The Kr8 partnership stands out as the most significant example of how the earthquake problem and reinforcement task have impacted the operationalization of housing associations. However, it's also important to consider how each housing association has experienced and dealt with the earthquake issues independently, apart from the collective efforts.

During the explorative talks, the directors were asked the question: '*How does the earthquake problem affect the real estate activities of your housing association?*'. The answers matched what the data analysis already showed; the impact varies per housing association. **Figure 17** illustrates, through a simple axis system, which association experiences what impact.

What immediately stands out is the position of Lefier and Woonzorg NL all the way to the left side of the axis. Elles Dost explains the position of Lefier as follows: *"For Lefier, the reinforcement task constitutes only a*



Figure 16: Current organisational structure of Kr8 (own work)







Figure 18: Handling of the earthquake problem within the organization (own work)

minuscule portion of our overall portfolio. Therefore, our perspective on this issue differs significantly from that of - for example - Goud Wonen" (personal communication, February 2, 2024). Goud Wonen is indeed located on the other side of the axis. Regarding the impact on real estate activities, Harry Oosting says the following: "The impact is big. All of Goud Wonen's assets are located within the earthquake zone. Approximately 400 of our 1500 homes need to be demolished and rebuild" (personal communication, January 17, 2024). Acantus, Groninger Huis en Wierden & Borgen are all situated in the middle. Regarding their position, Henk Fissering explains: "The impact is considerable. Part of our assets is located in the earthquake zone, but part is not" (personal communication, January 17, 2024).

All housing associations agree, however, that the earthquake issues lead to a significant increase in workload. Essentially, the entire portfolio strategy may need to be revised. This, of course, takes time. Laura Broekhuizen, director of Groninger Huis, adds to this that the political volatility of the dossier also adds to the challenges: "Whenever the situation shifts, we need to reassess: What does this mean for us? What actions should we take? And should we take any action at all, considering that future changes may render our current decisions obsolete?" (personal communication, January 16, 2024). Navigating through the constantly evolving landscape of laws and regulations, staying updated on changes, and ensuring that decisions remain understandable to tenants pose a complex task for all housing associations.

Following up on this question, the directors were asked: 'How is handling earthquakes arranged within the organization?'. The answers are visualized in **figure 18**. What stands out is that all housing associations have chosen not to establish a separate department for this purpose. This decision is based on different considerations. In the case of Goud Wonen, it simply couldn't be organized separately from the rest of the organization. Being a small association with all of their homes located in the earthquake-affected area, their

work inherently involves addressing the impacts of the earthquakes. For Wierden & Borgen, the decision not to establish a separate department was based on the concern that it might become disconnected from the rest of the organization. Groninger Huis states that the pragmatic recognition that the reinforcement task would eventually reach its conclusion was the most important reason to not establish a separate department. When this time arrives, the association would prefer not to be left with a redundant team.

However, the most commonly cited reason (mentioned by Acantus, Groninger Huis, Lefier and Woonzorg NL) to not establish a separate department was that often, housing associations opt to demolish and new built the homes requiring reinforcement. In this case, the projects undertaken in the context of the reinforcement task are not significantly different from any other demolition and new construction project. The only distinctions lie in the available subsidies and regulations for financing, as well as the quantity of homes involved. So, in principle, this can be managed by the existing departments. This however inevitably adds a substantial amount of 'extra' work on top of their regular duties. Almost every housing association therefore reports hiring additional staff to manage the increased workload. For example, Onno Bremmers from Woonzorg NL explains how they've hired extra resident consultants: "We simply use the regular process to address the reinforcement task. However, 3 extra resident consultants have been hired specifically for the reinforcement projects" (personal communication, January 23, 2024).

Goud Wonen opted for a different approach. They chose to outsource (part of) their reinforcement projects to a company called Rizoem. Harry Oosting explains: *"If we were to handle the reinforcement task ourselves, our organization would have needed considerable expansion. Learning from Marenland's difficulties, we decided against scaling up and chose outsourcing instead"* (personal communication, January 17, 2024). Later on, Wierden & Borgen also enlisted the services



Figure 19: Earthquakes: a financial or a social problem? (own work)

of this party. Regarding this transition to outsourcing, Matthieu van Olffen states: *"If we could have foreseen the full impact of the dossier and all that needed to be done, we might have organized it differently beforehand. After initially addressing the reinforcement task by expanding existing departments, we're now following Goud Wonen's lead and outsourcing some of our projects"* (personal communication, January 22, 2024).

Another question asked during the explorative talks was: 'Do you primarily consider the earthquakes as a financial or a social problem?'. The answers given by the directors are visualized in figure 19. Initially, it was thought that the earthquake issues would pose a significant financial problem for the individual housing associations. Particularly when considering the high percentages of homes affected and in need of reinforcement, as indicated in section 4.1. However, in the answers to this question, it became evident that the housing associations do not perceive the earthquake problem as a financial issue per se.

What's notable is that Lefier and Woonzorg NL are once again positioned together at a different end of the axis compared to the rest of the housing associations. This is because, as previously mentioned, the reinforcement task affects only a small portion of their portfolio (3.6% and 0.7% respectively, see section 4.1). Although significant financial investments are still involved, Onno Bremmers from Woonzorg NL emphasizes that for them, the financial risk is significantly lower compared to smaller associations with larger assets. *"In the event of setbacks in Groningen, Woonzorg NL remains financially stable"* he says (personal communication, January 23, 2024). For Woonzorg NL, the earthquakes primarily pose a problem in the social domain because of the vulnerability of their target group.

Another thing that stands out is that Goud Wonen, the smallest association with the largest task (51.9%, see section 4.1), does also not view it as a financial issue. This is because fortunately, many schemes and subsidies are tied to the reinforcement task that the association

can utilize. Harry Oosting even dares to cautiously call the earthquakes an opportunity for his association, in the sense that the subsidies allows them to renew their assets for relatively little money and make a significant quality leap. A similar sentiment comes from Wierden & Borgen and Groninger Huis. Laura Broekhuizen, of Groninger Huis, also sees the opportunities that the reinforcement task offers. However, in her response, she also extensively addresses the fact that for tenants, it obviously does not feel that way: *"It costs us a lot of time and effort, but it's primarily a social problem because the cohesion in a neighborhood is completely changed through the demolition and reconstruction projects"* (personal communication, January 16, 2024).

Acantus stands out as the only association genuinely conflicted in its response and ultimately settles for 'both'. While Henk Fissering acknowledges the assertion of other associations that constructing new homes within the context of the reinforcement task demands only a relatively modest investment, he also emphasizes that the overall costs consistently surpass the funding provided by the NCG. Consequently, Acantus must also make investments. In his own words: *Financially, we're not coming out of this too badly. We're acquiring new homes for relatively little money. However, the contribution we have to make ourselves, though small, wouldn't have been necessary otherwise. The houses were still in good condition"* (personal communication, January 17, 2024).

The debate over whether the earthquakes represent a financial or social issue initiated another question, namely: 'What are - in your opinion - the most important concerns or challenges that tenants face as a result of the earthquakes?'. The answers that were given to this question unfortunately can't be visualized in a single axis, as they were too divergent. However, from the responses provided by the directors, it became clear how much they empathize with their tenants. Harry Oosting (Goud Wonen) identifies a decrease in trust, ambiguity, and uncertainty as the biggest challenges for tenants, a sentiment echoed by Matthieu van Olffen (Wierden & Borgen) and Laura Broekhuizen (Groninger Huis). People are worn down by the hassle. All directors notice a sense of resignation among tenants. Onno Bremmers (Woonzorg NL) states that for his tenant group, the reinforcement is something unwanted. " These are elderly people aged 80 and above who simply want to spend their remaining years peacefully in their familiar surroundings" (personal communication, January 23, 2024).

The upheaval caused by reinforcement and moving is something that not only the elderly but all tenants dread immensely. These concerns play a much more significant role than a sense of insecurity, a sentiment none of the directors actively notice. Henk Fissering (Acantus) perhaps explains the situation of tenants in the reinforcement task most aptly: "When a row of houses is designated for reinforcement, it causes a lot of unrest. People have to (temporarily) leave their homes, often against their will. People are left questioning about things like; What will happen next? When will it happen? What will the future look like, and where will I live? It's not just about one's individual dwelling undergoing transformation; it encompasses the entire neighbourhood. If you've grown accustomed to your current surroundings and impending changes force you into a new environment, it can evoke mixed feelings. The uncertainty tenants face is not by choiceit's an unexpected transition. This experience differs from a typical relocation; it's an imposition, a series of changes thrust upon people without their consent. Consequently, it often begins with a sense of unease" (personal communication, January 17, 2024).

An insightful observation presented by Harry Oosting (Goud Wonen) is that once relocated to temporary housing, the situation of tenants seems to stabilize a little. The temporary accommodations provide satisfactory living conditions. These are fully furnished homes with an improved energy efficiency rating, offered at the same rental price, with additional expenses such as internet coverage covered by the NCG. The tenants who are scheduled for later phases, compelled to stay in their homes for an extended duration while maintenance activities cease, and confronted with rows of vacant houses or expansive construction sites, are the ones who experience heightened challenges to their quality of life.

This inequality also leads to situations where people no longer wish each other well, says Henk Lambeck, manager gebiedsteam Midden-Groningen at Lefier. Matthieu van Olffen (Wierden & Borgen) agrees, stating that much more so than in normal circumstances, the social infrastructure in the reinforcement area has been destroyed. The social impact is very significant. What Laura Broekhuizen of Groninger Huis finds very poignant is that people sometimes truly don't feel at home in their neighbourhood anymore. She strongly feels that housing associations should be mindful of this.

4.5 A challenge in the social domain

"Our tenant group was already in a precarious situation, and the earthquakes have exacerbated their vulnerability" states Geja Hagedoorn, manager Living at Groninger Huis (personal communication, September 21, 2023). It is important to note that the region worst affected by the earthquakes faced preexisting challenges. This becomes evident in the 'Brede Welvaartsindicator' (BWI), an international measure developed to gauge prosperity beyond mere economic growth (Provincie Groningen, 2020).

In the BWI, the Netherlands is divided into 40 regions, each assessed based on 11 indicators. The province of Groningen is divided into three regions, namely: 'Other Groningen,' 'East Groningen,' and 'Delfzijl and surroundings.' The Groningen regions perform poorly, ranking at positions 32, 34, and 40 on the list (Universiteit Utrecht & RaboResearch, 2023). The scores are particularly low on the indicators income, health, and education. For instance, the three Groningen regions form the 'top 3' of the lowest-scoring regions on disposable household income in the Netherlands. 'Delfzijl and surroundings' and 'East Groningen' also show the lowest scores for health indicators (positions 39 and 40) (Universiteit Utrecht & RaboResearch, 2023). In other words, the life expectancy in 'East Groningen' and 'Delfzijl and surroundings' is the lowest in the Netherlands. Additionally, 'East Groningen' exhibits the lowest average educational level in the country (Provincie Groningen, 2020). Looking at the indicator employment furthermore reveals that a relatively large number of people are unemployed or have a flexible (and therefore uncertain) employment relationship (Provincie Groningen, 2020).

While this thesis specifically focuses on the impact of earthquakes on liveability and the role of housing associations in mitigating these effects, it is important to note that the aforementioned challenges also significantly affect liveability in the area. In this context, the collaborative efforts with municipalities and healthcare organizations are crucial; however, cracks seem to be appearing in those partnerships. In the explorative talks, the housing associations report seeing a withdrawal from municipalities and healthcare organizations, forcing them to adopt a more proactive role in devising solutions. Laura Broekhuizen (Groninger Huis) suspects that the withdrawal is due to a shortage of both financial resources and capacity (personal communication, January 16, 2024). Many small municipalities in the earthquake-affected area are also overwhelmed by the additional work stemming from the earthquake dossier. Their financial vulnerability is further exacerbated by the approach of the so-called 'ravijnjaar', a year in which municipalities find themselves caught between the old financial system, which expires in 2025, and the new one that comes into effect in 2027. As a result, municipalities collectively miss out on over 3 billion euros, putting their budgets under significant pressure (ANP, 2023). This development creates the existence of a void - a void that housing associations frequently find themselves filling. As Henk Lambeck, manager gebiedsteam Midden-Groningen at Lefier explains: "If we step behind the front door and see that a tenant is struggling, we cannot simply turn around and walk away and pretend *it never happened*" (personal communication, January 23, 2024). Or can they?

4.6 Housing associations' perspectives on their role

While the previous sections mainly focussed on how the earthquake problem affects the operations of housing associations, this section delves into what perspectives housing associations hold regarding their role in addressing the issues. While addressing material damage falls squarely within the core responsibility of housing associations - to provide affordable, highquality housing for individuals with limited incomes (Rijksoverheid, 2023) -, dealing with immaterial damage presents a more intricate challenge.

During the explorative talks, the directors were asked the question: 'What is your view regarding the role of housing associations in addressing the consequences of earthquakes? Do you believe their responsibility should only encompass material damage, or should it extend to addressing immaterial damage as well?'. From the answers, it became evident that all six Kr8 associations do feel responsible for not only addressing the material damage, but also acknowledging the immaterial damage of their tenants.

In discussing the role of housing associations in the reinforcement task, Henk Fissering from Acantus remarked. *"In essence, I don't think that our role is any different than that of housing associations in other areas. However, the social dimension does require more attention in this context"* (personal communication, January 17, 2024). On one hand, this is because the reinforcement task generates a lot of stress and uncertainty among residents, necessitating additional support. On the other hand, this is because the

reinforcement task means that housing associations enter behind a lot of front doors at once, revealing previously unknown issues that tenants are grappling with. As a result, tenants in Groningen might demand heightened attention, but it's crucial to recognize that the social component has always been integral to the role of housing associations.

The intrinsic social aspect of the housing associations' role is reaffirmed by Laura Broekhuizen of Groninger Huis, who emphasizes, *"It is not just about stones. If we build good houses but our tenants are unhappy, unemployed, burdened with debts, and facing domestic hassles, the repercussions become evident in the state of the garden, the maintenance, and how residents care for their houses. All these factors have a direct impact on our property and its decreasing value"* (personal communication, January 16, 2024). Housing associations acknowledge their responsibility not only for the physical properties they own but also for the well-being of the individuals residing within them.

The question that arises here is; how far does that responsibility go? Opinions on this matter differ between the associations. This becomes visible in figure 20. Generally, the responsibility is manifested by taking on a signalling role towards municipalities and healthcare organizations. This position is also taken by Lefier and Woonzorg NL, - who once again choose a different stance from the rest. "Don't do it *yourself, but refer*["] states Onno Bremmers (personal communication, January 23, 2024). The other associations, Acantus, Goud Wonen, and Wierden & Borgen, hover between signalling and actively seeking to be part of the solution. "In the basis, we take on a signalling role, but sometimes we can also be part of the solution" says Matthieu van Olffen (personal communication, January 22, 2024). This is not only out of necessity but also driven by their genuine desire to make a positive impact.

Groninger Huis goes even further. Laura van Broekhuizen believes that a signalling role is too passive. When addressing whether this is permissible



Figure 20: Housing associations' perspectives on their role (own work)

within the framework of the Housing Act, Laura Broekhuizen of Groninger Huis suggests that housing associations must actively look for such opportunities. *"I believe there is ample room for action, stemming from our own sense of responsibility"* (personal communication, January 16, 2024).

It is interesting to try to understand where these differences in viewpoints originate. Perhaps they stem from the varying impact that the earthquake problem has? Could it be that a bigger impact motivates a more active role? In figure 21, both axis systems are combined. The statement appears to be true on the left side of the system. Both Lefier and Woonzorg Nederland have the least impact and the most passive role perception. However, on the right side of the system, it is noticeable that the association with the greatest impact (Goud Wonen) does not have the most active role perception. Groninger Huis has. This suggests that the stance an association takes in this discussion is also determined by other factors, such as the size of the housing association and the number of resources they have available, as well as the personality of the director.

4.7 Achievements

Despite the different opinions on how far the responsibility of the housing associations extends, the Kr8 has already accomplished a great deal. Starting with the successful distribution of the value decline funds from the WSW. This amount, totalling over 70 million euros, was divided among the Kr8 associations in three instalments without any hassle. Additionally, by the end of 2019, the Kr8 associations published '9 certainties' they intended to offer tenants in the earthquake-affected areas in the event of demolition and new construction due to earthquake issues. These certainties were subsequently included in the social plans of the individual associations. In 2020, the Kr8 associations developed a coordinated portfolio strategy titled 'oog op de regio' and in November 2020, administrative agreements were made regarding reinforcement in Groningen. Perhaps the most significant milestone for the Kr8 associations thus far came with the agreements with the government to align compensations for tenants and private owners later that same year. In light of these agreements, ca. 26,000 tenants residing in the earthquake-affected



Figure 21: Housing associations' perspectives on their role compared to the impact on the associations (own work)

area received a one-time amount of 750 euros as compensation for the hardships they endure in the reinforcement task.

In 2022, the Kr8 associations developed a communication guideline for reinforcement, outlining what residents can expect and how they will be involved in each phase. By 2024, efforts are underway to iron out the remaining wrinkles in compensations. Collaborating with the NCG, an overview of all available compensations for housing associations/tenants has been compiled, aiming for consistent application within Kr8. Over the years, the associations have collectively found a way to navigate, resulting in a more streamlined approach to the reinforcement task. All directors affirm that the reinforcement task is currently progressing quite satisfactorily. This is supported by figures from the NCG, who report that 40% of all addresses that have already been reinforced belong to housing associations (personal communication, January 31, 2024).

With the reinforcement task advancing steadily and the provision of compensations for tenants being taken care of, it appears that the most fundamental issues have been effectively dealt with. This means that there is room for the Kr8 associations to adopt a broader perspective. Beyond the mere technical aspects of reinforcement, the Kr8 associations are increasingly committed to enhancing liveability within these projects. The following section presents examples of initiatives.

4.8 Enhancing liveability in reinforcement projects

Housing associations dedicate a lot of time and effort to guiding their tenants through the reinforcement process. Meindert Molter, a resident participant at Lefier, mentions how at the very beginning of the reinforcement task, there was always someone from the housing association present when the NCG came to assess a house. To kind of 'protect' the tenant. This is no longer standard practice. Nowadays, a letter is sent from the NCG directly to the tenants stating that the NCG is coming by for assessment and that the association is aware of this (personal communication, January 23, 2024).

When the assessment indicates that a home requires reinforcement, the housing association takes on the task of communicating all information about the progress to their tenants. Resident counsellors maintain contact with residents through resident meetings, neighbourhood gatherings, newsletters, websites,

e-mails, information evenings, consultation evenings and conversations at the kitchen table. Additionally, the housing association assumes responsibility for arranging temporary housing, often utilizing the NCG's temporary homes for this purpose. When assigning residents to temporary accommodations, they strive to consider existing social networks to the fullest extent possible. They do this by means of a social network map. Residents who prefer living near one another are intentionally placed in proximity in temporary housing, while individuals who may not get along are deliberately situated as far apart as feasible. Efforts are also made to secure temporary housing within the same municipality as the resident's original home, facilitating familiarity and minimizing disruption to their routines.

Onno Bremmers from Woonzorg NL emphasizes the heightened significance of this aspect for his target group. Elderly individuals often rely heavily on their immediate surroundings. For them, more so than perhaps for other tenants, it is crucial to be offered temporary housing in their own village. Besides the proximity to amenities, legal regulations also come into play. Bremmers elaborates, *"When someone moves from Loppersum to Appingedam, they enter a completely different service area. The general practitioner from Loppersum doesn't serve in Appingedam, neither does the home care service or the cleaning company"* (personal communication, January 23, 2024). These are all things that have to be taken into account.

In addition, the housing associations organize various activities around the move and return. For instance, several directors of housing associations mention organizing a clean-up day, where the association sets up a container and coffee cart on the street to assist residents in tidying up their homes and gardens before they move to temporary housing. After residents have vacated, the housing associations ensure the upkeep of the gardens to prevent other local residents from being affected by the neglected maintenance associated with vacancy. Sometimes, there can be months or even years between residents leaving and the reinforcement or demolition-new construction process commencing. Upon residents' return to their (new) homes, housing associations also strive to provide a positive impetus. For example, Matthieu van Olffen (Wierden & Borgen) shared a notable example of organizing a garden day upon residents' return. "People could choose plants for their new garden for a maximum amount of around 100 euros. And a gardener was also present to

plant these items. It worked out really well" (personal communication, January 22, 2024). This initiative served a dual purpose: residents were pleased with their gardens and thus had a positive feeling upon return, and they had the opportunity to socialize with their new neighbours.

While the aforementioned actions represent commendable initiatives and are frequently met with enthusiasm and appreciation from tenants, they have not yet been systematically implemented. "We are still too reliant on opportunities that come our way, on people who approach us with an initiative rather than *initiatives originating from us*" emphasizes Matthieu van Olffen (personal communication, January 22, 2024). Additionally, housing associations often lack awareness of each other's actions and best practices. The parliamentary inquiry into gas extraction in Groningen, especially the emphasis on prioritizing the human aspect of the situation, motivated housing associations to elevate their ambition of enhancing liveability. In response, the Kr8 associations collectively decided to develop a 'Woonactieplan' (WAP).

At the time of writing this thesis, the Woonactieplan is in draft form. The manual is expected to be presented to State Secretary Vijlbrief and the municipalities in 2024 (Wierden & Borgen woningstichting, 2023). The next chapter will discuss its contents in more detail.

4.9 Conclusion

The objective of this chapter was to explore the question: How does the earthquake problem in Groningen affect the operations of housing associations, and what perspectives do they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues?

In total, there are 7,786 housing association homes in the reinforcement task of the NCG. 6,669 of these homes are owned by the Kr8 associations. The impact of the earthquakes on the real estate portfolio varies per association (for example, consider Goud Wonen versus Woonzorg NL). Contrary to initial assumptions, the explorative talks showed that the earthquakes do not primarily pose a financial challenge for the housing associations. In fact, they offer an opportunity for associations to renew their portfolio's at a relatively low cost thanks to the many regulations and subsidies available. Rather, the main challenges for housing associations arising from the earthquakes lie in the operationalization and the social domain.

Reinforcing houses was a complex task that none of the housing associations had previously undertaken. Especially in the beginning, there was considerable uncertainty regarding the scope of the reinforcement task (impact on the portfolio) and how to implement this new task within the organization. Initially, 5 out of the 6 associations chose not to create a new department but to integrate the reinforcement task into the regular process. However, additional employees were hired to handle the extra workload. Only Goud Wonen opted to outsource it.

It was in the uncertainty that the housing associations in the earthquake-affected region found solidarity. Forced by the AW and WSW to collaborate, the associations formed the 'Kr8' partnership. Up until that point, each association had been operating fairly independently. Within the earthquake dossier, they realized the strength in unity. The Kr8 associations decided to collaborate in the reinforcement effort, going beyond addressing the material damage to also acknowledging the immaterial damage their tenants suffer from. For example, they advocated for equalizing compensations for both tenants and homeowners. Surprisingly, housing associations are not legally responsible for addressing either material or immaterial damage caused by earthquakes. So why do housing associations take on this task themselves?

The explorative talks uncover that in the case of material damage, this has a very practical reason. Housing associations have their own maintenance portfolio strategies and perspectives. plans, Recognizing their role as housing providers, it makes sense for them to take on the reinforcement of their real estate themselves. In the case of immaterial damage, it is a combination of feeling responsible for the wellbeing of their tenants and overburdened healthcare networks in the region. Opinions differ on how far this responsibility extends. Associations on which the earthquake problem has small impact envisage a more passive role for themselves compared to those who experience greater impact.

However, it seems that the position each association takes is also determined by other factors, such as the size of the housing association and the number of resources they have available, as well as the personality of the director. Especially Groninger Huis advocates for examining what is possible from one's own responsibilities and actively seeking to be part of the solution. Together, the Kr8 associations have made substantial strides in addressing both material and immaterial damage in recent years. 40% of the addresses already reinforced in the total reinforcement task belong to the Kr8 associations. Considering that their share represents only 30% of the total, we can conclude that they are overperforming. Throughout their reinforcement efforts, they have prioritized facilitating the well-being of their tenants, striving to enhance liveability within these projects. While section 4.8 offers examples of commendable initiatives, the lack of standardization or unity in approach remains apparent. With the introduction of the 'Woonactieplan', the associations seek to fulfil their aspiration of further enhancing and professionalizing their approach to liveability.



SLOOP IS BETERY VOOR NUL OP DE METER!

CHAPTER 5

Liveability challenges of tenants in Groningen

Emphasizing the contextual nature of liveability, the literature review highlighted the importance of understanding the local context. It is crucial to comprehend the specific challenges inherent in the area, along with their underlying causes, before formulating plans. Typically, this understanding is achieved through a liveability assessment. This chapter will sequentially examine the different scales at which a liveability study can be conducted, the measuring tools available to assess liveability in the earthquake-affected area, and the approach adopted by the Kr8 associations. Ultimately, the results of the Kr8 association's study will be analysed to find an answer to sub-question 5: *What earthquake-related liveability challenges do tenants in Groningen encounter and what are their expressed needs and wishes?*.

5.1 Liveability assessment on different levels

Liveability assessments, as emphasized by Lowe et al. (2014), are instrumental in conducting needs evaluations and establishing policy objectives, priorities, and benchmarks. The assessments are conducted at various scales, offering valuable insights

Emphasizing the contextual nature of liveability, the literature review highlighted the importance of understanding the local context. It is crucial to comprehend the specific challenges inherent in the area, along with their underlying causes, before formulating plans. Typically, this understanding is achieved through a liveability assessment. This

> In the Netherlands, a similar assessment tool is the 'Leefbaarometer', developed by 'RIGO Research and Advies BV' and 'Atlas voor gemeenten' under the commission of the former Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning, and the Environment (Den Boer, 2023). The primary objective of the Leefbarometer is to offer a detailed assessment of the liveability in the Netherlands, down to a fine-grained level (100 x 100 meters). This assessment is based on a comprehensive range of factors pertaining to the residential environment, including the availability of amenities, local noise levels, and safety conditions (<u>https://www. leefbaarometer.nl/kaart/#kaart</u>). The Leefbaarometer serves as a tool for signalling and ongoing monitoring. Since its inception in 2008, the Leefbaarometer has



Figure 22: Groningen on the 2020 Leefbaarometer map (Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijkrelaties, 2023)

undergone two revisions, resulting in Leefbaarometer 3.0. This updated version comprises five dimensions: the physical environment, housing availability, amenities, social cohesion, and factors related to nuisance and safety. These dimensions encompass 45 distinct environmental characteristics, further divided into 94 indicators (Mandemakers et al., 2021).

In this research context, exploring what the Leefbarometer reveals about Groningen is quite fascinating. The 2020 map provides an interesting view, as shown in **figure 22**. Initially, it's important to note that all areas within the earthquake-affected region receive a rating of 'sufficient' or higher. The Ten Boer region even scores 'good', even though it is in the highest seismic risk zone (see **figure 8**). One might expect the categories related to the 'physical living environment' and 'safety' in this region to include factors that could lower the overall liveability score. However, the elements used in the Leefbaarometer assessment tool are general, making them fail to capture the aspects that make the region unique.

Fortunately, a liveability assessment tool specifically developed for Groningen exists in the form of a biennial survey administered by the municipality. Conducted under the banner of 'leefbaarheidsonderzoek,' this survey seeks to gather input from residents, specifically inquiring about their perceptions of the quality of life and safety.

The most recent 'leefbaarheidsonderzoek' was conducted in 2022. Over 130,000 residents, aged 18 and above, were invited to take part in this study (OIS Groningen, 2023). Each of these residents received a personalized letter at their homes, containing a unique login code that allowed them to complete the questionnaire online. Ultimately, 17,264 residents actively participated (OIS Groningen, 2023). The outcomes of the survey play an integral role in populating the 'Basismonitor Groningen,' a comprehensive online platform designed to make policy-relevant data sourced from the municipality of Groningen available (<u>https://</u> <u>basismonitor-groningen.nl/</u>). The 'Basismonitor' shows the state of affairs in 33 districts and neighbourhoods of the municipality of Groningen, encompassing elements such as safety, environmental quality, access to recreational amenities, healthcare provisions, and various other factors (Den Boer, 2023).

However, both the survey and the 'Basismonitor' are limited in scope to the municipality of Groningen, rather

than encompassing the entire province. Consequently, the 33 districts and neighbourhoods covered by the Basismonitor are situated exclusively in and around the city, excluding the earthquake-affected area (OIS Groningen, n.d.). Similar to the Leefbaarometer, the effects of earthquakes on liveability are thus not made visible.

5.2 Measuring the effects of gas extraction on liveability

It has been previously acknowledged that there is no suitable measuring tool available to assess the effects of gas extraction on liveability. In 2016, the Nationaal Coordinator Groningen (NCG) commissioned three researchers from the University of Leiden and Utrecht to conduct a methodological review of existing liveability studies that could potentially offer a more comprehensive understanding of the liveability within the earthquake-affected area. The research focused specifically on quantitative survey research among residents of the earthquake-affected area and the surrounding regions.

In their final report titled 'Het meten van de gevolgen van aardbevingen op de leefbaarheid in Groningen: Een methodologische review naar leefbaarheidsonderzoeken' (Assessing the Impact of Earthquakes on Liveability in Groningen: A Review of Liveability Studies) Lugtig, Bethlehem & Ter Mors compare different studies that were all initiated, to varying extents, in response to the earthquake challenges faced in Groningen. The aim of this comparative analysis was to assess the strengths and limitations of the chosen research designs to determine their suitability for informing policy and investment decisions.

The studies that were reviewed by Lugtig, Bethlehem & Ter Mors in 2017 are:

- 'Gronings Perspectief' (Groningen Perspective)
 Conducted by the University of Groningen in collaboration with the Public Health Service (GGD) and the 'Onderzoeksbureau Onderzoek en Statistiek' (O&S) Groningen.
- *Wonen en aardbevingen in Groningen' (Housing and Earthquakes in Groningen)* Carried out by OTB Delft in collaboration with CMO STAMM. This is a sub-report of the larger study 'Woningmarkt en leefbaarheidsonderzoek aardbevingsgebied Groningen' (Housing Market and Liveability Research in the Groningen earthquake zone)
 - 'Leefbaarheid en bevolkingskrimp in Groningen'

(Liveability and population decline in Groningen) - Conducted using the Groninger Panel by the 'Sociaal Planbureau Groningen' (Social Planning Office Groningen), a part of the research agency CMO STAMM.

'Onderzoek naar de tevredenheid met de schadeafhandeling door de NAM' (Study on satisfaction with the damage settlement by the NAM) - Conducted by the research firm APE Public Economics.

Overall, Lugtig, Bethlehem, and Ter Mors (2017) affirm that the combined findings of these studies consistently indicate that the liveability in specific areas of Groningen is encountering challenges, with earthquake-related damage linked to reduced housing satisfaction or health decline. The authors suggest that the four reviewed studies provide a solid foundation for understanding the liveability in and around the earthquake-affected area in Groningen (Lugtig, Bethlehem & Ter Mors, 2017). However, considering the current setup, along with the uncertain duration and associated funding, these studies are not suitable for effectively measuring how liveability might change in the upcoming years, let alone monitoring potential effects resulting from policy changes (Lugtig, Bethlehem & Ter Mors, 2017).

5.3 The approach of Kr8

The 6 housing associations active in the earthquakeaffected region have also considered various existing tools to map out the liveability of their portfolio in the earthquake effected area. For example, they explored the Leefbarometer 2.0, but they too noted its limitations. As Geja Hagedoorn, manager Living at Groninger Huis, explains: "Our work area appears entirely green on the map. However, we know this doesn't accurately reflect the reality" (Personal communication, November 13, 2023). In an attempt to address the absence of a proper measuring tool for liveability in the earthquakeaffected area, they decided to conduct home visits in various neighbourhoods and engage in discussions with tenants in May 2023 (May 22-May 25). "We thought, why not directly ask our tenants what challenges they encounter? And what needs and desires they have" states an employee of housing association Acantus "After all, this provides the best indication, even better than a standard measuring tool" (personal communication, January 30, 2024).

Engaging with tenants to assess the liveability of areas in the reinforcement task aligns closely with the

recommendations from Nij Begun, which underscore the significance of prioritizing people in reinforcement efforts (measure 11). Furthermore, it resonates with the definition of liveability outlined by the province of Groningen. In the 'Leefbaarheidsprogramma 2019 – 2023' (liveability program 2019 – 2023), the province describes liveability as the *"ability to live well in the province, both now and in the future"*. The province believes that what constitutes 'well' should be left to the residents to define.

This raises a number of critical questions. Firstly, whether merely accommodating people's preferences guarantees the formulation of an effective plan. Is what people want inherently the best option? And if it is, do people all want the same thing? These are questions that dr. Ir. Terry van Dijk (University of Groningen) also addresses in his research on participation. According to him, when organizations engage people, they need to consider four key factors: *why* they are doing it, *what* they are discussing, who they are involving, and how they are doing it. Generally, organizations have several reasons to engage in participation. They may cite legal obligations, the desire to prevent future disputes, or the anticipation of improved outcomes as motivating factors. While each of these rationales holds some validity, van Dijk (2024) argues that the primary purpose of participation should be to get to know each other. This argument is based on the fact that people can tolerate a lot, but not from a stranger. Participation should primarily aim to build mutual respect and trust.

Regarding the subject of participation, van Dijk (2024) suggests that it should align with the project's stage, clarifying what is open for discussion and what has already been decided. People can't always have a say on everything. Certain things are already decided, and that's okay too. Acknowledging that not everything can be subject to debate is crucial, just like the fact that not everyone can or should be involved. Determining the participants is equally important. Lastly, the method of participation warrants consideration. Participation processes can encompass various activities such as role-playing, voting, drawing, debating, walking, informal conversations over coffee, drafting texts, or formalizing agreements.

In the case of the Kr8 associations, the why and the what was to investigate what tenants perceive as essential for living safely, comfortably, and proudly in Groningen, the who consisted of tenants residing in the core of the earthquake area, and for the how, a combination of personal conversations and a questionnaire was chosen. A questionnaire consisting of 7 open-ended questions was devised:

- 1. What do you consider important for your home; now and in the future?
- 2. What do you consider important for your living environment; now and in the future?
- 3. What do you think should be prioritized first?
- 4. What can we, as housing association(s), do for you in this regard?
- 5. What is your vision for housing and life in Groningen, including for future generations?
- 6. What has been lost and what would you like to see restored?
- 7. What are you proud of as a resident of Groningen?

Instead of passively waiting for tenants to come forward and fill out the guestionnaire, the Kr8 associations took the initiative to proactively engage with tenants by reaching out to them directly. 10.000 letters were sent to tenants of the different associations residing in Delfzijl, Farmsum, Uithuizen, Appingedam, Ten Boer, Uithuizermeeden, Siddeburen and Loppersum, inviting them to participate. This proactive approach aimed to diversify input, steering clear of relying solely on the same 'active' tenants they usually interacted with (for example, those who are part of the tenants' organization). After sending out the invitations, 50 colleagues from Kr8 associations ventured into the beforementioned villages throughout a dedicated 'Kr8 week, actively engaging in conversations with 147 tenants. During these dialogues, the questionnaire served as a tool to guide the discussion, with the questions being filled out either by the tenant or the association employee facilitating the dialogue. In addition to the 147 physical questionnaires collected, another 116 individuals completed the online version of the questionnaire (Woonactieplan, 2023). In total,

263 tenants have been able to participate in this way. Hence, an extensive dataset is at hand. The response rates per question are visualized in **figure 23**.

NB: At the conclusion of the questionnaire, a section was allocated for tenants to furnish supplementary comments. Within this section, tenants had the option to disclose their name and residential address if inclined. Given the voluntary nature of this questionnaire, a substantial proportion of tenants abstained from providing such information. Consequently, it is impossible to differentiate between the neighbourhoods or districts in the data processing. Furthermore, there is no information available regarding the gender or age of the respondents. The data collected may thus lack certain demographic nuances that could have provided valuable context.

5.4 Data analysis – the approach

How the data analysis was conducted, is delineated in this section. A methodological approach was employed that aimed to systematically explore and categorize the collected data from the survey forms, hereby quantifying the gualitative data. Firstly, the survey forms were thoroughly reviewed for each individual respondent to gain an initial impression of the provided responses. Based on this initial analysis, it was decided to exclude question 5 and question 7 from the data analysis. Question 5: 'What is your vision for housing and life in Groningen, including for future generations?'because it is essentially a summary of questions 1 and 2 and people often repeated themselves here, and question 7: 'What are you proud of as a resident of Groningen?' because it is less directly related to the challenges faced by tenants and their needs and wishes.

Subsequently, a deeper analysis of questions 1,2,3,4 & 6 was conducted, examining the answers per specific question. If a particular theme was mentioned by at

1	97,70%
2	85,60%
3	72,60%
4	64,30%
5	76,00%
6	67,30%
7	73,80%

Figure 23: Response rate per question (own work)

least 5 respondents in their answers to that question, it The entire process is visually summarized in figure 24. was assigned a code. This iterative process resulted in the creation of a list of 22 codes, which functioned as representative labels for the various topics addressed by the respondents (open coding). The derived codes are as follows (in alphabetical order):

- Accessibility (public transport)
- Age-friendly
- A good neighbour(hood)
- Character
- Clarity
- Collaboration with other parties
- Facilities
- Facilities for youth
- Financial assistance
- Greenery
- Housing supply
- Layout of the house
- Maintenance and management
- Peace
- Putting people first
- Reinforcement (demolition/new construction or reinforcement and damage repair)
- Safety
- Space
- Sustainability
- Traffic
- Trust
- Other

Next, the answers were coded per question, with each response being assigned to the corresponding code or topic. Subsequently, the number of mentions of each topic per question was counted to gain insight into the frequency with which certain issues were raised. It is important to note that a respondent could mention multiple topics they considered relevant or important, potentially resulting in the total number of responses being higher than the number of respondents. In addition, a rule was applied where synonyms or related terms used by a respondent to denote a specific topic were considered as one count. For example, if a respondent mentioned multiple words such as 'energyefficient' and 'solar panels', these different expressions were considered as one mention of the overarching topic 'sustainability'. This approach minimized redundant counts and promoted an accurate representation of the key themes emerging from the collected data. Ultimately, this counting process was translated into a pie chart for each question, illustrating the 5 most frequently cited codes.



Figure 24: Visualisation of the data analysis process (own work)

The original data analysis can be found in **appendix F**.

Although the applied method of coding and categorizing responses was useful, there are some limitations. Firstly, it is challenging to develop a comprehensive list of codes. There is always a risk that certain information may be missed or overlooked due to ambiguity in responses. Furthermore, the personal background and experience of the researcher can influence the way the data is analysed, potentially resulting in some responses not being accurately coded.



Figure 25: Pie chart of tenants' responses to question 1 'what do you consider important for your home; now and in the future?' (own work)

5.5 What do tenants say?

The analysis of the surveys uncovered several valuable insights, which will be outlined in the following paragraphs. It's crucial to note that this list isn't exhaustive. The approach of Kr8 doesn't encompass all challenges faced by tenants or all aspects of liveability. However, considering the available resources, it's about maximizing the potential of what's currently accessible, and the resultant action points are in fact interesting.

In response to question 1: *What do you consider important for your home; now and in the future?*, tenants answered the following (see **figure 25**).

What immediately stands out from the pie chart is that sustainability is by far the most frequently mentioned topic. A total of 166 respondents identify this as important. In this context, tenants frequently emphasize the importance of reducing energy costs, highlighting aspects such as better insulation, solar panels, and heat pumps. Following in second place, with 67 mentions, is the layout of the house. Many tenants take this opportunity to share their wish list, including desires for a new kitchen, a more practical layout, and, notably, larger spaces, with the

housing associations. However, it's worth noting that these aspirations are not always equally relevant or realistic. Maintenance and management rank third, mentioned a total of 51 times. Respondents emphasize the significance of maintaining their homes and gardens, tackling concerns such as mold, moisture, and drafts, while also considering avenues for home improvement. Coming in fourth and fifth place, with 25 and 24 mentions respectively, are safety and reinforcement. Reinforcement in this context can refer to either demolition/reconstruction or reinforcement and damage repair.

These last two topics are specific to the situation in Groningen, unlike the previously mentioned themes. It's noteworthy that if the same question was asked elsewhere in the country, these two would likely not be mentioned. People emphasize the importance of their homes being free from damage and earthquakeresistant. Safety holds paramount importance in this regard, with several individuals expressing a preference for demolition and new construction.



Figure 26: Pie chart of tenants' responses to question 2 'What do you consider important for your living environment; now and in the future?' (own work)

In response to question 2: What do you consider mentioned 40 times. From the explanations, it appears important for your living environment; now and in the *future?*, tenants answered the following (see **figure 26**).

While the previous question revealed a notable difference, the responses to this second question demonstrate a narrower margin between the top two selections. Greenery is cited 67 times, closely trailed by maintenance and management with 66 mentions. Respondents' explanations indicate a significant correlation between the two topics. Tenants express a desire for increased greenery in their surroundings, but only if the green is properly maintained. They posit that inadequately maintained green spaces could have a negative impact on the living environment, contrary to the intended positive effect. Specifically, respondents advocate for more park-like green spaces, additional trees and bushes, and natural drainage solutions. Next to the upkeep of general greenery, the theme of maintenance encompasses the upkeep of gardens, roads, and sidewalks. Garden maintenance emerges as a primary concern for many respondents. Many people express annoyance at the inadequate upkeep of a neighbour's garden. They want the housing association considerate and respectful. They also find it pleasant to to address this issue. In third place is peace, which is have a mix of residents of different age groups.

that this relates 50/50 to disturbances caused by other tenants or disruptions caused by the reinforcement works. Tenants indicate that the liveability of the neighbourhood is affected negatively by both.

In fourth place are amenities for youth, distinguished as a separate sub-category from other amenities (such as supermarkets, shops, restaurants, etc.). The amenities for youth specifically are mentioned 36 times. A clear message emerges from the survey: there are few facilities for youth. Tenants express a desire for playgrounds, a skatepark, or youth clubs or entertainment venues in the area. In fifth place, with 33 mentions, is a good neighbour(hood). Tenants emphasize the importance of social interaction in the community; "Noaberschap" is the Groningen term for this concept. They value being able to simply borrow a cup of sugar from a neighbour, and a sense of coziness and solidarity in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, respondents mention that they prefer to maintain a level of cultural homogeneity in the neighbourhood, emphasizing the importance of people being



Figure 27: Pie chart of tenants' responses to question 3 'What do you think should be prioritized first?' (own work)

In response to question 3: *'What do you think should be prioritized first?'*, tenants answered the following (see **figure 27**).

In this question, sustainability once again takes the lead, being mentioned 59 times. Just like in guestion 1, respondents emphasize their desire to have more energy-efficient homes to reduce energy costs. Besides the solutions mentioned earlier (insulation, solar panels, and heat pumps), transitioning away from gas and supporting tenants' sustainability initiatives are also highlighted here. Maintenance and management rank second with 40 mentions. As observed in the responses to question 2, garden upkeep emerges as a significant concern for many respondents. They emphasize the urgency of addressing this issue promptly. Neglect is attributed not only to neighbours but also to prolonged vacancies resulting from reinforcement efforts. Respondents collectively advocate for measures to prevent vacancies and ensure ongoing maintenance by the housing associations. Additionally, similar concerns related to maintenance and management, such as addressing mold, moisture, and drafts, as well as maintaining sidewalks and streets, are reiterated, echoing the sentiments expressed in guestions 1 and 2.

In third place is reinforcement (referring to demolition/ reconstruction or reinforcement and damage repair), mentioned 35 times in this question. Tenants emphasize the need for quicker processes in both reinforcement efforts and damage repair. They express a preference for replacing outdated homes with more resilient and earthquake-resistant alternatives.

Following closely in fourth and fifth place are safety and greenery, each receiving 23 mentions. Safety concerns primarily revolve around earthquakes, although a few respondents extend this to encompass overall neighbourhood living conditions, like criminality. In discussing greenery, respondents advocate for more park-like spaces, additional trees and bushes, and natural drainage solutions, echoing sentiments expressed in question 2.



Figure 28: Pie chart of tenants' responses to question 4 'What can we, as housing association(s), do for you in this regard?' (own work)

In response to question 4: *'What can we, as housing association(s), do for you in this regard?'*, tenants answered the following (see **figure 28**).

Notable in this question is that the most frequently mentioned theme is one that did not come up in the other questions: putting people first. This is mentioned 43 times. A common sentiment expressed is that people do not feel taken seriously, highlighting an important task for housing associations. Tenants desire to feel that their concerns are earnestly considered and that they can trust the association to strive diligently to address their needs. They want the housing associations to engage with them, listen to them and advocate for them where necessary. Moreover, they wish to be actively involved in the decision-making process. Participation is a crucial requirement that holds a high priority on their list of expectations. In second place is a familiar theme: sustainability. This is mentioned 30 times. Since the homes are owned by the housing associations, they are held responsible by tenants for implementing desired insulation, solar panels, and heat pumps. In third place is maintenance and management, with 28 mentions. Repeating what is mentioned here would be redundant, as the sentiments

are exactly the same as in questions 1, 2, and 3. Just like with sustainability, housing associations are held accountable.

More interestingly, another 'new' theme ranks fourth: clarity. This is mentioned 17 times. Tenants expect better communication from the housing associations. It is expected that housing associations communicate what they know about what will happen to the property, that they are honest in this regard, that they do what they say, and that they say what they do. This involves making clear agreements and being transparent. Last but not least, reinforcement is mentioned again. With 16 mentions, this theme ranks fifth. Since the properties belong to the housing associations, tenants expect them to ensure the realization of the desired demolition /reconstruction projects or reinforcement and damage repair. Specifically, tenants have some additional wishes; for example, respondents state that housing associations should prioritize properties with energy labels E, F, and G in the reinforcement task and provide more assistance with relocation. They could also do better in offering suitable housing.


Figure 29: Pie chart of tenants' responses to question 6 'What has been lost and what would you like to see restored?' (own work)

In response to question 6: *What has been lost and what would you like to see restored?*, tenants answered the following (see **figure 29**).

In this question, amenities come out on top. This is mentioned 42 times. Respondents mention the disappearance of various amenities, such as shops, local supermarkets, bakeries, butchers, community centres, gyms, and healthcare facilities. It is striking that as second, a good neighbour(hood) is mentioned. This theme is mentioned 39 times. Respondents indicate that social contact in their neighbour(hood) or district has decreased, that the unity and solidarity are gone. The 'Noaberschap' referred to in an earlier question is gone and has been replaced by individualism. Ranking third, with 15 mentions, is the concept of character. Tenants express remorse over the disappearance of historic homes and farms, noting the significant transformation of the landscapes in earthquakeaffected areas. This sentiment underscores the value placed on the historical integrity of their living environments.

Greenery occupies the fourth position in this question, with 13 mentions. Respondents raise concerns about

the impact of the reinforcement efforts on natural landscapes, expressing apprehension regarding biodiversity loss and environmental degradation. Tenants advocate for greater attention to preserving green spaces. Lastly, trust emerges as the fifth-ranked theme, mentioned 11 times. Respondents express a profound erosion of trust across various institutions, including politics, government, municipality, and housing associations. This loss of trust is deemed unfortunate, reflecting a broader societal sentiment that warrants attention.

Although not explicitly mentioned in the question, it becomes evident from the survey answers that the reinforcement task plays a significant role in the disappearance of amenities, social interaction, neighbourhood character, greenery, and trust. The reinforcement task greatly affects the fabric of community life, a conclusion that is supported by the research of for example Gronings Perspectief.

A summary of the data-analysis can be found in **appendix G**.

5.6 Results in relation to Maslow's hierarchy of needs The integration of data analysis outcomes within a Maslow's hierarchy of needs framework offers a lens through which to interpret the findings. In question 1, t which delves into housing-related inquiries, a notable emphasis on security needs emerges, evident in t discussions about safety provisions and structural reinforcement. This underscores the foundational importance placed on safety and stability in the earthquake-affected area. Conversely, question 2, t focusing on the living environment, reveals a marked leaning towards social needs, as evidenced by mentions of promoting social cohesion and facilities for youth.

In question 3, delving into the prioritization of actions, there's a notable acknowledgment of the paramount importance of security needs. This correlation resonates with Maslow's hierarchy, emphasizing that addressing immediate safety concerns inherently takes precedence over social needs. The persistent emphasis on social needs in question 6 (related to what has been lost and what people would like to see restored) however highlights their enduring significance during the post-closure phase. Rather than solely addressing physical losses, respondents predominantly highlight intangible elements such as a good neighbour(hood), character and trust. Notably, in question 4, which examines the role of housing associations, ego-related needs emerge. Here, tenants express their desires for acknowledgment and status within the operations of housing associations.

In summary, the analysis underscores the paramount significance of addressing both security and social needs for tenants in the earthquake-affected area. While security understandably takes precedence, there's a notable longing for strong social connections and resilient community bonds. Before pursuits of egorelated needs and self-actualization can be realized, it's essential to first establish a solid foundation of fulfilled social and security needs.

5.7 Conclusion

In trying to answer the question: *What earthquakerelated liveability challenges do tenants in Groningen encounter and what are their expressed needs and wishes?* An important knowledge gap came to light. A review of multiple studies showed that currently, no assessment tool is available for measuring liveability in relation to the earthquakes in Groningen. Let alone tailored specifically for tenants.

From the ambition to draft a Woonactieplan, the Kr8 associations have attempted to bridge this gap in knowledge by disseminating a survey among their tenants and directly interacting with them to collect responses during the Kr8 week in May 2023. The survey, that focused on the question what tenants perceive as essential for living safely, comfortably, and proudly in Groningen, showed some interesting results. The four themes that appear in the top 5 of (more than) half of the questions are:

- Maintenance and management (4x);
- Sustainability (3x);
- Greenery (3x);
- Reinforcement (3x).

With the exception of the reinforcement theme, the raised concerns revolve around fundamental aspects that likely resonate with tenants in other regions of the country. Tenants prioritize the upkeep of their homes, value a green and well-maintained environment, and advocate for measures to make their homes more sustainable.

This observation stands in contrast to initial expectations. There was a prevailing anticipation that residents in these areas would express significant dissatisfaction and primarily focus on earthquakerelated issues in their responses. Even from the explorative talks with the directors, there was an anticipation for a different thematic emphasis. When asked about the principal concerns or challenges confronting tenants in Groningen (specifically; in the reinforcement area), most directors cited issues such as diminished trust, ambiguity, uncertainty, and protracted waiting periods. However, despite the presence of these sentiments in some of the responses, reality appears to be more nuanced.

This might be because the survey was designed to look at liveability more broadly, not just focusing on earthquakes or reinforcement. However, another reason could be that many people are actually quite satisfied. Despite the media often highlighting the challenges and hardships faced by residents in earthquake-affected areas, it's important to recognize that not everyone experiences the same level of distress or disruption. There are also many Groningers, even in areas needing reinforcement, who are living their lives quite normally and thus concern themselves with fundamental things like maintenance. An important consideration regarding the survey results is its generalizability. While gathering opinions from 263 tenants is commendable, it may not fully represent all tenants' perspectives across the six housing associations. To address this, the Kr8 associations organized an additional working session involving municipalities, the NCG, contractors, architects, and healthcare organizations to discuss the results. These partners are deeply engaged in the community and can provide valuable insights to assess challenges and understand overall sentiment. Considering these efforts, the survey serves as a solid foundation for the Woonactieplan.





The Woonactieplan

After exploring the earthquake-related liveability challenges that tenants in Groningen encounter, this chapter shifts its focus to the resulting policy document: the Woonactieplan. Spanning 30 pages, the plan outlines a long-term vision for tenants in Groningen and delineates specific measures in the physical and social domain aimed at ensuring a safe and pleasant future living environment (see **appendix H**). This chapter addresses the last two sub-questions. For clarity and organization of the chapter, a chronological structure has been adopted.

The first part of the chapter (sections 6.1 through 6.3) centres on the past of the Woonactieplan, looking into how it came about. It sequentially examines the rationale behind the Woonactieplan, the core themes and strategies that were defined and how these align with the survey data. This initial part seeks to address sub-question 6: *What strategies to enhance liveability are delineated by the Kr8 associations in the Woonactieplan and how do these align with the survey?*

In the second part of the chapter (sections 6.4 through 6.7), the focus shifts towards the present and future. This part examines the current status of the Woonactieplan and discusses debates on the next steps. The board meeting held on January 30, 2024, marks the outset. To further explore the next steps not only from the perspective of the housing associations but also involving the collaborative partners, a focus group is convened. The outcome of the focus group finally leads to the development of a step-by-step guide to areabased working, addressing sub-question 7: *What is the current status of the Woonactieplan and what is the preferred course of action?*.

6.1 Rationale behind the Woonactieplan

The rationale behind the plan is closely linked to the parliamentary inquiry, of which the final report was presented in February 2023. The main conclusion of the committee read that the interests of Groningen's residents have systematically been overlooked in the natural gas extraction process, and that if the earthquake issue had been taken seriously from the outset, much suffering could have been prevented. As a result, the committee concluded that the Netherlands h as a moral obligation to rectify its debt to Groningen (Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2023).

In the introduction of the Woonactieplan, the Kr8 associations state that they can and want to contribute to rectifying this debt to Groningen by achieving recognition, restoring trust, and providing perspective in the earthquake-affected area. The Kr8 associations emphasize the need for greater attention to the situation of tenants, who are often overlooked in earthquake-related matters. According to the Kr8, the distinct position of tenants compared to homeowners is evident in fundamental matters such as lease termination upon property demolition, differing compensation structures, lack of control over what is rebuilt, and the large-scale of reinforcement efforts (Woonactieplan, September 2023). The central message of the Woonactieplan is that addressing these challenges requires collective action and collaboration. Housing associations position themselves as an integral part of the solution, potentially serving as a bridge between various parties.

The decision to create a Woonactieplan was not solely based on goodwill. Naturally, there was also a financial motivation for the housing associations to participate. Through the Woonactieplan, the housing associations aimed to secure a portion of the funds allocated for the province. To increase their chances, the Kr8 associations ensured that the Woonactieplan was in line with the approach outlined in 'Nij Begun', a set of 50 measures presented by the government in response to the parliamentary inquiry. Specifically, the Woonactieplan corresponds to the following of the Nij Begun measures:

- 12. More customization to counter differences;
- 13. More attention to spatial quality during reinforcement;
- 14. Extra money for liveability and neighbourhood development;
- 15. Extra money for restoration of public space after completion of the reinforcement;
- 20. No juridification;
- 21. More influence and better information;
- 22. Better support by IMG, NCG, and SNN with one desk;
- 27. A strong safety net for those who need it;
- 28. Making homes that still need reinforcement gas-free(-ready);
- 29. Encouragement of sustainability for homes in Groningen and North Drenthe.

(Financiële onderbouwing van het Woonactieplan, September 2023).

In the process of writing the plan, the Kr8 associations • also ensured to align with the government's directives. The parliamentary inquiry underscored the importance of prioritizing people in finding solutions. This principle was embraced by the Kr8 associations by developing the plan bottom-up. In preparation for the plan, the Kr8 corporations organized a Kr8 week, during which over 50 employees ventured into 8 different villages in the earthquake-affected area (Delfzijl, Farmsum, Uithuizen, Appingedam, Ten Boer, Uithuizermeeden, Siddeburen, and Loppersum) and actively engaged in conversations with 147 tenants. The main goal was to investigate what tenants perceive as essential for living safely, comfortably, and proudly in Groningen. The conversations were structured using a questionnaire consisting of 7 open-ended questions. In addition to the 147 physical questionnaires collected, another 116 individuals completed the online version of the questionnaire (Woonactieplan, 2023). In total, 263 tenants were able to participate in this manner.

After gathering the voices of 263 tenants during the Kr8 week, an additional working session with collaboration partners such as the municipalities, NCG, contractors, architects and healthcare organizations was organized in June 2023. During this working session, the outcomes of the Kr8 week were discussed and translated into specific points of focus.

6.2 Core themes and strategies

The aforementioned process resulted in the identification of four core pillars for the Woonactieplan: trust, social foundation, living environment and housing. The Woonactieplan delineates the specific actions that the Kr8 associations aim to undertake for each pillar. The following enumeration provides a summary:

- The housing associations aim to enhance *trust* by: Unconditionally supporting tenants, involving them in decisions, making and fulfilling clear agreements, listening to their concerns, being accountable, and simplifying communication. Additionally, the housing associations aspire to have a regular physical presence in neighbourhoods and villages, ideally on a structural basis, but at least annually.
- The housing associations aim to safeguard the *social foundation* by: Investing in social infrastructure (such as a community centre) and taking existing social networks into account in the planning process.

- The housing associations aim to contribute to a pleasant *living environment* by: Integrating the preservation of character into the planning process (through early involvement of master builders, urban planners, and architects that are familiar with the character of Groningen's neighbourhoods and villages). Additionally, the housing associations aim to keep supporting residents where needed, for example in maintaining gardens or addressing nuisances.
- The housing associations aim to enhance the *housing* experience by: Guiding tenants through the reinforcement process from start to finish. In cases where tenants are confronted with demolishment and new construction, they aim to have tenants at the drawing board, with space for individual preferences and needs.

(Woonactieplan, September 2023).

The Woonactieplan also delineates clear prerequisites. The Kr8 associations emphasize that, beyond a change in mindset, actions, and aspirations, they need financial support, space, and trust from the government to implement the Woonactieplan effectively. Reducing regulation and bureaucracy are presented as essential to encourage creativity, innovation, and customized solutions. Specifically, the Kr8 associations ask for a fund free from bureaucratic obstacles.

6.3 Alignment with survey data

From the contents of chapter 5 and the summary of the data analysis (see **appendix G**), it can be observed that there are four themes that are most frequently mentioned in the questionnaires. According to tenants, maintenance and management, sustainability, greenery, and reinforcement (referring to demolition / reconstruction or reinforcement and damage repair) are necessary to live safely, comfortably, and proudly in Groningen. Maintenance and management is mentioned most frequently, appearing in the top 5 answers for four out of the five questions in the questionnaire (see pie charts in chapter 5). The remaining themes - sustainability, greenery and reinforcement - all appear in the top 5 answers for three out of the five questions in the questionnaire (see pie charts in chapter 5), suggesting they are equally significant. Given that the Woonactieplan delineates trust, social foundation, living environment, and housing as its pillars, it can be concluded that these do not align in a one-to-one manner with the findings of the questionnaires.

However, this divergence does not inherently connote a negative implication. As highlighted in chapter 3 (paragraph 5.3 'the approach of Kr8', section three about the research by dr. Ir. Terry van Dijk (2024)), merely accommodating people's preferences does not guarantee the formulation of an effective plan. While tenants provide valuable input, they generally lack expertise in real estate or spatial development. Furthermore, tenants sometimes struggle to see the big picture. This becomes evident from the inclusion of personal grievances (such as disputes with neighbours) in the questionnaires. Another challenge that was highlighted by van Dijk (2024) is the lack of uniformity in people's wishes and desires. This variability also becomes apparent in the data analysis. Apart from question 1, 'What do you consider important for your *home; now and in the future?*, where sustainability was overwhelmingly prioritized, the differences between themes are relatively minor across all questions. Ultimately, incorporating the housing associations' own perspective and that of their collaborative partners might be crucial to accentuate and formulate a plan that can be effectively applied.

Given the aforementioned, the lack of direct correspondence between the pillars of the Woon actie planand the themes identified in the questionnaires may be justifiable. However, such justification hinges upon it being an intentional decision. Hence, it is crucial to investigate whether the decision-making process was intentional or if inconsistencies in data processing may have been responsible for muddling the clarity of the themes, leading to different outcomes. In this context, a few interesting things come to light.

The digital questionnaires were crafted by a communication agency (Vonc) using Google Forms and subsequently distributed via email. Following the conclusion of the Kr8 week, the online forms were closed, and the resultant data was securely stored on a dedicated server. Access to the gathered responses was exclusively facilitated through Vonc, ensuring control over data accessibility and confidentiality. After the questionnaires had been administered, Vonc undertook the task of summarizing the findings. Their approach mirrored the methodology employed within the present report, involving the identification of themes, subsequent coding of responses, and quantitative enumeration of each theme's frequency. This process effectively served to quantify the qualitative data obtained, offering insights into of direct correspondence between the Woonactieplan the themes that tenants deemed most significant. and the themes identified in the questionnaires.

However, an oversight in Vonc's summary pertains to the inclusion of personal details such as names, email addresses, and, in some cases, residential addresses of residents on the final page. Such dissemination of sensitive information contradicts the intended confidentiality of the survey data. The rationale behind outsourcing the task of creating, distributing and summarizing the questionnaire to an external entity rather than engaging an individual involved in the Woonactieplan's development remains unclear.

Interestingly, a distinct approach was adopted with the physical questionnaires. After the Kr8 week, the physical questionnaires were collected by one of the individuals involved in the development of the Woonactieplan and stored in a private workspace. No backup of the forms was created, and no effort was made to digitize them. Despite reports of review, they were neither summarized nor quantified for use in the Woonactieplan. When asked about this decision, the prevalent explanation emphasized the qualitative nature of the data. The primary objective of the Kr8 week was not to gather quantitative metrics; instead, housing associations sought qualitative insights through tenant narratives, fostering a responsive and empathetic engagement process. While this rationale may be understandable, it doesn't solve the question about the disparate treatment of digital versus physical data. After all, isn't the digital data just as qualitative in nature? Moreover, when making this choice, one must exercise caution with statements such as "this is frequently mentioned by our tenants..." or "the questionnaire indicated that this is a prominent *theme..."*. If you intend to make assertions along those lines, they should be grounded in quantitative analysis.

By limiting the quantification to the digital forms alone (116 out of 247), a substantial portion of the data was overlooked. It is believed that this oversight resulted in the inadvertent emphasis on certain themes while simultaneously neglecting others. For example, it stands out that maintenance and management, which emerged as the most frequently mentioned topic in the overall data analysis, scarcely resurfaces in the Woonactieplan. Conversely, the themes of trust and social foundation have received significant emphasis as pillars within the Woonactieplan despite not emerging as frequently mentioned topics from the data analysis. It it is suggested that errors in data processing, rather than deliberate intent, may account for the lack

6.4 Current state

Then on to the present, the current state of the Woonactieplan. The most recent version of the plan dates back to September 2023, with no significant changes made since then. It is unclear whether this September 2023 version is the final one to be shared with State Secretary Vijlbrief in 2024, or if there is still an intention to share the plan with Vijlbrief at all. To the outside world, it seems like the progress of the Woonactieplan has 'stalled'. This sentiment was confirmed during a meeting with the tenant organizations on March 28, 2024, in Delfzijl, where tenants openly questioned the lack of progress since the Kr8 week almost a year ago.

The Kr8 associations defend their stance by stating that while significant progress has been made, this has mainly happened internally. This has to do with the fact that there's a need for a shift in mindset before tangible actions can occur. The Kr8 associations are just now beginning to transition towards concrete actions. As a result, there aren't any direct examples of actions coming from the Woonactieplan yet. Nonetheless, the Kr8 associations state that both individual associations and collaborative partners have undertaken numerous initiatives aligned with the plan's principles. One of the subsequent steps therefore involves gathering and consolidating these instances as 'best practices' to illustrate to tenants the (potential) impact of the Woonactieplan. In line with this, the Kr8 associations intend to organize a 'reinforcement café' before the summer of 2024. During this event, employees of the associations and collaborative partners will work on a specific case. Ultimately, actions should be implemented not only individually but also collectively and systematically, rather than sporadically.

The stalled progress of the Woonactieplan indicates once again how challenging the translation from plan to reality can sometimes be. An extra complicating factor in this case is the perceived loss of momentum. In the aftermath of the parliamentary inquiry, when the government began allocating funds for Groningen, the Kr8 associations had yet to finalize the Woonactieplan. This meant that the Kr8 associations couldn't specify what their role was going to be or what (financial) support they desired from the government when asked (personal communication, January 15, 2024). Now, the opportunity has elapsed. Government funding is currently intertwined with the agendas associated with Nij Begun, and since the housing associations have not been part of the negotiations so far, it is improbable that

a distinct funding allocation for the Woonactieplan will materialize. Although this is a setback, the Kr8 associations indicate that they want to proceed with the Woonactieplan even without government funding. However, in that case, the ambitions will need to be adjusted and budgets will need to be allocated within all Kr8 associations (personal communication, January 16, 2024). A significant portion of these budgets is anticipated to come from the liveability budgets (board meeting, January 30, 2024).

But besides the perceived loss of momentum, there are other factors at play that prevent the Woonactieplan progressing. Firstly, there has been a from notable reshuffle in the personnel working on the Woonactieplan, disrupting the progress. In addition, key questions regarding ownership of the Woonactieplan, the delineation of responsibilities between individual housing associations and Kr8 as a collective entity and the alignment of the Woonactieplan with other regional initiatives dominate the discourse. Rather than the contents of the plan, the foremost concern on everyone's agenda seems to be the bigger picture. Several decisions will need to be made at the governance level (Kr8-wide) before the Woonactieplan can proceed further.

6.5 Debates on the next step

During the board meeting of January 30, 2024, it was suggested to transform the Woonactieplan (WAP) into a kind of tool. A 'fan' to link the 4 agendas from Nij Begun (social, economic, recovery, and sustainability). This would ensure the coherence of the Woonactieplan with other plans in the region, increasing its relevance. However, Nij Begun operates with an entirely different scope than the Woonactieplan. The plans from Nij Begun encompass the entire province of Groningen, including the head of Drenthe. This would mean that the Woonactieplan would need to be scaled up from Kr8 to the G13 and then also include the head of Drenthe.

Here, the question arises whether this is feasible, but also whether it is even desirable. The Woonactieplan was drafted by the Kr8 associations as a plan based on insights gathered from its tenants residing in the core of the earthquake-affected area. While 80% of the strategies employed might be generally applicable, 20% of the issues that the Woonactieplan addresses are specific to this group and region. As highlighted in chapter 3, effectively enhancing liveability requires tailored approaches suited to the specific needs and circumstances of each area. Another hurdle for this scenario is the evident lack of widespread adoption of the Woonactieplan within Kr8. In various meetings, it became apparent that the understanding and impact of the plan vary significantly among the different Kr8 associations. If the Kr8 associations struggle to rally support for the Woonactieplan within their own spheres of influence, how do they intend to advocate for it to the G13 and the northern region of Drenthe?

It is argued here that before even starting the discussion of whether or not to scale up the Woonactieplan, it is imperative that it gains solid traction within the Kr8. In order to achieve this, it is suggested that an organizational change is necessary. In the current arrangement, two out of the four individuals tasked with working on the Woonactieplan are external. Although they are highly capable, they lack the authority within the various organizations to effectuate change. During the board meeting of January 30, 2024, Matthieu van Olffen suggested that for the Woonactieplan to succeed it is essential to appoint dedicated individuals from each Kr8 association to collaborate on its implementation (personal communication, January 30, 2024). By assigning internal personnel to the task, it becomes easier to gather support for the plan. Laura van Broekhuizen added to this that it's also an opportunity for internal staff to contribute to something very meaningful and complex (personal communication, January 16, 2024).

In light of these discussions, the board of directors has proposed a new organizational structure in April 2024 (see **figure 30**). This structure distinguishes several working groups, some of which already existed, others are splits, and others are entirely new. In the proposed new structure, the Woonactieplan lands under the working group 'Groningen area-based approach and liveability', which consists of all the housing managers from the different Kr8 associations and a few communication advisors.

Regarding the task assigned to this working group, the directors have indicated that members of the group should start by reassessing the Woonactieplan, evaluating its alignment with the current context and objectives. Additionally, Anita Tijsma has emphasized the necessity for clearer interventions linked to the stated goals, stating: "Even within the soft domain of liveability, it is still possible to implement concrete measures" (personal communication, January 30, 2024). It is suggested that perhaps, the 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' by Aedes (see appendix A) could serve as an example in this regard. During the board meeting of January 30, 2024, it was discussed and agreed upon by the directors that the working group should dedicate a few hours per week to bridging the information gap between the various associations and involving collaborative partners. Last but not least, the need to reintegrate a financial chapter was discussed.



Figure 30: Proposed new organisational structure Kr8 (own work)

Originally included in the Woonactieplan, this chapter was deleted as it was branded 'a mere means to secure funding', which would overshadow the plan's focus. However, for a plan to be effectively implemented, a comprehensive understanding of the financial landscape and resource requirements is indispensable. This perspective was notably highlighted by Matthieu van Olffen (personal communication, January 30, 2024).

6.6 Focus group – the approach

The previous sections (6.4 and 6.5) provided an overview of the current status of the Woonactieplan and sketched a preferred course of action informed by insights gathered from housing associations. However, to ensure a comprehensive understanding, it is imperative to also incorporate perspectives from collaborative partners. To facilitate this, a focus group session was organized on Wednesday, April 17, 2024, from 9:00 to 10:30 at the Wierden and Borgen office in Bedum. The purpose of the focus group was to assess collaborative partners' engagement with the Woonactieplan and explore the opinions of the key stakeholders on how the transition from plan to reality can be realized. Questions such as 'What is already being done?', 'What exemplary cases can we share with each other?', 'Where is there still room for improvement?' and 'How can we shape this *collectively?*' were central to the discussion.

In the selection of participants, attention was directed towards the attendee lists of the previous year's Woonactieplan conference held in Scharmer. Those who had attended and expressed a willingness to contribute to future discussions were approached for inclusion in the focus group. The aim was to assemble a diverse group of individuals, ensuring representation from each collaborating partner. Invitations were extended to a diverse array of stakeholders via e-mail, including the NCG, the IMG, the HPAG, the municipalities of Eemsdelta and Groningen, Cadanz Welzijn, KAW, Rizoem, and Plegt-Vos. In addition, Geja Hagedoorn was asked to join the session as a representative of the housing associations and Judith Adema was appointed to lead the session. Ultimately, 8 individuals attended, with Plegt-Vos, IMG, and the municipalities unable to participate. Unfortunately, the absence of the municipality was a recurring theme throughout the research process. This likely stems from constraints in capacity rather than reluctance, highlighting the considerable burden faced by municipalities in the earthquake-affected region, leaving little room for additional engagements. The nonattendance of

Plegt-Vos and IMG, though regrettable, holds lesser significance given their comparatively peripheral role in this context.

The focus group was structured as follows. First, there was some time allocated for arrival and welcome. The space in which the focus group session took place featured a large, high table with bar-style seating for ten people, a screen, and a whiteboard wall complete with markers and magnets. The wall already displayed the various activities planned for the session (see **figure 31**). The setting provided an opportunity for informal networking over coffee or tea. Following this, participants were asked to sit down and Judith provided a concise overview of the session's objectives and format, extending a formal welcome. A brief introductory round ensued, during which each participant briefly introduced themselves and outlined their connection to the subject matter.

During the first fifteen minutes of the session, Judith delivered a short presentation on the Woonactieplan, offering insights into its current status and developments since the previous year's meeting. Judith emphasized that in recent months, the Kr8 associations have primarily focused on internal deliberations regarding the Woonactieplan, with an emphasis on shifting perspectives rather than immediate action. She elaborated that the Kr8 associations are now transitioning into the phase of implementing change and emphasized the importance of collaboration with their partners in this endeavour. As part of the presentation, a visual aid in the form of a 'praatplaat' containing the key elements of the Woonactieplan was distributed among the participants (see **appendix I**). Notably, no PowerPoint or other presentation tool was utilized.

Following this, it was time to engage the participants in activities. The participants were asked to take an active stance. Two activities had been prepared to conduct during the one-hour session. The first, titled 'theme ranking', involved participants engaging with the data gathered during the Kr8 week. The idea of this activity was to assess whether the collaborative partners have a good grasp of what concerns and wishes tenants in the earthquake-affected area have. On the whiteboard wall, five A4 sheets were displayed, each featuring different themes: greenery, amenities, accessibility, a good neighbour(hood), and maintenance & management (see **figure 31**). Participants were asked, *"Which theme do you think was most frequently*



Figure 31: Photo collage focus group session (photos taken by author)

mentioned by tenants in response to the question 'what do you consider important for your living environment, now and in the future?". They were then tasked with collaboratively ranking the themes from most to least mentioned. In the second activity, titled 'liveability statement', participants were asked to respond to the statement *Tiveability in Groningen (specifically, in the context of reinforcement projects) includes the same parameters as in the rest of the country*. The purpose of this activity was to reflect on the generalizability of the results to other contexts. Both activities yielded interesting results, which will be discussed in section 6.7.

The final 5 minutes of the focus group session were allocated for Q&A and concluding remarks. Participants were encouraged to express their last thoughts, concerns, and ideas regarding the Woonactieplan. In conclusion, all attendees were sincerely thanked for their valuable contributions and participation.

6.7 Focus group findings

In this section, the results of the focus group will be shared and reflected upon. For organizational clarity, the results are categorized into 'activity 1: theme ranking', activity 2: liveability statement' and 'other'.

6.7.1 Activity 1: theme ranking

In activity 1, titled 'theme ranking', the participants were asked "Which theme do you think was most frequently mentioned by tenants in response to the question 'what do you consider important for your living environment, now and in the future?". They were then tasked with collaboratively ranking the themes from most to least mentioned. The idea of this activity was to assess whether the collaborative partners have a good grasp of what concerns and wishes tenants in the earthquake-affected area have.

The participants ranked the themes in the following order: a good neighbour(hood) at number one, maintenance and management and green tied for second place, facilities at three, and accessibility at four. Based on the data analysis, the order would have been: green at number one (67x), closely followed by maintenance and management in second place (66x), with facilities at three (62x), a good neighbour(hood) at four (33x), and accessibility at five (15x). The attentive reader may have observed that two themes, 'accessibility' and 'facilities', mentioned here were not among the top 5 in Chapter 5's discussion of question 2: What do you consider important for your living environment, now and in the future?'. In the original top 5, 'peace' and 'facilities for youth' were featured. The inclusion of 'accessibility' instead of 'peace' and the integration of 'facilities' in general aimed to enrich complexity of the activity, as these aspects are frequently emphasized in media discussions.

A visualization comparing the sequence determined by the participants (left) and the sequence following from the data analysis (right) is presented in **figure 32**.





The first thing that stands out is that the participants give maintenance and management and greenery an equal place in the ranking. This is consistent with the minimal difference found between the two themes in the data analysis (67 mentions for greenery compared to 66 mentions for maintenance and management). When asked to explain this ranking, participants emphasized the interconnectedness of the themes. People find greenery in their living environment very important, provided it is well-maintained. The subsequent discussion revealed that in practice, properly coordinating the maintenance of greenery can be a challenge. Particularly, there is room for improvement in the alignment among different stakeholders. KAW provided an example of a hedge that was pruned by three different parties: one side was maintained by the municipality, the other side by the housing association, and tenants were expected to tend to the top themselves. This situation is hilarious yet untenable. Ideally, responsibility for the maintenance of greenery should be consolidated under a single entity.

In contemplating why greenery and maintenance ranked higher than a good neighbour(hood) by tenants, it was first jokingly noted that the Dutch place great value on a tidy street or garden. Then, the reinforcement task was suggested as a plausible explanation. If coordinating efforts is already challenging under normal circumstances, it is reasonable to anticipate greater difficulties during reinforcement even initiatives. The data analysis indeed confirms that most problems with greenery and maintenance are related to the 'pause mode' that the reinforcement task brings along. For example, tenants indicated in the questionnaires that when the fate of a row of houses remains uncertain, maintenance of both the dwelling and the surroundings is halted either by the housing association or the tenant itself. Tenants also report instances where, after a row of houses has been cleared out to reinforce or demolish, the gardens receive no attention, much to the dismay of neighbouring residents who often witness the subsequent decline. Both scenarios are recognized by the participants of the focus group session, especially the HPAG. KAW even offered a third scenario, noting that there are also instances where people don't face an unkept landscape, but rather a desolate one when neighbours decide to relocate their plants and shrubbery with them. Nevertheless, the outcome remains an unsightly view and a significant liveability concern.

To mitigate the decline, KAW proposed the employment of a neighbourhood concierge, ideally a proactive resident, equipped with a modest budget and hand tools to maintain the green and rectify minor inconveniences like overhanging branches or uneven tiles. This is a winwin situation, as it increases residents' involvement in the neighbourhood, offers a form of daily activities, and improves the neighbourhood. Cadanz further added to the discussion that it is important to enhance tenants' comprehension and acceptance through transparent communication. An illustrative case involved the partial mowing of a lawn to restore the other half to its natural state, fostering biodiversity in the redeveloped area. Regrettably, this initiative was not communicated to the residents, leading to the perception of neglect. As a result, complaint after complaint was filed, but once it was explained, people found it to be a good idea.

Moving on to the theme that ranked third in the data analysis and was also ranked third by the participants during the focus group session: facilities. No one was surprised to see this topic in the top three. While exacerbated by seismic events, the participants pointed to the fact that the disappearance of facilities has long been a concern in Groningen, as it is rooted in the broader issues that the province faces (see section 4.5 on the BWI). The revelation that the data analysis highlighted a specific need for facilities catering to children also resonated with the participants. However, a debate regarding what type of facility ensued. Cadanz contended that simply installing conventional playground equipment falls short. They stressed the significance of seeking interconnections with water management, exemplified by initiatives like rain gardens and natural play areas. The other parties welcomed this idea with enthusiasm, emphasizing that by combining various aspects in this way, a lasting impact can be achieved.

The most notable deviation between the sequence as estimated by the participants and the sequence derived from the data analysis was the theme 'a good neighbour(hood)'. While the participants ranked this as the top priority, it emerged as fourth in the data analysis. This elicited a surprised reaction. All participants had expected residents to place more emphasis on this. When asked why they had anticipated this, they referred to the fact that the questionnaires were conducted among tenants in the earthquake-affected area and that from experience, they know that in reinforcement projects, more than in regular neighbourhood renewal, social structures are disrupted. In this context, Rizoem

urged for more attention to be given to the period spent in temporary housing. Rizoem pointed to the fact that all attention is often directed towards the 'new' neighbourhood, to ensure everything there is arranged properly. However, what is often overlooked is that people sometimes spend up to 2 years in temporary housing. Rizoem mentioned that, on behalf of Goud Wonen, they have in the past organized meetings in temporary housing, which were very well received by residents.

Expanding on the discussion regarding which stages of the process require more attention, the NCG expressed the belief that there should be more aftercare. It is pointed out that residents are well guided before the move, but there is no further follow-up afterwards. Drawing the comparison to buying a luxury car, they noted that often you are contacted sometime after the purchase to inquire about your satisfaction and if everything is alright. The parties agreed that a similar follow-up should ideally occur in the case of reinforcement projects. KAW shared a notable example of a project they are undertaking on behalf of another housing association in Delfzijl, where they visit residents six months after they have moved into their new homes to check how they are doing.

The theme of accessibility was placed last by the participants. In the official data analysis, this theme did not even make it to the top 5. As explained before, it was included in this activity to enhance complexity. Participants discerned that despite the frequent portrayal of accessibility as a prominent issue in the media, other themes carry greater significance for tenants. Consequently, no further discussion ensued on this particular topic.

6.7.2 Activity 2: liveability statement

In activity 2, titled 'liveability statement', the participants were asked to respond to the statement *'liveability in Groningen (specifically, in the context of reinforcement projects) includes the same parameters as in the rest of the country'.* The purpose of this activity was to reflect on the generalizability of the results to other contexts.

In response to the question of whether liveability in Groningen encompasses the same parameters as in the rest of the country, a lively discussion ensued. Cadanz was quick to highlight that there is no universally agreed-upon definition of liveability. Instead, the crucial aspect is to understand from residents what liveability means in their specific area or what they deem necessary. This perspective, echoed in the province of Groningen's definition (referenced on page 58), garnered unanimous support from all participants. Particularly, the HPAG reiterated the importance for housing associations to actively engage with tenants and pursue an area-based approach. Furthermore, Cadanz emphasized the need to not only assess what is required but also recognize the community's capacity for self-action, underscoring the necessity for a local 'leader' - a sentiment reaffirmed by the HPAG.

In the same discussion, the significance of consistent evaluation was highlighted. While there may be a sustained demand for a soccer field over a decade, by the 11th year, with the youth aging, there might emerge a new preference to cultivate fruit trees in that very area. When examining the list of themes derived from the data analysis in 2023 (activity 1), the participants concurred with the researcher that they do not seem unique to the earthquake-affected area. Similar results could also have been obtained if the survey had been conducted elsewhere in the Netherlands. The housing associations' representative then suggested that perhaps it could be said that approximately 80% of the issues pertinent to addressing liveability are general concerns, while the remaining 20% are specific to the locality and call for customized solutions.

KAW responded to this statement by emphasizing that, in their view, the primary distinction in liveability in Groningen lies not so much in the content as in the context. While the thematic concerns may be similar, the operational environment for organizations trying to enhance liveability is markedly different. KAW identified people's distrust in institutions, the temporary nature of the situation, and the accompanying uncertainty as the most significant factors. According to KAW, addressing liveability poses a formidable challenge when trust is so low, and prospects for the future are so bleak that people are reluctant to participate. This reluctance to participate is further exacerbated by the feeling of being unable to exercise autonomy over one's own life, which is unique to the situation in Groningen and specifically to the situation of tenants in Groningen. Being informed that you must relocate to temporary housing outside the village due to the demolition of your old home carries a different weight than if you could make that decision yourself. But to enhance liveability, an impetus from the people is also essential. So, if that drive is absent, where does one begin?

The NCG added nuance by noting that this sentiment does not apply universally to all Groningers. They emphasized that media often portray Groningers as victims, downtrodden, whereas many residents do not see themselves this way. The rest of the participants echoed this perspective. It's not all doom and gloom; there are also many positive initiatives that saw the light in the reinforcement task. However, improving liveability demands greater investment in time, effort, and collaboration than in a 'normal' situation, as emphasized by Cadanz Welzijn. Nevertheless, all participants agree that there are already numerous commendable examples to highlight. The HPAG concluded the discussion with a clear call to action: the Housing Action Plan began almost a year ago, progress has been made, much is underway, but it's essential to ensure that this progress is visible and reaches the residents. Let's compile these and showcase what has already been achieved or is happening in the area.

6.7.3 Other

This last section delves into two additional noteworthy points of feedback from the collaborative partners, which do not directly correspond to the conducted activities. The first was a call to keep engaging with tenants. This came from KAW and Rizoem. KAW pointed out that the Kr8 associations often express a sense of obligation to provide updates or have specific agendas when visiting tenants. In response, KAW emphasized the significance of such visits as opportunities to demonstrate good landlordship. This entails checking in on tenants' well-being and attentively listening to their concerns without any preconceived agenda. Linked to the imperative of ongoing tenant engagement is a noteworthy observation by Rizoem. They underscored that the insights gleaned from the data collected during the Kr8 week are already a year old. This raises pertinent questions about the current relevance of the identified themes. Has the focus not shifted in the intervening period? Rizoem suggested that ideally, housing associations should systematically, or at least annually, engage with neighbourhoods and communities to solicit feedback from their tenants.

The second call came from the NCG and related to how housing associations position themselves. The NCG indicated that housing associations can and even should take a firmer stance when it comes to the theme of liveability. According to the NCG, it's essential for housing associations to clearly define in their agreements the actions needed to improve liveability within a project, along with the allocated budgets. Interestingly, the NCG humorously acknowledged that there might be initial resistance to such demands, but ultimately compromises could be reached. The same applies to the performance agreements made with the municipality and the tenant organizations.

A final observation pertains to inconsistencies in the presentation of data collected during the Kr8 week. Discrepancies were noted between the reported figures and the data analysis outlined in this report. For instance, it was stated that 160 conversations with tenants took place, while the actual data indicates 147 live conversations. More significantly, it was said that the Kr8 week data primarily comprised conversations rather than formal questionnaires, despite the existence of 273 completed questionnaires. Furthermore, the housing associations themselves asserted that the study lacked statistical validity, although this claim warrants further investigation. On one hand, there seems to be a tendency to downplay the findings, while on the other hand, there are instances of overstating results. For example, claims were made regarding significant variations between areas based on the questionnaires, yet this cannot be verified due to the lack of address information. Additionally, in response to a query from Rizoem about tailoring action plans for each area, an affirmative response was provided. However, this assertion contradicts the overarching nature of the Woonactieplan for the earthquakeaffected area, which typically does not differentiate between locations such as Farmsum and Tuikwerd.

6.8 Conclusion

The objective of this chapter was to analyse and comprehend the Woonactieplan, including its current composition, objectives, and projected means of attainment. In this chapter, not one, but two subquestions were addressed. For readability purposes, the chapter was divided into two parts and structured chronologically. The same structure will be used in this conclusion.

The first part of this chapter (sections 6.1 through 6.3) centred on the past of the Woonactieplan, looking into how it came about. It sequentially examined the rationale behind the Woonactieplan, the core themes and strategies that were defined and how these align with the survey data. This initial part sought to address sub-question 6: *What strategies to enhance liveability are delineated by the Kr8 associations in the Woonactieplan and how do these align with the survey?*

It was discovered that in the Woonactieplan, the Kr8 associations outline their ambition to focus on 4 pillars: *trust, social foundation, living environment,* and *housing.* Different strategies are mentioned for each pillar, such as ensuring regular physical presence of housing associations in neighbourhoods and villages, involving residents in the selection of an architect, and investing in social infrastructure. Given that tenants delineated maintenance and management, sustainability, greenery, and reinforcement (referring to demolition / reconstruction or reinforcement and damage repair) as most important, it can be concluded that the pillars of the Woonactieplan do not align in a one-to-one manner with the findings of the questionnaires.

This mismatch does not necessarily indicate a flaw, as research has shown that merely accommodating people's preferences does not guarantee the formulation of an effective plan. Tenants are not real estate professionals, are not always able to see the bigger picture, and may not always want the same thing. It is therefore quite defensible that the housing associations have added their own professional perspective and that of their collaborative partners to accentuate and formulate a plan that can be effectively applied.

However, such justification hinges upon it being an intentional decision. An investigation revealed that, in this instance, discrepancies in data processing rather than intentional decision-making, are likely to explain the discrepancy between the pillars outlined in the Woonactieplan and the themes identified in the questionnaires. While a complete overhaul may not be necessary or feasible, the Kr8 associations are advised to use the opportunity for further refinement. A different level of emphasis might be more suitable for certain themes.

In the second part of the chapter (sections 6.4 through 6.7), the focus shifted towards the present and future. This part examined the current status of the Woonactieplan and discussed debates on the next steps. The board meeting held on January 30, 2024, hereby marked the outset. To further explore the next steps not only from the perspective of the housing associations but also involving the collaborative partners, a focus group was convened. This second part of the chapter sought to address sub-question 7: *What is the current status of the Woonactieplan and what is the preferred course of action?*

Regarding the current status of the Woonactieplan, it was concluded that since the last version of the Woonactieplan in September 2023, the Kr8 associations have been inward-looking, focusing on how the plan would land internally. This involved rethinking and restructuring the Kr8 partnership to facilitate progress, alongside efforts to align with existing regional initiatives. Only now, the Kr8 associations are transitioning from thinking differently to acting differently, raising questions about the preferred course of action.

From the perspective of the directors, there was the idea to align the Woonactieplan with the contours of Nij Begun. This would mean that the Woonactieplan is scaled up to include the entire province of Groningen and a part of Drenthe. This approach is discouraged in this study, for two significant reasons. Firstly, because the plan is based on the perspectives of tenants residing in villages at the heart of the earthquake zone. While some themes and strategies may be applicable elsewhere, they cannot be simply generalized. Secondly, because implementing the Woonactieplan and garnering support within the Kr8 already poses challenges. This issue needs to be addressed first. A notable step in the right direction was the recent establishment of a new organizational structure for Kr8, integrating the implementation of the Woonactieplan within the liveability working group. It is hoped that this restructuring will provide more coherence and effectiveness to the Woonactieplan moving forward.

From the perspective of collaborative partners, the preferred course of action centred on translating the plan into tangible outcomes. Although many examples can be found of initiatives that align with the spirit of the Woonactieplan, ultimately, actions should be implemented not only individually but also collectively. And systematically, rather than sporadically. This sentiment is strongly felt within the Kr8 as well. It is time for action! At the time of writing, discussions within the Kr8 revolve around the desire to develop a 'Groninger School', a sort of step-by-step guide to areabased working rooted in the experiences of the various Kr8 associations in reinforcement projects. As an added feature to this chapter, an initial attempt is made to develop such a step-by-step approach, which serves as a stepping stone to the concluding chapter.





6.9 Step-by-step guide to area-based working*

Throughout the past decade of engaging with the reinforcement task, the Kr8 associations have gained valuable insights into how they can contribute to letting tenants live safely, pleasantly and proudly in Groningen. The main lessons learned are that enhancing liveability demands the adaptation of an area-based approach and collaborative efforts.

Area-based working refers to a strategy or approach in urban planning and development that focuses on improving specific geographic areas or neighbourhoods. Rather than implementing city-wide policies or initiatives, area-based working targets particular regions or communities, aiming to address their unique needs, challenges, and opportunities. This makes it very suitable for addressing liveability. By concentrating resources and interventions in specific geographical areas, this approach seeks to achieve more targeted and impactful results, revitalizing neighbourhoods, fostering social cohesion, and stimulating economic development.

Step 0: Forming an impression

Before commencing work in an area, it is essential to develop a comprehensive understanding of the project. This involves analysing the characteristics of the neighbourhood and identifying potential collaborative partners. Subsequently, these partners should be approached to inform them about the plans, ascertain if they have any overlapping initiatives, and most importantly, determine their willingness to contribute. Partners will be briefed about the participation process in step 1 and can choose to join if they wish. If they choose not to participate, they implicitly accept that steps 1 and 2 will be conducted without their input, and they will only be involved again at step 3.

Step 1: Active participation

Area-based working often employs a bottomup approach, involving active participation and collaboration with local residents. After all, who better to tell you what is needed in an area than the people who live there? Hence, step 1 is active participation. The term 'active' refers to how participation is carried out. The 'classic' form of participation, where a room is rented out and residents are informed rather than involved, is no longer sufficient. The method of participation used in drafting the Woonactieplan is seen as an example of how it should be done. Going into neighbourhoods, knocking on doors, and simply sitting down at people's kitchen tables to hear their concerns associations can be documented in performance

and needs. Although this qualitative approach aligns well with the conceptual nature of liveability, it is important for the subsequent steps to document or consolidate the results somewhere. There are various options for this. In the case of the Woonactieplan, this was done through a questionnaire, but one could also think of a more visual approach, such as creating a map of the area with strengths and weaknesses.

Step 2: Defining actions

The next step involves analysing the gathered data to identify specific needs. Make this process concrete. Often, there's a tendency to think in broad, overarching theme's, but this overlooks the value of the area-based approach. For instance, if the active participation in step 1 reveals a strong demand for a youth playground in a neighbourhood, this should translate in a one-to-one manner to the action point of realizing a playground. Don't shy away from specifics or seemingly small-scale interventions. These are precisely the opportunities to generate real impact and enhance liveability. Compile a comprehensive list of tangible actions.

*Check: Between step 2 and step 3, it is advisable to test the action list with residents to ensure that the overall sentiment has been accurately captured.

Stap 3: Task division

Next, based on the defined list of actions, careful consideration must be given to a) what tasks fall within my purview, and b) what lies beyond my scope or responsibilities and therefore should be forwarded to other parties in the area. It is essential to ensure that concerns falling outside of one's own purview are effectively communicated to the relevant collaborative partners. This necessitates the maintenance of streamlined communication channels. The division of responsibilities must be communicated to the residents so they know which party to approach for specific concerns.

Step 4: Formalizing and coordinating

The next step is to gather all collaborative partners around one table to formalize task assignments and coordinate schedules. A project should not commence without completing this step. It may seem simple and obvious, but experience shows that this step is often overlooked. Everything that is arranged in advance prevents hurdles later in the process and accelerates implementation. Agreements between the municipality, tenant organizations, and housing agreements. For other partners in the area, individual contracts or other forms can be utilized. Once this step is completed, the schedules should be communicated to the residents so they know what to expect.

Step 5: Budgeting

Step 5 involves allocating budgets to the interventions that need to be carried out. This critical step ensures that financial resources are effectively directed towards achieving project goals. It begins with a thorough assessment of the costs associated with each intervention, taking into account factors such as materials, labour, and any additional expenses. The budgeting process requires careful consideration and prioritization to optimize the allocation of funds and maximize impact. Clear budget allocations help maintain transparency and accountability throughout the project lifecycle, enabling stakeholders to track expenditures and adjust plans as needed.

Step 6: Establishing a team

Step 6 requires the establishment of a 'neighbourhood team' to execute all the proposed interventions. Ideally, this team should consist of a representative from all involved parties, along with 1 or 2 enthusiastic local residents. The residents should be chosen through a transparent and inclusive process, ensuring representation from diverse demographics within the neighbourhood. The residents participating in the neighbourhood team preferably serve as a driving force in the area, capable of rallying their neighbours. These residents should also be compensated for their participation in the neighbourhood team.

Step 7: Maintenance and supervision

As the plans are implemented and the project transitions to the maintenance phase, responsibility gradually shifts from the project team to the residents. One potential solution is the appointment of a neighbourhood caretaker, who, equipped with a small budget and basic tools, can promptly address minor issues as they arise. In this final phase, the other involved parties would primarily serve in a monitoring capacity.

All of the steps are visually summarized in **figure 33**.

This step-by-step guide may seem like nothing new. But in practice, it becomes apparent that not all steps are self-evident or consistently followed. For example, in step 2, actions are frequently formulated too vaguely, which complicates their execution. Likewise, in step

3, parties tend to select actions they can manage independently, neglecting to follow up on those delegated to collaborative partners. Merely allocating tasks and allowing each party to work independently proves ineffective. In the last few years, it has become apparent that individual activities, regardless of their quality, will not yield significant improvements in liveability. Therefore, the central message put forward in this thesis is that enhancing liveability demands the adaptation of an area-based approach and collaborative efforts. Housing associations are integral part of the solution, but they can't do it alone.

While rooted in experiences from the reinforcement task, it is believed that this framework is also applicable in other contexts - Dutch or international - where liveability enhancement is required. Beyond housing associations, other entities involved in largescale neighbourhood improvement efforts could also benefit from the guide. Designed to be flexible enough to accommodate customization yet specific enough to be practically applied, the framework could be used by project developers, municipalities, project management firms etc. Regarding the who, where, when, the only prerequisite is that the guide is consulted from the very start of a project.

STEP 7

Shift responsibility to residents (neighbourhood caretaker) and monitor

STEP 6

Establish a 'neighbourhood team' comprising of a representative of each involved party plus 1-2 residents, to carry out the plans

STEP 5

Allocate budgets to the interventions that need to be carried out

STEP 4

Gather all collaborative partners to formalize task assignments and coordinate schedules

STEP 3a

Select from the defined list of actions; what tasks fall within my purview?

STEP 3b

Select from the defined list of actions; what should be forwarded to other collaborative partners in the area?



Review the action list with residents to ensure its accuracy

STEP 2

Analyse the gathered data, assess what is needed and consequently define concrete actions

STEP 1

Physically enter the neighbourhood, actively engage with residents and collect concerns/wishes

STEP 0

Analyze the characteristics of the neighborhood and identify / inform collaborative partners

Figure 33: Visualisation of the proposed step-by-step guide to area-based working (own work)



Conclusion

7.1 Summary

The closure of the gas tap in 2024 signals the beginning of a new chapter in the Groningen earthquake file: the post-closure phase. Beyond the enormous task of reinforcing over 27,455 addresses, there is much immaterial damage that requires recovery. As a result, the liveability of the province is under severe pressure. Given that 30% of the homes in the reinforcement task are owned by housing associations, they play a crucial role in rebuilding Groningen. To investigate their often-overlooked role, this thesis aimed to answer the question *'What strategies could housing associations employ to address both material and immaterial damage and enhance liveability in the earthquakeaffected region of Groningen?'.*

To support the main research question, the following sub-questions were defined:

- 1. What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?
- 2. How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act?
- 3. How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?
- 4. How does the earthquake problem in Groningen affect the operations of housing associations, and what perspectives do they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues?
- 5. What earthquake-related liveability challenges do tenants in Groningen encounter and what are their expressed needs and wishes?
- 6. What strategies to enhance liveability are delineated by the Kr8 associations in the Woonactieplan and how do these align with the findings of the survey?
- 7. What is the current status of the Woonactieplan and what is the preferred course of action?

To address the research questions, a literature review was initiated as the primary step. This review was structured around three main areas: the impact of earthquakes in Groningen, the role of housing associations in the Netherlands, and strategies for enhancing liveability. Following the examination of each aforementioned domain individually, practical integration was facilitated through a six-month internship at Kr8. Kr8 stands as a collaboration among six housing associations operating within the earthquake-affected region (Acantus, Groninger Huis, Goud Wonen, Lefier, Wierden & Borgen, and Woonzorg NL) alongside the Huurders Platform Aardbevingen

Groningen (HPAG). Throughout the internship period, supplementary research methodologies were implemented. These included a thorough data analysis of existing questionnaires and explorative talks with pertinent stakeholders, among which the directors of the housing associations. Furthermore, a comprehensive document analysis of the Woonactieplan was conducted. As the research neared its conclusion, a focus group session was convened to validate research findings and contemplate future trajectories. Which research method was used to answer which subquestion, is summarized in **figure 34**.

The comprehensive conclusions for each sub-question can be found in the various chapters of this thesis report, presented as sub-conclusions. In the research findings section, these are briefly reiterated, allowing for a subsequent discussion on the main research question.

7.2 Research findings

The investigation into the main question started with a literary exploration of the impact of earthquakes in Groningen, answering *sub-question 1*. Here, it became evident that the impact of the earthquakes is not only material, but also immaterial. And that as a result, the liveability of the province is under severe pressure. It was found that the reinforcement task is not only about rebuilding houses, but also about rebuilding trust. Hence the title of this thesis. Upon examining the role of housing associations in the Netherlands (*subquestion 2*), literature showed that throughout history, there has been a continuous pushing and pulling between housing associations and the government regarding their tasks and responsibilities. After various irregularities, the government mandated housing associations in 2015 to refocus on their core task: constructing and managing rental properties for people with lower incomes. However, the latest revision of the Housing Act in 2022 introduced renewed flexibility, allowing housing associations to engage in a broader range of activities.

The literature review on strategies to enhance liveability, related to *sub-question 3*, revealed two very important lessons. First, that liveability is a highly context-dependable concept. It predominantly concerns the here and now, thus lacking a universal definition. Existing literature suggests that what constitutes liveability should be established at a neighbourhood or district level and entrusted to the residents. After all, who better to tell you what is needed in an area than the

Sub-question/method	Literature review	Explorative talks	Data analysis	Document analysis	Focus group
1. What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?	Х				
2. How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act?	х				
3. How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?	Х				
4. How does the earthquake problem in Groningen affect the operations of housing associations, and what perspectives do they hold regarding their role in addressing the issues?		X			
5. What earthquake-related liveability challenges do tenants in Groningen encounter and what are their expressed needs and wishes?			Х		
6. What strategies to enhance liveability are delineated by the Kr8 associations in the Woonactieplan and how do these align with the findings of the survey?				Х	
7. What is the current status of the Woonactieplan and what is the preferred course of action?					Х

Figure 34: Method used per sub-question (own work)

people who live there? In a similar vein to the absence of a universal definition of liveability, literature showed that there is no standard list of strategies that, when applied, automatically results in an enhancement of liveability. While suggestions or examples of successful strategies from other cases are provided, the second lesson emphasized that every area requires a tailored approach based on its specific needs.

In the context of *sub-question 4*, the explorative talks revealed that the impact of the earthquakes varies greatly per housing association. This is underscored by data from the NCG dashboard (2023), which shows, for example, that Goud Wonen has 51.9% of their homes included in the reinforcement task, whereas Woonzorg NL only has 0.7% included. Contrary to initial assumptions, it was discovered that the earthquakes do not primarily pose a financial challenge for the housing associations. Instead, the main challenges for housing associations arising from the earthquakes lie in the operationalization and in the social domain.

The explorative talks revealed that it was in their quest on how to address the challenges that the housing associations in the earthquake-affected region found solidarity. United under the Kr8 partnership, they decided to collaborate in the reinforcement task, going beyond addressing the material damage to also acknowledging the immaterial damage their tenants suffer from. When comparing this to the answer on sub-question 2, it is interesting to note that within the context of the earthquake issue in Groningen, a broader understanding of the role of housing associations seems to have emerged. Despite not being legally obligated to address either material or immaterial damage, the Kr8 associations express willingness to do so. However, opinions differ on how far this responsibility extends. Overall, it can be said that the associations on which the earthquake problem has a smaller impact also envisage a more passive role for themselves. But the position that each association takes in this debate is also influenced by other factors, such as the size of the housing association and thus the number of resources, as well as the personality of the director.

Following an examination of the impact on housing associations and their perceptions of their role, sub*question 5* shifted focus to the impact on tenants. Through a data analysis of an existing survey, insight was gathered into the liveability challenges that tenants in the earthquake-affected region face and what their needs and wishes are. As it turns out, tenants are predominantly concerned with four themes: maintenance and management, sustainability, greenery and reinforcement. With the exception of the reinforcement theme, the raised concerns encompass fundamental aspects that are likely to resonate with tenants in other regions of the country. This outcome was divergent from initial expectations and prompted the subsidiary conclusion that approximately 80% of liveability issues are fundamental, while the remaining 20% are area specific needs. What sets working on liveability in Groningen apart from working on liveability in other regions in the country are not so much the thematic concerns, but rather the context. People's distrust in institutions, the temporary nature of the situation, and the accompanying uncertainty emerged as the most significant challenges.

In the context of *sub-question 6*, it was found that the Kr8 associations divide liveability into four pillars: trust, social foundation, living environment and housing. A document analysis of the Woonactieplan revealed that for each pillar, specific strategies are defined. For example, the Kr8 associations aim to strengthen the social foundation by taking existing social networks into account when moving tenants to temporary housing. With regard to the alignment of the Woonactieplan to the survey data, it was concluded that the pillars do not relate in a one-to-one manner with the findings of the survey. This however, does not necessarily indicate a flaw, as research has shown that merely accommodating people's preferences does not guarantee the formulation of an effective plan. Although their input is highly valuable, tenants are not real estate professionals. Nor are they always able to see the bigger picture, or express identical preferences. It is therefore quite defensible that the Kr8 associations have added their own professional perspective and that of their collaborative partners to accentuate and formulate the Woonactieplan. However, such justification hinges upon it being an intentional decision. An investigation into the data analysis revealed that, in this instance, discrepancies in data processing rather than intentional decision-making, are likely to explain the discrepancy between the pillars outlined in the Woonactieplan and the themes identified by tenants.

The latter also holds relevance for the answer to the last sub-question 7, relating to the current status of the Woonactieplan and the preferred course of action. Conversations with the directors and other relevant stakeholders revealed that the development of the Woonactieplan is currently somewhat 'stuck' between paper and reality. It has been almost a year since the Kr8 associations went into the neighbourhoods and engaged with tenants, but although there are noteworthy examples of initiatives in line with the Woonactieplan, nothing structural has changed. The transition from planning to execution proves to be complex. The research identified several reasons for this complexity, including too vaguely formulated goals, a reshuffle in personnel and overarching discussions on the structure of the Kr8 partnership. But perhaps the most significant factor is the (perceived) loss of momentum. In the aftermath of the parliamentary inquiry, when the government began allocating funds for Groningen, the Woonactieplan had yet to be finalized. This meant that the Kr8 associations couldn't specify what their role was going to be or what (financial) support they

desired from the government when asked. Now, government funding is intertwined with the agendas associated with Nij Begun and it is improbable that a distinct funding allocation for the Woonactieplan will materialize. The next steps primarily revolve around ensuring their inclusion in the social agenda. Through the establishment of a 'Groninger School', essentially a methodological framework derived from the experiences of reinforcement projects, they aim to persuade The Hague that housing associations should be considered as integral contributors to, and participants in, the solution for Groningen. Further details regarding this matter will be provided in section 7.4, which delves into practical implications.

7.3 Conclusion on the main question

This thesis aimed to answer the question: 'What strategies could housing associations employ to address both material and immaterial damage and enhance liveability in the earthquake-affected region of Groningen?'. While various examples of strategies that housing associations could employ to enhance liveability were found in literature, it became increasingly apparent during the research process that the answer to this question should not be a substantive list of strategies but rather the delineation of a process through which housing associations can discern the most appropriate strategies to employ. Instead of modifying the main research question, it was decided to retain it as it stands to illustrate that during any research process, one may arrive at conclusions diverging from initial expectations. From this perspective, the disparity between the main question and the ultimate answer mirrors the educational journey undertaken.

Recognizing the context-dependent nature of liveability, it became evident in this study that enhancing liveability necessitates the adoption of **an area-based approach**. Simply put, this means assessing the needs of each neighbourhood or district through active participation with local residents and subsequently utilizing this assessment to tailor appropriate strategies. Throughout the research process, it also became apparent that, regardless of the quality of interventions, no single entity can independently enhance liveability. This is particularly true in a complex situation such as that presented by the earthquakes in Groningen; parties need each other. Collaborative efforts are essential to enhance liveability and address both material and immaterial damage effectively in Groningen.

The contribution of this research lies in its provision of a step-by-step guide for area-based working (see figure 33), an initial proposal for the 'Groninger School' that the Kr8 associations intend to develop. Drawing from experiences gained by the Kr8 associations in the reinforcement task in recent years, the guide outlines 7 steps, which are elaborated upon in section 6.9. Following these steps enables the identification of the needs of a specific area, the determination of suitable strategies, and the clarification of how to implement them with collaborative partners and within financial constraints. This guide is not limited to housing associations; other entities engaged in large-scale neighbourhood improvement endeavours can also derive benefits from it. Designed to be flexible enough to accommodate customization yet specific enough to be practically applied, the framework could be used by project developers, municipalities, project management firms etc. Regarding the who, where and when, the only prerequisite is that the guide is consulted from the very start of a project. While rooted in experiences from the reinforcement task, it is believed that this framework is also applicable in other contexts - Dutch or international - where liveability enhancement is required.

7.4 Practical implications

This research began with the observation that housing associations are rarely mentioned in the earthquake file, despite owning 30% of the homes requiring reinforcement. While their presence receives minimal attention, this study has uncovered the considerable impact of the earthquake issue on their operations, as well as their proactive engagement in recent years. This reflective section aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the tension between the role that housing associations are assigned in the earthquake file and the role that they (aspire to) take on. Additionally, critical inquiries concerning the justification for housing associations' involvement and the requisite governmental support will be deliberated upon in this section.

Exploring the challenges and accomplishments of the Kr8 has illuminated the unique circumstances that housing associations in Groningen face. Confronted with the far-reaching consequences of earthquake problem, they have developed a new perspective on their role. Despite not being legally obligated to address either material or immaterial damage, the Kr8 associations have expressed the willingness to do so and showed great competence in these efforts. While

the decision to address material damage mainly stems from practical considerations, addressing immaterial damage comes from a genuine involvement and sense of responsibility towards their tenants. Throughout the past years, the Kr8 associations have demonstrated their capacity to effect positive change within their own sphere of responsibility, positioning themselves as part of the solution. Together with their collaborative partners (NCG, IMG, municipalities, healthcare organizations etc..), the Kr8 associations have achieved a great deal for tenants in the earthquake affected region (see **appendix J**). Take, for example, the progress of the reinforcement task. 40% of the homes strengthened to date belong to the housing associations. But also consider what the Kr8 associations have done in equalizing differences between homeowners and tenants.

In considering whether housing associations are exceeding their mandate by addressing both material and immaterial damage, it is evident that they do not. Since 1997, liveability has been a key focus area for housing associations, expanding their role from merely ensuring housing quality to enhancing the overall quality of life in entire neighbourhoods. Initially, the lack of a clear definition hindered the effective implementation of liveability initiatives. After instances of misconduct, housing associations were directed to refocus on their core responsibility of constructing and managing rental properties for people with lower incomes in 2015. However, the earthquake problem in Groningen compelled housing associations to adopt a broader perspective again. Fortunately, the associations were given the space needed by the most recent amendments to the Housing Act in 2022. The successful initiatives by the Kr8 associations in reinforcement projects, along with their development of the Woonactieplan demonstrate that the associations have gained substantial expertise in enhancing liveability in recent years. However, to continue down this path, the Kr8 associations require executive authority, financial backing, adequate space, and governmental trust.

One would expect the government to encourage any party that is demonstrably involved and successful in improving liveability and trust in Groningen. Regrettably, practical observations reveal a contrasting reality. Without considering what has already happened in Groningen and by whom, various initiatives are being set up for the region. In response to the parliamentary inquiry, the government presented a comprehensive

plan titled 'Nij Begun' (Gronings for New Beginning) in April 2023, comprising 50 measures that align with the recommendations of the committee. Part of this plan was the development of four separate agendas: the Economic Agenda, the Social Agenda, a Recovery Agenda for Groningen (focused on damage recovery and reinforcement), and a Sustainability Agenda. The intention was for residents, social organizations, schools, knowledge institutions, housing associations, the Public Health Service (GGD), businesses, etc., to form a 'broad coalition' and work together on themes like liveability, educational quality, and poverty reduction. However, in drafting both the Social and Economic Agenda, The Hague is taking the lead. The plans are being devised in a top-down fashion, marked by considerable governmental control. The 'participation' evenings' organized can hardly be called participatory. There is a lot of talking and very little listening, with the audience consisting primarily of middle aged men in suits. Housing associations, like social organizations or residents, are barely included in the planning process so far. And although the Kr8 associations are trying, the prospect of their ability to exert influence seems doubtful.

It begs the question: has the government truly failed to glean any lessons from the past decade? Following the parliamentary inquiry, one would anticipate a clear understanding that imposing top-down plans on Groningers only undermines their trust in the future. It should be evident that initiatives need to be crafted bottom-up, fostering extensive community involvement. Moreover, it should be apparent that housing associations represent invaluable stakeholders who must be actively engaged in the planning process. They rightly belong at the table for both agendas, given their substantial ownership in the reinforcement task (30%) and the significant investments they have made in the province. But apparently, it is not.

It is truly unfortunate that in formulating plans for Groningen, the government overlooks the valuable expertise available within housing associations. Expertise they would eagerly share if only given the opportunity. This thesis aims to shed light on this oversight, igniting efforts to rectify it and ensure that housing associations receive the rightful acknowledgment that they deserve for their contributions. The Kr8 associations should have a seat at the table and be appointed an official role in rebuilding Groningen, along with the corresponding executive authority, financial support and trust. Fortunately, the current status remains open to modification. The agendas are anticipated to reach finalization by the conclusion of 2024. This timeframe implies a forthcoming period characterized by the advocacy endeavours of the Kr8 associations to assert influence, leveraging the Woonactieplan as a strategic instrument. Concurrently, the Kr8 associations are actively immersed in the implementation of measures 28 and 29, addressing the integration of reinforcement with sustainability - a pivotal concern for tenants. If no official role for housing associations is allocated in the agendas, they will gradually revert to their 'regular' processes as the reinforcement task reaches completion. Expectations are that the development of the Groninger School and other initiatives from the Woonactieplan will continue, albeit in an adjusted form due to finite resources. Through their involvement in the earthquake file, housing associations have become more aware of their strengths, not only in the physical but also in the social domain. The hope is that they will continue to derive value from these strengths towards the future, creating a safe and pleasant living environment for generations to come.

7.5 Limitations and suggestions for future research

In this concluding section, the limitations of the current research (methods) are acknowledged and avenues for future investigation are proposed.

The first limitations of this research relate to the nature of the earthquake file; encompassing its *extensive scope, intricate complexity* and *ongoing status,* as well as its *Dutch context*. Given the extensive scope of the file, a clear focus area had to be defined. It was decided to investigate the file from the perspective of housing associations and focus on the theme of liveability. While this addresses a significant gap in knowledge, it's important to recognize that the findings only address a small portion of the entire file. And although some results might be relevant to other parties involved, the report holds particular significance for housing associations. In addition to the extensive scope, other potential limitations stem from the intricate *complexity* of the dossier. The earthquake dossier is marked by the involvement of numerous stakeholders and a complex bureaucratic landscape. Although efforts have been made to explain the intricate dynamics and relationships among stakeholders as clearly as possible, mergers, name changes, or shifts in functions among parties may disrupt the clarity achieved. It's essential to recognize that this report does not claim absolute infallibility in its content. This also pertains

to the numerical data. The amount of parties involved resulted in a lot of different viewpoints and conflicting data. To ensure consistency, this report relied on the NCG dashboard as the most reliable source. However, it is still very well possible that the numbers stated are incorrect.

This also has to do with the ongoing status of the dossier. Throughout the writing process, diligent efforts were made to integrate the latest information and update numbers accordingly. Repeated revisions and supplementation of various sections of the report were made to accommodate new developments. On the one hand, this highlights the relevance and timeliness of the study, yet it also presents a challenge in the sense that a 'final version' of the report can never be reached. At a certain point in time, a boundary had to be established within the ongoing dossier to achieve a final conclusion in time for graduation. It is important to recognize that developments occurring after this point may impact the correctness of the information shared and the effectiveness of strategies and interventions proposed in this report. A final note pertains to the fact that the earthquake dossier is a *very Dutch* dossier. All research reports are given Dutch, or even Groningen dialect titles. To maintain clarity and authenticity, these titles have remained untranslated in this report. Similarly, the explorative talks and focus group were conducted in Dutch to align with the operational language of the internship. Results were translated as literally as possible for the report, but it's essential to note that the translation process may have inadvertently led to the omission of subtle nuances and contextual richness.

In addition to the limitations inherent to the nature of the dossier, there are also limitations stemming from the research design and methods. For instance, the reliance on the Woonactieplan as a central element raises questions about the research's independence and depth. How would the research have looked if the Woonactieplan had not existed? For sure, understanding the ambitions of the various housing associations and how they position themselves within the file would have required greater effort. Perhaps multiple explorative talks or in-depth interviews with the directors would have been necessary. But the absence of the Woonactieplan would also have signalled a lack of preoccupation of housing associations on the 'soft' side of the file in itself, causing a shift in focus. Without the Woonactieplan, attention would likely have gravitated towards the seemingly more straightforward aspect of physical infrastructure. The emphasis of the research would have been on the financial and asset management implications of the earthquake issues on the real estate portfolios of housing associations.

A similar question arises concerning the utilization of an existing questionnaire in the data analysis. The use of a pre-existing survey may introduce inherent biases in survey responses or participant selection processes, potentially impacting the validity and reliability of the research findings. But what if this data hadn't been available? This scenario would have presented a significant challenge, as the literature review revealed the lack of a measurement instrument for liveability in the earthquake-affected area. Had the focus remained on liveability, developing a measuring tool for the liveability of tenants in the earthquake-affected region would have been essential. However, this endeavour would have been time-consuming and likely yielded fewer responses than the 263 obtained by Kr8. Nonetheless, a self-designed questionnaire could have been more closely aligned with the research question, enabling a more targeted inquiry. If the questionnaire had been self-designed, a closed format would likely have been preferred over an open one to facilitate easy quantitative analysis. Moreover, questions addressing both material and immaterial aspects would be asked separately. For example, tenants could have been asked to rate their satisfaction with specific facilities available in (the vicinity of) their housing complex, such as parking facilities, recreational areas, or greenery. Additionally, statements regarding the sense of community or safety within the neighbourhood could have been included, allowing tenants to indicate their level of agreement on a scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

In conclusion, the fact that this research was conducted in combination with a graduation internship at the Kr8 associations has greatly propelled the progress, but at the same time, it has strongly influenced the design and execution. Despite efforts to maintain objectivity, the involvement of the Kr8 inevitably introduced some degree of bias into both the research design and its findings. Considering how the research might have unfolded independently from the Kr8 presents an intriguing prospect. Similarly, one could speculate endlessly about the potential outcomes had different decisions been made at various junctures. For instance, engaging directly with tenants to verify the accuracy of the data collected by the Kr8 could have provided valuable insights and mitigated potential biases in the results. Additionally, testing the step-by-step guide with relevant stakeholders in a separate focus group would have offered an opportunity for further refinement of the methodology.

With regard to suggestions for future research, it would be very interesting to look in a few years at how the agendas have been formulated, what governance structure has been established for the implementation of the agendas and what role housing associations have ultimately been given, if any. It would also be very interestingtoseeif, after completion of the reinforcement task, housing associations maintain their broad role perception or if it reverts back. Additionally, it would be great if future research continues with the step-bystep guide to area-based working (see **figure 35**). Each step of the plan presents an opportunity for further investigation. For instance, in step 1, research could focus on participation methods: How can meaningful engagement be created? What approaches are most *effective in activating people?* Similarly, step 2 offers a chance to explore questionnaire setup and result processing. Step 4 provides an avenue for examining governance structures and collaboration forms. Ultimately, it would be fantastic if the step-by-step guide evolves into a kind of living document, where research and examples of best practices are added for each step.

STEP 7

Shift responsibility to residents (neighbourhood caretaker) and monitor

STEP 6

Establish a 'neighbourhood team' comprising of a representative of each involved party plus 1-2 residents, to carry out the plans

STEP 5

Allocate budgets to the interventions that need to be carried out

STEP 4

Gather all collaborative partners to formalize task assignments and coordinate schedules

STEP 3a

Select from the defined list of actions; what tasks fall within my purview?

STEP 3b

Select from the defined list of actions; what should be forwarded to other collaborative partners in the area?



Review the action list with residents to ensure its accuracy

STEP 2

Analyse the gathered data, assess what is needed and consequently define concrete actions

STEP 1

Physically enter the neighbourhood, actively engage with residents and collect concerns/wishes

STEP 0

Analyze the characteristics of the neighborhood and identify / inform collaborative partners

Figure 35: Visualisation of the proposed step-by-step guide to area-based working (own work)

Respect - Nine van Stel

Daar waar de grond Het offer bracht Daar waar de staat De munt 't hoogste acht

Daar waar het scheurt Omdat het beeft Daar waar het land Niet om de aarde geeft

Daar waar het recht In rijen wordt vergokt Daar waar de adem Door de woede stokt

Daar waar de waarde Loos verworden lijkt Daar waar het geloof Murw gebeukt bezwijkt

Daar waar het woord Gegeven wordt genomen Daar waar de mens Meer zorgen kent dan dromen

Daar is de kloof Groter dan de scheur English translation of Respect - Nine van Stel

Where the ground Made its sacrifice Where the state Values the coin the highest

Where it cracks Because it quakes Where the land Does not care for the earth

Where justice Is gambled away in lines Where breath Is halted by anger

Where worth Seems to become worthless Where faith Collapses, battered and worn

Where the word Given is taken Where people Have more worries than dreams

There the gap Is greater than the crack



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aedes. (n.d.). *Leefbare en veilige wijken*. Retrieved November 9, 2023, from <u>https://aedes.nl/leefbare-en-veilige-wijken</u>/

Aedes. (2021, January 12). *Praatplaat biedt inspiratie om te werken aan leefbaarheid*. Retrieved November 9, 2023, from <u>https://aedes.nl/leefbare-en-veilige-wijken/praatplaat-biedt-inspiratie-om-te-werken-aan-leefbaarheid</u>

Aedes. (2022a, August 4). *Nationale Prestatieafspraken volkshuisvesting goed voor ruim 108 miljard aan investeringen*. Retrieved February 13, 2024, from <u>https://aedes.nl/nationale-prestatieafspraken/nationale-prestatieafspraken-volkshuisvesting-goed-voor-ruim-108</u>

Aedes. (2022b, December 20). *Meer nieuwe woningen bouwen na afschaffing verhuurderheffing*. Retrieved February 13, 2024, from <u>https://aedes.nl/nieuwbouw/meer-nieuwe-woningen-bouwen-na-afschaffing-verhuurderheffing</u>

ANP. (2023, October 18). Kamer vreest "Ravijnjaar 2026" voor gemeenten. *Binnenlands Bestuur*. Retrieved February 20, 2024, from <u>https://www.binnenlandsbestuur.nl/financien/kamer-houdt-adem-voor-ravijnjaar-</u>2026-voor-gemeenten

Beekers, W. (2010). Woonbeleid in Nederland: Hoe woningcorporaties ontworteld raakten. *Canon Sociaal Werk, 5*(6), 54–60. <u>https://www.canonsociaalwerk.eu/1995-verzelfstandiging-</u>wocorpo/beekers_wouter_hoe_woningcorpo raties_ontworteld_raakten_sd2010_5_6.pdf

Beekers, W. (2012). Het bewoonbare land. Aedes Magazine.

https://dkvwg750av2j6.cloudfront.net/m/6a4b6ec13e6b8f00/original/Aedes-Magazine-9-2012-Het-bew oonbare-land-het-verhaal-van-anderhalve-eeuw-huisvesting-september-2015.pdf

Besluit toegelaten instellingen volkshuisvesting 2015 (2023, January 1). Retrieved October 18, 2023, from <u>https://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0036702/2023-01-01.</u> The Hague: Rijksoverheid.

Bres advocaten. (2015, July 1). Woningwet 2015: waarom, wat, wie en hoe? - Bres advocaten. *Bres Advocaten*. Retrieved October 16, 2023, from <u>https://bresadvocaten.nl/nieuws/woningwet-2015-waarom-wat-wie-en-hoe/</u>

Bureau PAU & Hajema Communicatie. (2023). *Nieuw perspectief voor Groningen: Startdocument Economische Agenda*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/detail?id=2024D01636&did=2024D01636

Busscher, N., & Hupkes, S. (2022, March 31). De maatschappelijke impact van gaswinning in Groningen. In *Kennisplatform Leefbaar En Kansrijk Groningen* [Masterclass]. <u>https://www.kennisplatformleefbaar.nl/masterclasses</u>

Companen & Thésor. (2020). *Effecten van de verhuurderheffing op het wonen in Nederland: Een evaluatie 2013 tot 2020*.

Corporatiebouw. (2019, April 10). *Corporatie Standvast Wonen en gemeente Nijmegen ronden vernieuwing af van buurt bij Hatertse brug - Corporatiebouw*. Retrieved November 9, 2023, from https://corporatiebouw.nl/corporatie-standvast-wonen-en-gemeente-nijmegen-ronden-vernieuwing-af-van-buurt-bij-hatertse-brug/

Drent, M. (2023, April 25). Kabinet biedt Groningen 22 miljard euro voor inlossen ereschuld. *RTV Noord*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <u>https://www.rtvnoord.nl/nieuws/1016716/kabinet-biedt-groningen-22-miljard-euro-voor-inlossen-ereschuld</u>

Drent, M., & Braakman, T. (2024, April 16). Historische wet aangenomen: Groningse gaskraan gaat definitief dicht. *RTV Noord*. Retrieved April 29, 2024, from <u>https://www.rtvnoord.nl/politiek/1153406/historische-wet-aangenomen-groningse-gaskraan-gaat-definitief-dicht</u>

Dückers, M., Kanis, B., Van Der Molen, J., Gerbecks, J., Boendermaker, M., Berends, S., & Stroebe, K. (2023). *De psychosociale impact van de gaswinningsproblematiek op bewoners in 2021 en 2022: Eindrapport Gronings perspectief fase 3*. Retrieved February 26, 2024, from <u>https://www.groningsperspectief.nl/eindrapport-gp3/</u>

Ekker, H., & Start, R. (2022a, June 10). *Wie is de baas over het gas?* (season 1, episode 2). NPO Radio 1/NOS.

Ekker, H., & Start, R. (2022b, June 24). *De zoektocht naar kennis* (season 1, episode 4). NPO Radio 1/NOS.

Den Boer, R.C.L. (2023). *Liveable Neighbourhoods: How Dutch Housing Associations Engage with the Social Aspect of Liveability* [Master thesis]. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

FluxEnergie. (2017, July 10). Tweede Kamer wil geen parlementaire enquête gaswinning – Groningen geeft niet op. *FluxEnergie Vakblad Voor De Energiesector.* Retrieved September 25, 2023, from <u>https://www.fluxenergie.nl/tweede-kamer-wil-geen-parlementaire-enquete-gaswinning-groningen-geeft-</u> <u>niet-op/</u>

Groninger Bodem Beweging. (2023, August 31). *Feiten & cijfers*. Retrieved October 14, 2023, from <u>https://groninger-bodem-beweging.nl/nieuws/feiten-en-cijfers/</u>

Hakfoort, J., van Leuvensteijn, M., & Renes, G. (2002). Woningcorporaties: prikkels voor effectiviteit en efficiëntie. CPB, Centraal Planbureau, 's-Gravenhage.

Hoekstra, J. (2017). Reregulation and Residualization in Dutch Social Housing: A Critical Evaluation of New Policies. *Critical Housing Analysis*, *4*(1), 31–39. <u>https://doi.org/10.13060/23362839.2017.4.1.322</u>

Jansen, S. J. (2019). Place attachment, distress, risk perception and coping in a case of earthquakes in the Netherlands. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 35*(2), 407–427. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-019-09706-7</u>.
Jansen, S. J., Hoekstra, J., & Boumeester, H. (2017). The impact of earthquakes on the intention to move: Fight or flight? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *54*, 38–49. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.09.006</u>.

Kester, J. (2017). Energy security and human security in a Dutch gasquake context: A case of localized performative politics. *Energy Research & Social Science, 24*, 12–20.

Klijn, F. & Deltares. (2015). *Aardbevingen Groningen: naar een methode voor risicogebaseerd prioriteiten versterkingen: Bevindingen verkenning fase 1* (No. 1220581–000). Retrieved February 26, 2024, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307877929_Aardbevingen_Groningen_naar_een_methode_voor_risicogebaseerd_prioriteren_versterkingen

Klijnstra, W. (2019, July 4). Centrum Veilig Wonen: begonnen als oplossing en geëindigd als probleem. *RTV Noord*. Retrieved February 26, 2024, from <u>https://www.rtvnoord.nl/nieuws/210519/centrum-veilig-wonen-begonnen-als-oplossing-en-geeindigd-als-probleem</u>

Kolthof, P. (2019, March 14). Ik wacht (57): Roelie Smink en Simon Koorn uit Noordbroek. *Dagblad Van Het Noorden*. Retrieved October 19, 2023, from <u>https://dvhn.nl/groningen/Ik-wacht-57-Roelie-Smink-en-Simon-Koorn-uit-Noordbroek-24265385.html</u>

Kr8. (2020, October). WoonKr8. Nieuwsbrief Van De Woningcorporaties in Het Aardbevingsgebied.

Kr8, LTO Noord, Natuur en milieu Groningen, Ommelander ziekenhuis Groningen, Groninger gasberaad, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Noorderpoort, Alfa-college, Hanzehogeschool Groningen, Tinten, Groninger Dorpen, HuurdersPlatform Aardbevingen Groningen, Rabobank, Economic board Groningen, Groningen Seaports, FNV, SER Noord Nederland, Chemport Europe, VNO NCW Noord / MKB Nederland Noord, . . . New energy coalition. (2023, April 21). *Het plan voor de Groningers*. VNO NCW Noord / MKB Nederland Noord. Retrieved October 19, 2023, from <u>https://vnoncw-mkbnoord.nl/actueel/het-plan-voor-de-groningers</u>

Leidelmeijer, K. & Kamp, I. van (2003). *Kwaliteit van de Leefomgeving en Leefbaarheid.* Amsterdam: RIGO Research en Advies BV.

Lowe, M., Whitzman, C., Badland, H., Davern, M., Aye, L., Hes, D., Butterworth, I., & Giles-Corti, B. (2014). Planning Healthy, Liveable and Sustainable Cities: How Can Indicators Inform Policy? *Urban Policy and Research*, *33*(2), 131–144. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2014.1002606</u>

Lowe, M., Arundel, J., Hooper, P., Rozek, J., Higgs, C., Roberts, R., & Giles-Corti, B. (2020). Liveability aspirations and realities: Implementation of urban policies designed to create healthy cities in Australia. *Social Science & Medicine, 245*, 112713. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112713</u>

Lugtig, P., Bethlehem, J., & Ter Mors, E. (2017). *Het meten van de gevolgen van aardbevingen op de leefbaarheid in Groningen: Een methodologische review naar leefbaarheidsonderzoeken.* <u>https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27137.76643</u> Marsman, G. & Leidelmeijer, K. (2001). Leefbaarheid Schipholregio: meer dan geluid alleen, RIGO i.o.v. gem. Haarlemmermeer en provincie Noord-Holland, Amsterdam.

Mandemakers, J., Leidelmeijer, K., Burema, F., Halbersma, R., Middeldorp, M., & Veldkamp, J. (2021). *Leefbarometer 3.0: Instrumentontwikkeling.* Atlas Research.

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken. (n.d.). *Rijksbouwmeester*. College Van Rijksadviseurs. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <u>https://www.collegevanrijksadviseurs.nl/rijksbouwmeester</u>

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties. (2021). *De Woningwet vanaf 1 januari 2022 in vogelvlucht: Aanpassingen naar aanleiding van de evaluatie van de Woningwet 2015*.

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties. (2022, July 12). *Nationale prestatieafspraken voor de volkshuisvesting*. Home | Volkshuisvesting Nederland.

https://www.volkshuisvestingnederland.nl/onderwerpen/nationale-prestatieafspraken-voor-de-volkshuisvesting

Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties. (2023, July 20). *Wetsvoorstel Versterking Regie op Volkshuisvesting naar Raad van State*. Nieuwsbericht | Home | Volkshuisvesting Nederland. https://www.volkshuisvestingnederland.nl/actueel/nieuws/2023/07/14/wetsvoorstel-versterking-regie-op-volkshuisvesting-naar-raad-van-state

Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Klimaat. (2023a, June 6). *Afspraken over versterking per adresgroep.* Nationaal Coördinator Groningen. Retrieved March 4, 2024, from <u>https://www.nationaalcoordinatorgroningen.nl/eigenaar/uw-batch</u>

Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Klimaat. (2023b, August 31). Regiobouwmeester Enno Zuidema start op 1 september. *Nationaal Coördinator Groningen*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <u>https://www.nationaalcoordinatorgroningen.nl/actueel/nieuws/2023/08/31/regiobouwmeester-in-dienst</u>

Macke, J., Sarate, J. a. R., & De Atayde Moschen, S. (2022). Liveability Dimensions and Sense of Community in a Developing Country. *International Journal of Social Ecology and Sustainable Development, 13*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijsesd.293238

Nationaal Programma Groningen. (n.d.). *Vraag en antwoord - Nationaal Programma Groningen*. Retrieved October 19, 2023, from <u>https://www.nationaalprogrammagroningen.nl/veelgestelde-vragen/</u>

Newman, P. W. G. (1999). Sustainability and cities: Extending the metabolism model. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 44*, 219–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046 (99)00009-2

NOS. (2019, March 5). Parlementaire enquête naar gaswinning Groningen. *NOS*. Retrieved September 25, 2023, from https://nos.nl/artikel/2274618-parlementaire-enquete-naar-gaswinning-groningen

NOS. (2023, June 23). Groningse gaswinning naar nul op 1 oktober 2023, jaar later ontmanteling. *NOS*. Retrieved April 29, 2024, from <u>https://nos.nl/collectie/13902/artikel/2480019-groningse-gaswinning-naar-nul-op-1-oktober-2023-jaar-later-ontmanteling</u>

NOS. (2024, January 8). Toch weer eventjes gaswinning in Groningen vanwege vrieskou. *NOS*. Retrieved April 29, 2024, from <u>https://nos.nl/artikel/2504142-toch-weer-eventjes-gaswinning-in-groningen-vanwege-vrieskou</u>

OIS Groningen. (2023). Leefbaarheid in de Groningse wijken en dorpen : Een aanvullend rapport n.a.v. het leefbaarheidsonderzoek 2022. In *OIS Groningen*. Retrieved November 9, 2023, from <u>https://publicaties.oisgroningen.nl/ois-leefbaarheid-in-de-groningse-wijken-en-dorpen-2022</u>

OIS Groningen, Gemeente Groningen, & Python United. (n.d.). *Basismonitor Groningen*. Basismonitor Groningen. Retrieved November 9, 2023, from <u>https://basismonitor-groningen.nl/</u>

Oprichting eerste woningbouwvereniging. (2020, October 9). IsGeschiedenis. Retrieved October 9, 2023, from https://isgeschiedenis.nl/nieuws/oprichting-eerste-woningbouwvereniging

OVV [Onderzoeksraad voor Veiligheid]. (2015). *Aardbevingsrisico's in Groningen: Onderzoek naar de rol van veiligheid van burgers in de besluitvorming over de gaswinning (1959–2014)*. Den Haag: Onderzoeksraad voor Veiligheid.

Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen & Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal. (2023). Groningers boven gas: rapport parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen. Boek 1 Conclusies en aanbevelingen. Xerox en Repro Tweede Kamer.

Paul, A. & Sen, J. (2020). *A critical review of liveability approaches and their dimensions. Geoforum, 117*(2020), 90-92 <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7529590/</u>

Postmes, T., Stroebe, K., Richardson, J., LeKander, B., Oldersma, F., Broer, J., & Greven, F. (2018). *Gevolgen van bodembeweging voor Groningers: Ervaren veiligheid, gezondheid en toekomstperspectief 2016 - 2017.* Retrieved February 26, 2024, from <u>https://www.groningsperspectief.nl/eindrapportgp/</u>

Provincie Groningen. (2020). *Leefbaarheid provincie Groningen: Uitvoeringsprogramma 2020 - 2023*. Retrieved February 19, 2024, from

https://www.provinciegroningen.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Documenten/Beleid_en_documenten/Documenten/nzoeker/Wonen_en_welzijn/Uitvoeringsprogramma_leefbaarheid_2020_-_2023.pdf

Provincie Groningen. (2023a). Ereschuld: herstel en perspectief voor Groningen.

Provincie Groningen. (2023b, November 28). Henk Nijboer benoemd als kwartiermaker sociale agenda. *Provincie Groningen.* Retrieved February 27, 2024, from

https://www.provinciegroningen.nl/actueel/nieuws/nieuwsartikel/henk-nijboer-benoemd-als-kwartiermakersociale-agenda/ Rijksoverheid. (n.d.-a). *Autoriteit woningcorporaties (Aw)*. Rijksoverheid.nl. Retrieved October 17, 2023, from https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/contact/contactgids/autoriteit-woningcorporaties-aw

Rijksoverheid. (n.d.-b). *Wat is het verschil tussen een sociale huurwoning en een huurwoning in de vrije sector*?Rijksoverheid.nl. Retrieved October 9, 2023, from

https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/huurwoning-zoeken/vraag-en-antwoord/wat-is-het-verschiltussen-een-sociale-huurwoning-en-een-huurwoning-in-de-vrije-sector

Rijksoverheid. (2022, April 14). Meeste wijken in Nederland prettig om te wonen: Grote verschillen in de steden. *Rijksoverheid.nl.* Retrieved October 9, 2023, from <u>https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2022/04/14/meeste-wijken-in-nederland-prettig-om-te-wonen-</u>

<u>grote-verschillen-in-de-steden</u>

Rijksoverheid. (2023, June 28). *Woningwet: regels voor woningcorporaties*. Rijksoverheid.nl. Retrieved September 27, 2023, from <u>https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/woning-verhuren/woningwet-regels-voor-woningcorporaties</u>

RTV Noord. (2023, November 28). Henk Nijboer mag jaarlijks 100 miljoen verdelen om Groningen erbovenop te helpen: "Serieus geld." *RTV Noord*. Retrieved February 27, 2024, from <u>https://www.rtvnoord.nl/nieuws/1096183/henk-nijboer-mag-jaarlijks-100-miljoen-verdelen-om-groningen-erbovenop-te-helpen-serieus-geld</u>

Ruth, M. & Franklin, R.S. (2013). Liveability for all? Conceptual limits and practical implications. *Applied Geography*, *49*(2013), 18-23.

Schmidt, A., Boersma, K., & Groenewegen, P. (2018). Management strategies in response to an institutional crisis: The case of earthquakes in the Netherlands. *Public Administration, 96*(3), 513–527.

Scholtens, B. (2018). The Janus face of natural gas resources in the Netherlands. In M. Mulder & P. Perey (Eds.), *Gas production and earthquakes in Groningen: Refection on economic and social consequences* (pp. 25–40). Groningen: University of Groningen (CEER Policy Papers no. 3).

Sheikh, W. T., & Van Ameijde, J. (2022). Promoting liveability through urban planning: A comprehensive framework based on the "theory of human needs." *Cities, 131*, 103972. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103972</u>

Sintubin, M. (2018). The Groningen case: When science becomes part of the problem, not the solution. *Seismological Research Letters, 89*(6), 2001–2007.

SodM [Staatstoezicht op de Mijnen]. (2013). *Reassessment of the probability of higher magnitude earthquakes in the Groningen gas field*. Den Haag: SodM

Stroebe, K., Postmes, T., Kanis, B., De Jong, M., Schoutens, L., Adams, W., & Boendermaker, M. (2021). *Eindrapport Gronings perspectief fase 2: Stand van zaken, februari 2021*. Retrieved February 26, 2024, from <u>https://www.groningsperspectief.nl/eindrapport-gronings-perspectief-fase2/</u> Ten Holter Noordam. (2022, May 9). *De leefbaarheid: een taai, maar belangrijk onderdeel van de volkshuisvesting*. Ten Holter Noordam Advocaten. Retrieved October 17, 2023, from <u>https://tenholternoordam.nl/kennisdelen/blog/de-leefbaarheid-een-taai-maar-belangrijk-onderdeel-van-de-volkshuisvesting</u>

Top, S., Pattje, W., Bröring, H. E., Jager-Smit, J., Vink, A., & Doevelaar, N. (2020). *Boudel op Rieg: Stand van zaken gasdossier Groningen.* Groninger Gasberaad.

Tweede Kamer (2014-2015). Parlementaire enquête woningcorporaties. (TK 33 606, nr. 4). Den Haag: Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal.

Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal. (2014, October 30). Parlementaire Enquêtecommissie Woningcorporaties presenteert eindrapport "Ver van huis." *Tweede Kamer Der Staten-Generaal*. Retrieved October 17, 2023, from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/nieuws/kamernieuws/newspage2972_eindrapport_woningcorporaties.jsp

Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal. (2017–2018). Gaswinning. (TK 33529, nr. 457). Den Haag: Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal.

Tweede Kamer (2022 – 2023). Parlementaire enquête aardgaswinning in Groningen. (TK 35 561, nr. 17). Den Haag: Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal

Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal. (2023a, June 19). *Parlementaire enquêtecommissie aardgaswinning Groningen*. Tweede Kamer Der Staten-Generaal. Retrieved September 25, 2023, from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerleden-en-commissies/commissies/parlementaire-enquetecommissie-aardgaswinning-groningen

Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal. (2023b, September 1). *Parlementaire onderzoeken: wat is het verschil?* Tweede Kamer Der Staten-Generaal. Retrieved September 25, 2023, from <u>https://www.tweedekamer.nl/debat_en_vergadering/uitgelicht/parlementaire-onderzoeken-wat-het-verschil-</u> <u>0</u>

Universiteit Utrecht & RaboResearch. (2023). *Brede Welvaartsindicator 2023*. Retrieved February 19, 2024, from <u>https://www.uu.nl/sites/default/files/BWI%202023.pdf</u>

Van Gent, W., & Hochstenbach, C. (2020). The neo-liberal politics and socio-spatial implications of Dutch postcrisis social housing policies. *International Journal of Housing Policy, 20*(1), 156–172. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/19491247.2019.1682234</u>

Van Der Voort, N., & Vanclay, F. (2015). Social impacts of earthquakes caused by gas extraction in the Province of Groningen, The Netherlands. *Environmental Impact* Assessment *Review*, *50*, 1–15. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2014.08.008</u> Van Der Woud, A. (2010). *Koninkrijk vol sloppen:* Achterbuurten *en vuil in de negentiende eeuw*. Uitgeverij Bert Bakker.

van Kamp, I., Leidelmeijer, K., Marsman, G., & de Hollander, A. (2003). Urban environmental quality and human well-being towards a conceptual framework and demarcation of concepts; a literature study. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 65*, 5–18. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s0169-2046(02)00232-3</u>

Veenhoven, R. (1996). Happy life-expectancy: A comprehensive measure of quality-of life in nations. *Social Indicators Research, 31*(1), 1–58. https://doi.org/10.1007/ BF00300831

Verdoes, A., & Boin, A. (2021). Earthquakes in Groningen: Organized Suppression of a Creeping Crisis. In *Understanding the Creeping Crisis*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70692-0</u>

Van Wijnbergen, S. (2020). *Essay over de verhuurderheffing* [Essay]. https://dkvwg750av2j6.cloudfront.net/m/51b20bee6b93c0d0/original/Van-Wijnbergen_Essay-over-deverhuurderheffing_maart-2020.pdf

Wierden & Borgen woningstichting. (2023, May 17). Help jij mee ons woon-actieplan voor Groningen te maken? *Wierden & Borgen Woningstichting*. Retrieved September 23, 2023, from <u>https://www.wierdenenborgen.nl/nieuws/help-jij-mee-ons-woon-actieplan-voor-groningen-te-maken</u>

Woonzorg Nederland. (2022, April 1). *Samenwerkingsverband Kr8-corporaties*. Woonzorg Nederland. Retrieved February 15, 2024, from <u>https://www.woonzorg.nl/nieuws/samenwerkingsverband-kr8-corporaties</u>





The 'praatplaat interventies leefbaarheid' by Aedes



rbeeld: een signaal van bewoners, een gesprek satie, de start van een wijkaanpak
t zich afspeelt en wie je nodig hebt om de pakken
situatie en opgave
resultaat je wil bereiken en hoe je dat wil volgen





Code Interventie

Beoogd effec	B	ec	0	go	d e	ff	e	С
--------------	---	----	---	----	-----	----	---	---

1	Huurderscheck, bijvoorbeeld door <u>voorlichting</u> , een kennismakingsgesprek, via een (ver)huurdersverklaring, met het <u>Kompas woonvoorwaarden</u> als kader, of voorbeeld <u>Fieldlab Amsterdam</u>)	Een goede match tussen huurder en woonomgeving
2	Gericht toewijzen, bijvoorbeeld gedifferentieerd toewijzingsbeleid (tweehu- renbeleid), inkomensafhankelijke huurverhoging (gebiedsgericht), toewijzing aan hogere inkomens (gebiedsgericht), zoals <u>Rotterdamwet</u>	
3	Mixen samenstelling complexen bijvoorbeeld in Zwolle en door Portaal	Wooncomplex veelzijdiger maken
4	Verkoop sociale huurwoningen (aan zittende huurders en/of bij mutatie), bijvoorbeeld <u>klushuizen</u> in een minder populaire wijk met veel sociale huur	Wooncarrière bieden aan scheefhuurders, aanbod voor middeninkomens vergroten
5	Spreiding van huurders met een zorg- en/of begeleidingsbehoefte bijvoor- beeld gefaciliteerd door de <u>WoonZorgwijzer</u> , met <u>tijdelijke huurcontracten</u> en/of met <u>tijdelijke contracten bij tijdelijk leegstaande woningen</u>	Balans tussen zorgvragers en zelfredzame huurders
6	Huurcontract inclusief zorg en begeleiding bijvoorbeeld in Zuid-Limburg, in Apeldoorn en via Housing First	Betere begeleiding en zorg, voorkomen van overlast

Bestaande woningvoorraad

Code	Interventie	Beoogd effect
1	Bewoners intensief betrekken (meedenken en meebeslissen) bij onderhoud en verduurzaming van een complex en directe woonomgeving	Gevoel van eigenaarschap bij het thuis en leefbaarheid vergroten
2	Beeldkwaliteit van alle complexen waarderen, bijvoorbeeld met de beheerkwaliteit tool van Woonbron en <u>beeldkwaliteitscatalogus</u>	Sturen op kwaliteit, schoon heel en veilig
3	Investeringen in woningvoorraad (onderhoud) prioriteren onder andere in gebied met multiproblematiek bijvoorbeeld in: <u>Nijmegen</u>	Aantrekkelijkheid buurt vergroten
4	Integrale gebiedsaanpak met partners, bijvoorbeeld in Rotterdam	Integrale buurtaanpak en versterken leefbaarheid

Nieuwbouw

Code	Interventie	Beoogd effect
1	Sloop/nieuwbouw bestaand bezit: terugbouwen ander woningtype en andere prijscategorie , bijvoorbeeld in <u>Amersfoort</u> en in <u>Nijmegen</u>	Ontbrekend woningtype toevoegen, veerkra versterken
2	Nieuwbouw sociale huur in een sterke wijk met weinig sociale huurwoningen	Gemengde en veerkrachtige wijken maken
3	Transformeren leegstaand bedrijfs- of maatschappelijk vastgoed naar woningen (bijvoorbeeld in <u>Nieuwegein</u>)	Extra woningbouw toevoegen
4	Nieuwbouw (of bestaand vastgoed) voor specifieke doelgroepen bijvoorbeeld <u>Oranje Huis</u> , <u>Skaeve Huse</u> en andere <u>nieuwe woonzorgfor-</u> <u>mules</u>)	Bijzondere doelgroepen huisvesten
5	Uitruilen ontwikkellocaties (met gemeente, ontwikkelaars of andere partijen, zoals bijvoorbeeld in <u>Utrecht</u>)	Gemengde wijken maken



Code Interventie

1	Het beheer intensiveren : bijvoorbeeld meer inzet wijkconsulenten, wijkbeheer, <u>wijk-GGD'er</u> , <u>buurtbemiddeling</u> en <u>pop-upwoning wijkagent</u>	Sociale veiligheid verhogen en overlast voorkomen
2	Zelfbeheer ondersteunen, van volledig (wooncoöperatie) tot <u>zelfbeheer</u> van bijvoorbeeld de schoonmaak (bijvoorbeeld in <u>Utrecht</u> , in <u>Gelderland</u> en in <u>Amsterdam</u>)	Huurderbetrokkenheid vergroten
3	Het inzetten van wijkvertegenwoordigers , zoals bijvoorbeeld in <u>Den Haag</u>	Gemeenschapszin vergroten
4	Investeren in ontmoeting en buurtactiviteiten (bijvoorbeeld in <u>Apeldoorn</u> , <u>Eindhoven</u> , <u>Amsterdam</u> via <u>BuurtCirkel</u> en <u>Zorgsaamwonen</u>)	Sociale cohesie vergroten, voorkomen eenzaamheid
5	Overlast melden vergemakkelijken (bijvoorbeeld de <u>Woonoverlast app</u> Eindhoven en de <u>app van Veiligheidshuis Fryslân</u>)	Aanpak overlast, eigen verantwoordelijkheid vergroten
6	Inzet op voorkomen van schulden en betalingsachterstanden, bijvoorbeeld door vroegsignalering en gegevens delen. (voorbeelden <u>Den Helder</u> ,	Bieden van woonzekerheid aan huurders

- De Voorzieningenwijzer en Armoedepact Almelo)

Lokale samenwerking

Code Interventie

- Gebiedsgericht een convenant of wijkplan sluiten met partners (bijvoo het <u>wijkvernieuwingsplan</u>, de <u>wijkdeal</u> in Groningen en de <u>Deysselbuur</u> Amsterdam) Themagericht een convenant sluiten met partners (voorbeelden Ridde
- Nieuwegein, in Friesland, gericht op gegevensdeling)
- Werkafspraken maken met partners over huisvesting, zorg en begeleid bijvoorbeeld in de Drechtsteden, regio Alkmaar, Apeldoorn en in Amste Met partners budgetten ontschotten (bijvoorbeeld in Den Bosch)

Kansrijke combinaties van interventies:

Leefbaarheid verbeteren in een wijk die onder druk staat: "Wijkaanpak Overvecht"



Met partners werk maken van schuldenproblematiek





zoekbalk en kies filter 'wiiken en buurter



eerkracht wijk





aEdes

In samenwerking met:



Beoogd	effect
--------	--------

Beoogd effect orbeeld Door een integrale wijkaanpak een inclusieve wijk realiseren, voorkomen ondermijning erkerk, Gezamenlijk sturen op gedeelde doelen ding Spreiding bijzondere doelgroepen, verbeteren zorg en begeleiding Middelen bundelen voor maximaal resultaat en minder		
erkerk, Gezamenlijk sturen op gedeelde doelen ding terdam Spreiding bijzondere doelgroepen, verbeteren zorg en begeleiding Middelen bundelen voor maximaal resultaat en minder		Beoogd effect
ding Spreiding bijzondere doelgroepen, verbeteren zorg en terdam begeleiding Middelen bundelen voor maximaal resultaat en minder		
terdam begeleiding Middelen bundelen voor maximaal resultaat en minder	<u>erkerk</u> ,	Gezamenlijk sturen op gedeelde doelen
	Ŭ	
maatschappelijke kosten		Middelen bundelen voor maximaal resultaat en minder maatschappelijke kosten

Wijkvernieuwing Malvert: vernieuwing en verduurzaming met ruimte voor een mix van bewoners



De veilige buurtaanpak Maastricht





Participatie en meer

Question list explorative talks

Lijst met verkennende vragen (Nederlands)

Deze vragenlijst heeft tot doel inzicht te verkrijgen in de uitdagingen waarmee woningcorporaties en huurders worden geconfronteerd als gevolg van aardbevingsproblematiek in Groningen. Daarnaast wordt de focus gelegd op de samenwerking binnen het KR8-verband en de ontwikkeling van het Woonactieplan. Het gesprek duurt ongeveer 45 minuten.

Verkenning van uitdagingen voor woningcorporaties:

- 1. Wat is uw visie op de rol van woningcorporaties? (met betrekking tot het aanpakken van de gevolgen van de aardbevingen; alleen materiële schade of ook immateriële schade?)
- 2. Hoe verhouden woningcorporaties zich tot andere partijen, bijvoorbeeld de gemeente, het NCG en het Rijk?
- 3. Hoe beïnvloedt de aardbevingsproblematiek de dagelijkse vastgoedactiviteiten van uw woningcorporatie?
- 4. Hoe is het omgaan met de aardbevingsproblematiek binnen uw corporatie geregeld? Bijvoorbeeld, is er een speciale afdeling voor opgericht?
- 5. Beschouwt u de aardbevingen voornamelijk als een financieel of een sociaal probleem?
- 6. Hoe beïnvloeden de aardbevingen het langetermijnstrategiebeleid of de planning van uw woningcorporatie?

Verkenning van uitdagingen voor huurders:

- 7. Wat zijn naar uw inzien de belangrijkste zorgen of uitdagingen waarmee huurders te maken krijgen als gevolg van de aardbevingen?
- 8. Kunt u persoonlijke ervaringen of verhalen delen van huurders die de moeilijkheden illustreren die ze ondervinden?
- 9. Hebben de aardbevingen in Groningen enige verstoring of spanning veroorzaakt in de relatie tussen woningcorporaties en huurders? Of in de relatie tussen huurders onderling?

*In mijn scriptie maak ik onderscheid tussen materiële en immateriële schade veroorzaakt door aardbevingen. Samen hebben deze geleid tot een afname van de leefbaarheid.

Verkenning van het samenwerkingsverband KR8

- 10. Kunt u uitleggen hoe de woningcorporaties tot elkaar zijn gekomen en hoe het samenwerkingsverband KR8 tot stand is gekomen?
- 11. Wat is uw mening over de huidige organisatiestructuur van KR8?
- 12. Wat waren de overwegingen om van KR8 geen juridische entiteit te maken?
- 13. Hoe vaak hebben de bestuurders van de verschillende corporaties contact met elkaar? En in welke mate vindt er overleg plaats?
- 14. Vindt u dat KR8 in de huidige vorm succesvol is? Zo niet, wat is volgens u nodig om KR8 tot een succes te maken?

Verkenning van het Woonactieplan:

- 15. Kunt u mij meer vertellen over de huidige samenstelling, doelstellingen en verwachte resultaten van het Woonactieplan?
- 16. Op welke manier wordt de meerwaarde van de samenwerking tussen de woningcorporaties binnen KR8 voor het Woonactieplan begrepen? (Er zijn slechts vier personen actief betrokken bij het opstellen ervan: 2 externe communicatieadviseurs, iemand van Groninger Huis en iemand van Acantus)
- 17. Wat is er naar uw mening nodig voor een succesvolle implementatie van het Woonactieplan?

APPENDIX C

Informed consent form



Geïnformeerde toestemming

Zuidbroek, 9 april 2024

Geachte heer/mevrouw,

U wordt uitgenodigd om deel te nemen aan een onderzoek getiteld 'Rebuilding trust: Housing associations in Groningen's earthquake aftermath'. Dit onderzoek wordt geleid door Maaike Creusen, een studente aan de TU Delft, als onderdeel van haar afstudeerscriptie voor de master Management in the Built Environment. Het onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd in opdracht van het bestuurlijk overleg KR8, waarbij woningcorporatie Groninger Huis fungeert als stageplek.

Aanleiding

De sluiting van de gaskraan op 1 oktober 2023 markeerde het einde van zes decennia van gaswinning in Groningen, Nederland. Hoewel dit moment wordt beschouwd als een mijlpaal, betekent het niet het einde van de aanhoudende uitdagingen die de inwoners van Groningen blijven treffen. Integendeel, het sluiten van de gaskraan markeert het begin van een nieuw hoofdstuk in het aardbevingsdossier: de fase van nazorg. Naast de enorme taak van het versterken van meer dan 27.318 gebouwen, worstelen veel Groningers met psychosociale problemen als gevolg van aardbevingen, zoals angst, een overheersend gevoel van onveiligheid en verhoogde stressniveaus. Deze masterscriptie gaat dieper in op de vaak over het hoofd geziene rol die woningcorporaties spelen bij het aanpakken van de verstrekkende gevolgen van aardbevingen. Ondanks dat ze toezicht houden op 30% van de getroffen woningen, zijn hun bijdragen grotendeels onverkend gebleven in de bestaande literatuur.

Doel

Dit onderzoek heeft als doel deze kenniskloof te overbruggen door zich te richten op de vraag: 'Welke strategieën zouden woningcorporaties kunnen toepassen om zowel materiële als immateriële schade te managen en de leefbaarheid te verbeteren in het door aardbevingen getroffen gebied van Groningen?' Het onderzoek sluit hiermee aan op de ontwikkeling van het Woonactieplan door de KR8 corporaties.

Verkennende gesprekken

De vragen die aan u zullen worden voorgelegd zijn ontworpen om inzicht te krijgen in de geleefde ervaringen, organisatorische reacties en de bredere uitdagingen waarmee huurders en woningcorporaties in Groningen worden geconfronteerd als gevolg van aardbevingen, waarbij de nadruk vooral ligt op leefbaarheidsvraagstukken. Het verkennende gesprek zal ongeveer 45 minuten in beslag nemen. De resultaten zullen worden gebruikt voor het beantwoorden van de deelvraag: *'Welke leefbaarheidsuitdagingen gerelateerd aan aardbevingen ervaren huurders en woningcorporaties in het door aardbevingen getroffen gebied van Groningen?*

Protocol

Uw deelname aan dit onderzoek is volledig vrijwillig, en u kunt zich elk moment terugtrekken zonder reden op te geven. U bent vrij om vragen niet te beantwoorden.

Het verkennende gesprek zal – wanneer u daarmee akkoord gaat – worden opgenomen op audio om het achteraf verwerken van de resultaten te vergemakkelijken. De opname en het transcript worden onder een code bewaard. Mocht u anoniem willen blijven, dan dient u dit in de bijgaande verklaring aan te geven. Als u kiest voor anonimiteit, wordt de informatie uit uw interview geanonimiseerd en zullen geen persoonlijk identificeerbare gegevens worden vrijgegeven. Indien u niet aangeeft anoniem te willen blijven, gaat u ermee akkoord dat u met naam, toenaam en functie genoemd kunt worden in het onderzoeksrapport.

Het eindrapport van dit onderzoek zal naar verwachting worden gepubliceerd in juni/juli 2024 in de TU Delft repository. De onderzoeksresultaten zullen worden gepresenteerd op de universiteit en bij het stagebedrijf. Na het afstuderen zullen zowel de opnames als de transcripties zorgvuldig worden vernietigd, waarbij de vertrouwelijkheid van de gegevens wordt gewaarborgd.

<u>Contactgegevens</u> Als u vragen heeft over dit onderzoek, kunt u contact opnemen met mij:

Maaike Creusen <u>M.J.Creusen@student.tudelft.nl</u> +31 6 25379615

Of met mijn eerste begeleider:

Harry Boumeester h.j.f.m.boumeester@tudelft.nl

Indien u mee wilt doen aan dit onderzoek, wilt u dan de bijgaande verklaring invullen en ondertekenen?

Met vriendelijke groet, Maaike Creusen

	Ja ,	/ Nee
(1) Ik verklaar dat ik de informatiebrief d.d. 9 april 2024 heb gelezen of dat deze brief aan mij is voorgelezen. Ik heb deze informatie begrepen. Daarnaast heb ik de mogelijkheid gekregen om hier vragen over te stellen en deze vragen zijn naar tevredenheid beantwoord.	0	0
(2) Ik verklaar hierbij dat ik vrijwillig meedoe aan dit onderzoek. Ik begrijp dat ik mag weigeren om vragen te beantwoorden en dat ik mijn medewerking aan dit onderzoek op elk moment kan stoppen zonder opgave van reden.	0	0
(3) Ik begrijp dat het geluidsmateriaal (of de bewerking daarvan) en de overige verzamelde gegevens uitsluitend voor analyse en wetenschappelijke presentatie en publicaties zal worden gebruikt.	0	0
(4) Ik begrijp dat het meedoen aan dit onderzoek betekent dat mijn antwoorden worden bewaard tot het onderzoek is afgerond. Ik begrijp dat de opgeslagen gegevens onder een code worden bewaard en - indien gewenst - anoniem worden verwerkt.	0	0
(5) Ik wil graag anoniem blijven	0	0
(6) Graag ontvang ik aan het eind van het onderzoek het rapport met daarin de resultaten en conclusies van het onderzoek. Om deze reden verleen ik toestemming om mijn naam- en adresgegevens tot het eind van het onderzoek te bewaren.	0	0

Ik heb dit formulier gelezen of het formulier is mij voorgelezen en ik stem in met deelname aan het onderzoek.

Naam deelnemer

Handtekening

Datum

'Ik heb toelichting gegeven op het onderzoek. Ik verklaar hierbij bereid te zijn nog opkomende vragen over het onderzoek naar vermogen te beantwoorden'.

Maaike Creusen

Naam onderzoeker

09.04.2024

Handtekening

Datum

APPENDIX D

Data management plan

Plan Overview

A Data Management Plan created using DMPonline

Title: DMP_Thesis_MBE_Rebuilding trust: Housing associations in Groningen's earthquake aftermath

Creator: Maaike Creusen

Principal Investigator: Maaike Creusen

Data Manager: Maaike Creusen

Project Administrator: Maaike Creusen

Affiliation: Delft University of Technology

Template: TU Delft Data Management Plan template (2021)

Project abstract:

The earthquake problem in Groningen has received significant attention within the current body of literature. While there has been extensive research on both material and immaterial damage, the predominant focus of prior research has been on mapping out the consequences. When it comes to mitigating these consequences, there has often been a singular focus on governmental responses, leaving a significant gap in our understanding of the role played by other relevent stakeholders such as housing associations in the area. Remarkably, despite being responsible for approcimately 30% of the affected homes, the specific contributions and challenges faced by housing associations in mitigating the extensive consequences of this crisis remain inadequately explored.

This thesis seeks to bridge this gap in knowledge by conducting an investigation into the role that housing associations play in addressing the (im)material damage caused by earthquakes.

The main question that this thesis wants to answer is: 'What strategies could housing associations employ to manage both material and immaterial damage and enhance liveability in the earthquake-affected region of Groningen?'.

The following sub-questions are explored to support the main research question:

- 1. What is the current state of the earthquake problem in Groningen, including its key characteristics and impact?
- 2. How is the role of housing associations defined within the framework of the Dutch Housing Act, and how is it interpreted by the associations operating within the earthquake-affected region of Groningen?
- 3. *How is liveability defined in existing literature, and what are the prevailing management strategies outlined to enhance it?*
- 4. What earthquake-related liveability challenges do tenants and housing associations encounter in Groningen's earthquake-affected region?
- 5. What does the Woonactieplan, that is currently being developed by the KR8 associations, entail?

6. What strengths and weaknesses does the Woonactieplan have in its current form?

To answer these questions, a **mixed-methods approach** will be employed.

First, a (preliminary) literature review is conducted to answer the first three sub-questions.

Within the scope of sub-question 4, a *quantitative approach* will be used to map the scale of the problem. This comprises the analysis of survey forms filled out by tenants in May 2023, available in both physical and online formats.

Pertaining to sub-question 5 and 6, a *qualitative approach* will be employed to analyse and understand the Woonactieplan in greater depth, including its current composition, objectives, and strengths and weaknesses. This is done through expert interviews. Towards the culmination of the research, the interntion is to communicate the research findings to the relevant stakeholders through the means of a focus group.

ID: 139928

Last modified: 12-02-2024

DMP_Thesis_MBE_Rebuilding trust: Housing associations in Groningen's earthquake aftermath

0. Administrative questions

1. Name of data management support staff consulted during the preparation of this plan.

The data steward of the faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Janine Strandberg, has reviewed this DMP on December 19, 2023.

2. Date of consultation with support staff.

2023-12-19

I. Data description and collection or re-use of existing data

3. Provide a general description of the type of data you will be working with, including any re-used data:

Type of data	File format(s)	How will data be collected (for re-used data: source and terms of use)?	Purpose of processing	Storage location	Who will have access to the data
Survey		earthquake-related liveability challenges	Groninger Huis	Student: Maaike Creusen	
Informed consent form	.word	dataset itself. The participant will receive the informed consent form via email prior to the interview / focus group. This form necessitates the inclusion of personal identifiable information (PII) such as the participant's first and last name, along with their signature. Within the form, participants are given the choice to either remain anonymous or grant permission for their name and occupation to be included in the report. They wil be requested to return the signed form to the researcher, either digitally or in print. The signed forms are scanned in / transferred to secure storage (the TU Project Storage Drive) as soon as possible and then encrypted separately from the research data. In the mean time, the hard copies of signed consent forms are stored securely (in a locked cupboard in a locked office). After processing, the original document will be disposed of securely.	to record the expert interview / focus group.	TU Delft Project Storage Drive	The project team (composed of: Student: Maaike Creusen, first mentor: Harry Boumeester and second mentor: Marja Elsinga)
Expert interview (audio recording)	.mp3	Ca. 15 - 20 stakeholders will be interviewed. Certain interviews are conducted face-to-face, while others are conducted online (via Teams). The interviews are recorded using an audio recorder. The audio recording is transferred to secure storage (the TU Project Storage Drive) as soon as possible and then deleted.	To gain insight into the lived experiences, organizational responses and broader challenges that tenants and housing associations in Groningen face as a result of earthquakes, with a particular focus on liveability issues.	TU Delft Project Storage Drive	The project team
Expert interview (transcript)	.pdf	Transcription from the audio recording, derived from an (offline), third-party service provider. The transcripts remain unaltered unless a participant explicitly requests anonymity, in which case their information is anonymized accordingly.	To facilitate data processing	TU Delft Project Storage Drive	The project team
Focus group (audio recording)	.mp3	Line focus droub occurs in person and is recorded using an	To test research findings and communicate them to the relevant stakeholders	TU Delft Project Storage Drive	The project team
Focus group (transcript)	.pdf	Transcription from the audio recording, derived from an (offline), third-party service provider.	To facilitate data processing	TU Delft Project Storage Drive	The project team

4. How much data storage will you require during the project lifetime?

• 250 GB - 5 TB

II. Documentation and data quality

5. What documentation will accompany data?

• README file or other documentation explaining how data is organised

III. Storage and backup during research process

6. Where will the data (and code, if applicable) be stored and backed-up during the project lifetime?

- OneDrive
- Another storage system please explain below, including provided security measures
- Project Storage at TU Delft

The audio recorder functions as a temporary storage facility for the audio recordings of the interviews and focus group. The primary storage location for all data is the TU Delft Project Storage Drive, accessible only to the project team, composed of student: Maaike Creusen, first mentor: Harry Boumeester and second mentor: Marja Elsinga. Additionally, the word document of the thesis report and other writing materials are stored on the student's laptop and backed up on her personal OneDrive account.

IV. Legal and ethical requirements, codes of conduct

7. Does your research involve human subjects or 3rd party datasets collected from human participants?

• Yes

8A. Will you work with personal data? (information about an identified or identifiable natural person)

If you are not sure which option to select, first ask you<u>Faculty Data Steward</u> for advice. You can also check with the <u>privacy website</u>. If you would like to contact the privacy team: privacy-tud@tudelft.nl, please bring your DMP.

• Yes

As I conduct interviews and a focus group, I process both personal data for administrative reasons and personal research data.

8B. Will you work with any other types of confidential or classified data or code as listed below? (tick all that apply)

If you are not sure which option to select, ask your<u>Faculty Data Steward</u> for advice.

• Yes, I work with other types of confidential or classified data (or code) - please explain below

In the survey adapted from Groninger Huis, certain tenants have chosen to share their home and email addresses voluntarily. This information is considered sensitive personal data (confidential).

9. How will ownership of the data and intellectual property rights to the data be managed?

For projects involving commercially-sensitive research or research involving third parties, seek advice of your<u>Faculty</u> <u>Contract Manager</u> when answering this question. If this is not the case, you can use the example below.

Throughout the active research phase, data confidentiality will be maintained within the internship company and solely accessible to the project team. Post-graduation, the thesis will be publicly accessible and uploaded to the thesis repository of TU Delft.

10. Which personal data will you process? Tick all that apply

- Other types of personal data please explain below
- Data collected in Informed Consent form (names and email addresses)
- Signed consent forms
- Email addresses and/or other addresses for digital communication
- Names and addresses

Occupation and/or organisation

11. Please list the categories of data subjects

Ca. 15 - 20 participants will be involved. These are employees of housing associations and representatives of other relevant instances involved in the Groningen earthquake file

12. Will you be sharing personal data with individuals/organisations outside of the EEA (European Economic Area)?

• No

15. What is the legal ground for personal data processing?

Informed consent

See Informed Consent Form

16. Please describe the informed consent procedure you will follow:

All study participants will be asked for their written consent for taking part in the study and for data storing/processing before the start of the interview / focus group.

17. Where will you store the signed consent forms?

- Other please explain below
- Same storage solutions as explained in question 6

Also see question 3

18. Does the processing of the personal data result in a high risk to the data subjects?

If the processing of the personal data results in a high risk to the data subjects, it is required to perform <u>**Data**</u> <u>**Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA).**</u> In order to determine if there is a high risk for the data subjects, please check if any of the options below that are applicable to the processing of the personal data during your research (check all that apply).

If two or more of the options listed below apply, you will have t<u>complete the DPIA</u>. Please get in touch with the privacy team: privacy-tud@tudelft.nl to receive support with DPIA.

If only one of the options listed below applies, your project might need a DPIA. Please get in touch with the privacy team: privacy-tud@tudelft.nl to get advice as to whether DPIA is necessary.

If you have any additional comments, please add them in the box below.

• None of the above applies

22. What will happen with personal research data after the end of the research project?

- Personal research data will be destroyed after the end of the research project
- Anonymised or aggregated data will be shared with others
- Personal data will be shared with others please explain which personal data will be shared, with whom, how and whether you have specified this in the informed consent form

See question 3 - Within the informed consent form, participants are given the choice to either remain anonymous or grant permission for their name and occupation to be included in the report. The audio recordings of the interviews and focus group will be destroyed after the end of the research project.

23. How long will (pseudonymised) personal data be stored for?

• 10 years or more, in accordance with the TU Delft Research Data Framework Policy

24. What is the purpose of sharing personal data?

• Other - please explain below

The utilization of names and occupations in expert interviews serves to validate and strengthen the research by attributing statements to credible sources. It adds credibility by showcasing insights from esteemed individuals, substantiating the study's findings, and emphasizing diverse perspectives involved in the research.

25. Will your study participants be asked for their consent for data sharing?

• Yes, in consent form - please explain below what you will do with data from participants who did not consent to data sharing

In that case, their information is anonymized accordingly.

V. Data sharing and long-term preservation

27. Apart from personal data mentioned in question 22, will any other data be publicly shared?

• All other non-personal data (and code) produced in the project

29. How will you share research data (and code), including the one mentioned in question 22?

 All anonymised or aggregated data, and/or all other non-personal data will be uploaded to 4TU.ResearchData with public access

30. How much of your data will be shared in a research data repository?

• 100 GB - 1 TB

31. When will the data (or code) be shared?

• At the end of the research project

32. Under what licence will be the data/code released?

• CC BY

VI. Data management responsibilities and resources

33. Is TU Delft the lead institution for this project?

• Yes, leading the collaboration - please provide details of the type of collaboration and the involved parties below

The initiative originates from TU Delft, but the research is being conducted in combination with an internship at Groninger Huis.

34. If you leave TU Delft (or are unavailable), who is going to be responsible for the data resulting from this project?

The first mentor of this research, name: H.J.F.M. Boumeester, email address: H.J.F.M.Boumeester@tudelft.nl

35. What resources (for example financial and time) will be dedicated to data management and ensuring that data will be FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-usable)?

4TU.ResearchData is able to archive 1TB of data per researcher per year free of charge for all TU Delft researchers. We do not expect to exceed this and therefore there are no additional costs of long term preservation.

Human research ethics checklist

Delft University of Technology HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS CHECKLIST FOR HUMAN RESEARCH (Version January 2022)

IMPORTANT NOTES ON PREPARING THIS CHECKLIST

- 1. An HREC application should be submitted for every research study that involves human participants (as Research Subjects) carried out by TU Delft researchers
- 2. Your HREC application should be submitted and approved **before** potential participants are approached to take part in your study
- 3. All submissions from Master's Students for their research thesis need approval from the relevant Responsible Researcher
- 4. The Responsible Researcher must indicate their approval of the completeness and quality of the submission by signing and dating this form OR by providing approval to the corresponding researcher via email (included as a PDF with the full HREC submission)
- 5. There are various aspects of human research compliance which fall outside of the remit of the HREC, but which must be in place to obtain HREC approval. These often require input from internal or external experts such as <u>Faculty Data Stewards</u>, <u>Faculty HSE advisors</u>, the <u>TU Delft Privacy Team</u> or external <u>Medical research partners</u>.
- 6. You can find detailed guidance on completing your HREC application here
- 7. Please note that incomplete submissions (whether in terms of documentation or the information provided therein) will be returned for completion **prior to any assessment**
- 8. If you have any feedback on any aspect of the HREC approval tools and/or process you can leave your comments <u>here</u>

I. Applicant Information

PROJECT TITLE:	Rebuilding trust: Housing associations in Groningen's earthquake aftermath
Research period: Over what period of time will this specific part of the research take place	Between February and June of 2024
Faculty:	Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment
Department:	Management in the Built Environment (MBE)
Type of the research project: (Bachelor's, Master's, DreamTeam, PhD, PostDoc, Senior Researcher, Organisational etc.)	Master thesis
Funder of research: (EU, NWO, TUD, other – in which case please elaborate)	N/a
Name of Corresponding Researcher: (If different from the Responsible Researcher)	Maaike Creusen
E-mail Corresponding Researcher: (If different from the Responsible Researcher)	M.J.Creusen@student.tudelft.nl
Position of Corresponding Researcher: (Masters, DreamTeam, PhD, PostDoc, Assistant/ Associate/ Full Professor)	Master student
Name of Responsible Researcher: Note: all student work must have a named Responsible Researcher to approve, sign and submit this application	Harry Boumeester
E-mail of Responsible Researcher: Please ensure that an institutional email address (no Gmail, Yahoo, etc.) is used for all project documentation/ communications including Informed Consent materials	H.J.F.M.Boumeester@tudelft.nl
Position of Responsible Researcher : (PhD, PostDoc, Associate/ Assistant/ Full Professor)	Assistant professor

II. Research Overview

NOTE: You can find more guidance on completing this checklist <u>here</u>

a) Please summarise your research very briefly (100-200 words)

What are you looking into, who is involved, how many participants there will be, how they will be recruited and what are they expected to do?

Add your text here – (please avoid jargon and abbrevations)

My thesis seeks to answer the question: 'What **strategies** could **housing associations** employ to **manage** both material and immaterial **damage** and **enhance liveability** in the **earthquake**-affected region of Groningen?' To this end, 6 sub-questions were formulated.

This research distinguishes itself from prior investigations into the Groningen earthquake problem through the integration of three distinct and pivotal elements (spheres): (1) earthquakes in Groningen, (2) the role of housing associations in NL and (3) management strategies for enhancing liveability. To comprehensively investigate the role that housing associations play, a *mixed-methods approach* will be employed. First, a (preliminary) literature review is conducted to achieve a comprehensive grasp of all three spheres for the purpose of their integration. Following the literature review, other qualitative and quantitative research methods will be employed, including a data analysis, in-depth interviews and a focus group.

The HREC submission is meant for the latter three, since they involve human participants. Ca. 15 – 20 participants will be involved to gain insight into the lived experiences, organizational responses and the broader challenges that tenants and housing associations in Groningen face as a result of earthquakes, with a particular focus on liveability issues.

The participants are employees of the KR8 associations and/or representatives of other relevant instances involved in the Groningen earthquake file. The selection is made in consultation with and using the network of the internship supervisor of the graduation company.

b) If your application is an additional project related to an existing approved HREC submission, please provide a brief explanation including the existing relevant HREC submission number/s.

Add your text here – (please avoid jargon and abbrevations) N/a

c) If your application is a simple extension of, or amendment to, an existing approved HREC submission, you can simply submit an <u>HREC Amendment Form</u> as a submission through LabServant.

III. Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan

NOTE: You can find more guidance on completing this checklist <u>here</u>

Please complete the following table in full for all points to which your answer is "yes". Bear in mind that the vast majority of projects involving human participants as Research Subjects also involve the collection of **Personally Identifiable Information (PII)** and/or **Personally Identifiable Research Data (PIRD)** which may pose potential risks to participants as detailed in Section G: Data Processing and Privacy below.

To ensure alighment between your risk assessment, data management and what you agree with your Research Subjects you can use the last two columns in the table below to refer to specific points in your Data Management Plan (DMP) and Informed Consent Form (ICF) – **but this is not compulsory**.

It's worth noting that you're much more likely to need to resubmit your application if you neglect to identify potential risks, than if you identify a potential risk and demonstrate how you will mitigate it. If necessary, the HREC will always work with you and colleagues in the Privacy Team and Data Management Services to see how, if at all possible, your research can be conducted.

			If YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitig	YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan columns below.		
ISSUE	Yes	No	RISK ASSESSMENT – what risks could arise? Please ensure that you list ALL of the actual risks that could potentially arise – do not simply state whether you consider any such risks are important!	MITIGATION PLAN – what mitigating steps will you take? Please ensure that you summarise what actual mitigation measures you will take for each potential risk identified – do not simply state that you will e.g. comply with regulations.	DMP	ICF
A: Partners and collaboration						
 Will the research be carried out in collaboration with additional organisational partners such as: One or more collaborating research and/or commercial organisations Either a research, or a work experience internship provider¹ ¹ If yes, please include the graduation agreement in this application 	x		The research is carried out in combination with a graduation internship at a housing association (Groninger Huis, see internship agreement). It could be that Groninger Huis wants to take the research in a different direction than my supervisors at TU Delft. Or that I become influenced (biased) because I mainly view the problem from their eyes.	By scheduling meetings involving both the supervisors from the TU Delft and the supervisor from Groninger Huis, the hope is that expectations stay aligned.		
2. Is this research dependent on a Data Transfer or Processing Agreement with a collaborating partner or third party supplier? If yes please provide a copy of the signed DTA/DPA		X				
3. Has this research been approved by another (external) research ethics committee (e.g.: HREC and/or MREC/METC)? If yes, please provide a copy of the approval (if possible) and summarise any key points in your Risk Management section below		X				
B: Location						

			If YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan columns below.			Please provide the relevant reference #	
ISSUE	Yes	No	RISK ASSESSMENT – what risks could arise? Please ensure that you list ALL of the actual risks that could potentially arise – do not simply state whether you consider any such risks are important!	MITIGATION PLAN – what mitigating steps will you take? Please ensure that you summarise what actual mitigation measures you will take for each potential risk identified – do not simply state that you will e.g. comply with regulations.	DMP	ICF	
4. Will the research take place in a country or countries, other than the Netherlands, within the EU?		X					
5. Will the research take place in a country or countries outside the EU?		X					
6. Will the research take place in a place/region or of higher risk – including known dangerous locations (in any country) or locations with non-democratic regimes?		X					
C: Participants							
7. Will the study involve participants who may be vulnerable and possibly (legally) unable to give informed consent? (e.g., children below the legal age for giving consent, people with learning difficulties, people living in care or nursing homes,).		x					
8. Will the study involve participants who may be vulnerable under specific circumstances and in specific contexts, such as victims and witnesses of violence, including domestic violence; sex workers; members of minority groups, refugees, irregular migrants or dissidents?		X					
9. Are the participants, outside the context of the research, in a dependent or subordinate position to the investigator (such as own children, own students or employees of either TU Delft and/or a collaborating partner organisation)? It is essential that you safeguard against possible adverse consequences of this situation (such as allowing a student's failure to participate to your satisfaction to affect your evaluation of their coursework).		x					
10. Is there a high possibility of re-identification for your participants? (e.g., do they have a very specialist job of which there are only a small number in a given country, are they members of a small community, or employees from a partner company collaborating in the research? Or are they one of only a handful of (expert) participants in the study?	×		While there is a possibility of re-identification, particularly concerning the executives of the housing associations, it's important to note that this may not inherently pose a significant risk. It's plausible that these individuals are comfortable with their identities being known within the context of the study.	However, to ensure transparency and respect for privacy preferences, participants are given the opportunity to express whether they wish to remain anonymous in the informed consent form, providing them with agency over the handling of their personal information.			
D: Recruiting Participants							
11. Will your participants be recruited through your own, professional, channels such as conference attendance lists, or through specific network/s such as self-help groups	x		Participant selection will be done through the network of the internship supervisor at the graduation company. There is a risk of bias in participant selection, as relying solely on the network of the internship supervisor at the graduation company may lead to a homogenous	By conducting interviews with individuals from various organizations, the risk of bias in participant selection is automatically mitigated as different perspectives are inherently represented. Furthermore, since my internship supervisor does not have contacts in all			

			If YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan columns below.		Please provide the relevant reference #	
ISSUE	Yes	No	RISK ASSESSMENT – what risks could arise? Please ensure that you list ALL of the actual risks that could potentially arise – do not simply state whether you consider any such risks are important!	MITIGATION PLAN – what mitigating steps will you take? Please ensure that you summarise what actual mitigation measures you will take for each potential risk identified – do not simply state that you will e.g. comply with regulations.	DMP	ICF
			pool of candidates who may not represent diverse perspectives or experiences.	areas, I will proactively complement the selection process by reaching out to additional sources myself.		
12. Will the participants be recruited or accessed in the longer term by a (legal or customary) gatekeeper? (e.g., an adult professional working with children; a community leader or family member who has this customary role – within or outside the EU; the data producer of a long-term cohort study)		x		······································		
13. Will you be recruiting your participants through a crowd-sourcing service and/or involve a third party data-gathering service, such as a survey platform?		x				
14. Will you be offering any financial, or other, remuneration to participants, and might this induce or bias participation?		х				
E: Subject Matter Research related to medical questions/health may require special attention. See also the website of the <u>CCMO</u> before contacting the HREC.						
 15. Will your research involve any of the following: Medical research and/or clinical trials Invasive sampling and/or medical imaging Medical and <i>In Vitro Diagnostic Medical</i> Devices Research 		X				
16. Will drugs, placebos, or other substances (e.g., drinks, foods, food or drink constituents, dietary supplements) be administered to the study participants? <i>If yes see here to determine whether medical ethical approval is required</i>		x				
17. Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants? If yes see here to determine whether medical ethical approval is required		x				
18. Does the study risk causing psychological stress or anxiety beyond that normally encountered by the participants in their life outside research?		x				
19. Will the study involve discussion of personal sensitive data which could put participants at increased legal, financial, reputational, security or other risk? (e.g., financial data, location data, data relating to children or other vulnerable groups) Definitions of sensitive personal data, and special cases are provided on the TUD Privacy Team website.		X				
20. Will the study involve disclosing commercially or professionally sensitive, or confidential information? (e.g., relating to decision-making processes or business strategies which might, for example, be of interest to competitors)	×		The study includes an analysis of a policy document that is still under construction. A risk associated with this is the potential for inadvertently disclosing sensitive information. This could lead to premature exposure of unfinished or unapproved policies, which may result in confusion, misinterpretation, or	This risk will be mitigated by clearly communicating with my supervisor to determine what information I am permitted to share and what information needs to remain confidential.		

			If YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan columns below.		Please provide the relevant reference #	
ISSUE	Yes	No	RISK ASSESSMENT – what risks could arise? Please ensure that you list ALL of the actual risks that could potentially arise – do not simply state whether you consider any such risks are important!	MITIGATION PLAN – what mitigating steps will you take? Please ensure that you summarise what actual mitigation measures you will take for each potential risk identified – do not simply state that you will e.g. comply with regulations.	DMP	ICF
			reputational damage to the organization responsible for drafting the document.			
21. Has your study been identified by the TU Delft Privacy Team as requiring a Data Processing Impact Assessment (DPIA)? If yes please attach the advice/ approval from the Privacy Team to this application		Х				
22. Does your research investigate causes or areas of conflict? If yes please confirm that your fieldwork has been discussed with the appropriate safety/security advisors and approved by your Department/Faculty.		x				
23. Does your research involve observing illegal activities or data processed or provided by authorities responsible for preventing, investigating, detecting or prosecuting criminal offences If so please confirm that your work has been discussed with the appropriate legal advisors and approved by your Department/Faculty.		x				
F: Research Methods						
24. Will it be necessary for participants to take part in the study without their knowledge and consent at the time? (e.g., covert observation of people in non-public places).		Х				
25. Will the study involve actively deceiving the participants? (For example, will participants be deliberately falsely informed, will information be withheld from them or will they be misled in such a way that they are likely to object or show unease when debriefed about the study).		x				
26. Is pain or more than mild discomfort likely to result from the study? And/or could your research activity cause an accident involving (non-) participants?		Х				
27. Will the experiment involve the use of devices that are not 'CE' certified? Only, if 'yes': continue with the following questions:		X				
Was the device built in-house?						
• Was it inspected by a safety expert at TU Delft? If yes, please provide a signed device report						
 If it was not built in-house and not CE-certified, was it inspected by some other, qualified authority in safety and approved? If yes, please provide records of the inspection 						
28. Will your research involve face-to-face encounters with your participants and if so how will you assess and address Covid considerations?	х		Fortunately, there is currently no ongoing COVID crisis. The preference is to conduct the interviews	Participants should be offered the freedom to choose between an online or in-person meeting.		

			If YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan columns below.		Please provide the relevant reference #	
ISSUE	Yes	No	RISK ASSESSMENT – what risks could arise? Please ensure that you list ALL of the actual risks that could potentially arise – do not simply state whether you consider any such risks are important!	MITIGATION PLAN – what mitigating steps will you take? Please ensure that you summarise what actual mitigation measures you will take for each potential risk identified – do not simply state that you will e.g. comply with regulations.	DMP	ICF
			and focus group in person. However, if it proves more convenient or practical, organizing them online is also acceptable.			
 29. Will your research involve either: a) "big data", combined datasets, new data-gathering or new data-merging techniques which might lead to re-identification of your participants and/or b) artificial intelligence or algorithm training where, for example biased datasets could lead to biased outcomes? 		X				
G: Data Processing and Privacy						
30. Will the research involve collecting, processing and/or storing any directly identifiable PII (Personally Identifiable Information) including name or email address that will be used for administrative purposes only? (eg: obtaining Informed Consent or disbursing remuneration)	×		To fulfill administrative requirements (such as the Informed Consent Form) participants' names, email addresses, and signatures are gathered. Inadequate storage of this Personally Identifiable Information (PII) could lead to potential risks such as data breaches or unauthorized access.	I will ensure that the PII is stored in secure and encrypted storage systems accessible only to authorized personnel. Participants will be asked to give consent for this storage and will be informed on data handling and confidentiality.		
31. Will the research involve collecting, processing and/or storing any directly or indirectly identifiable PIRD (Personally Identifiable Research Data) including videos, pictures, IP address, gender, age etc and what other Personal Research Data (including personal or professional views) will you be collecting?	x		The research will include the collecting, processing and storing of indirectly identifiable Personally Identifiable Research Data (PIRD), in the form of the audio recordings of the interviews and focus group, made with an (offline) audio recorder. Inadequate storage of this PIRD could lead to potential risks such as data breaches or unauthorized access. Moreover, Personal Research Data, in the form of personal and professional views, are shared during the interviews and focus group. One significant risk associated with this type of data, is the potential for reputational harm. Participants may express opinions or share information that, if exposed without context, could damage their reputation within their professional or personal spheres.	Regarding the audio recordings of the interviews and focus group, I will first seek informed consent for recording, processing, and storing the data. The audio recording will be transferred to secure storage (the TU Project Storage Drive) as soon as possible after the interview and then deleted. Transcripts will be generated using an (offline) third-party service provider (as outlined in the Data Management Plan). Regarding the personal and professional views, participants will have the option to specify if they prefer to remain anonymous. Additionally, any inclusion of a participant's personal or professional view in a report will be subject to their feedback on its presentation and explicit approval beforehand.		
32. Will this research involve collecting data from the internet, social media and/or publicly available datasets which have been originally contributed by human participants	×		Collecting data on the liveability in Groningen from publicly available datasets on the internet may entail risks related to data authenticity, accuracy, or ethical considerations surrounding data usage.	I will carefully evaluate the reliability and credibility of the sources. Additionally, I will adhere to ethical guidelines and obtain permission for data usage if		
			If YES please complete the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Plan columns below.		Please provide the relevant reference #	
--	-----	----	--	--	---	-----
ISSUE	Yes	No	RISK ASSESSMENT – what risks could arise? Please ensure that you list ALL of the actual risks that could potentially arise – do not simply state whether you consider any such risks are important!	MITIGATION PLAN – what mitigating steps will you take? Please ensure that you summarise what actual mitigation measures you will take for each potential risk identified – do not simply state that you will e.g. comply with regulations.	DMP	ICF
				required, to address potential concerns regarding privacy or usage rights.		
33. Will your research findings be published in one or more forms in the public domain, as e.g., Masters thesis, journal publication, conference presentation or wider public dissemination?	X		The master thesis will be published on the TU Delft repository. This may pose risks of data exposure, misinterpretation or potential misuse.	I will ensure that sensitive information is appropriately redacted or anonymized. Additionally, I will provide clear context and explanations within the thesis to minimize the potential for misinterpretation. Furthermore, I will clearly define permissions for data retrieval and use.		
34. Will your research data be archived for re-use and/or teaching in an open, private or semi-open archive?		×				

H: More on Informed Consent and Data Management

NOTE: You can find guidance and templates for preparing your Informed Consent materials) <u>here</u>

Your research involves human participants as Research Subjects if you are recruiting them or actively involving or influencing, manipulating or directing them in any way in your research activities. This means you must seek informed consent and agree/ implement appropriate safeguards regardless of whether you are collecting any PIRD.

Where you are also collecting PIRD, and using Informed Consent as the legal basis for your research, you need to also make sure that your IC materials are clear on any related risks and the mitigating measures you will take – including through responsible data management.

Got a comment on this checklist or the HREC process? You can leave your comments here

IV. Signature/s

Please note that by signing this checklist list as the sole, or Responsible, researcher you are providing approval of the completeness and quality of the submission, as well as confirming alignment between GDPR, Data Management and Informed Consent requirements.

Name of Corresponding Researcher (if different from the Responsible Researcher) (print)

Maaike Creusen

Signature of Corresponding Researcher:

Date: 12.02.2024

Name of Responsible Researcher (print) Harry Boumeester

Signature (or upload consent by mail) Responsible Researcher:

Date: 16-2-2024

V. Completing your HREC application

Please use the following list to check that you have provided all relevant documentation

Required:

- Always: This completed HREC checklist
- Always: A data management plan (reviewed, where necessary, by a data-steward)
- **Usually:** A complete Informed Consent form (including Participant Information) and/or Opening Statement (for online consent)

Please also attach any of the following, if relevant to your research:

Document or approval	Contact/s
Full Research Ethics Application	After the assessment of your initial application HREC will let you know if and when you need to submit additional information
Signed, valid <u>Device Report</u>	Your <u>Faculty HSE advisor</u>
Ethics approval from an external Medical Committee	TU Delft Policy Advisor, Medical (Devices) Research
Ethics approval from an external Research Ethics Committee	Please append, if possible, with your submission
Approved Data Transfer or Data Processing Agreement	Your Faculty Data Steward and/or TU Delft Privacy Team
Approved Graduation Agreement	Your Master's thesis supervisor
Data Processing Impact Assessment (DPIA)	TU <u>Delft Privacy Team</u>
Other specific requirement	Please reference/explain in your checklist and append with your submission

Data analysis Kr8 survey forms

Samenvatting

147 fysieke formulieren 116 digitale formulieren

In totaal 263 huurders die antwoord hebben gegeven op de vragen

Responspercentage per vraag

Vraag 1: 257/263 = 97,7% respons Vraag 2: 225/263 = 85,6% respons Vraag 3: 191/263 = 72,6% respons Vraag 4: 169/263 = 64,3% respons Vraag 5: 200/263 = 76,0% respons Vraag 6: 177/263 = 67,3% respons Vraag 7: 194/263 = 73,8% respons

Aanpak en kanttekeningen data analyse:

- Eerst zijn de enquêteformulieren per respondent doorgelezen. Daarna zijn alle antwoorden nog eens doorgelezen, dit keer per vraag. Op basis hiervan is een lijst van codes (onderwerpen) opgesteld (open coding).
- Vervolgens zijn per vraag de antwoorden gecodeerd.
- Daarna is geteld hoe vaak elk onderwerp genoemd werd. Een respondent kan meerdere onderwerpen aankaarten die hij/zij belangrijk vindt. Het aantal antwoorden kan dus hoger zijn dan het totaal aantal respondenten.
- Wanneer een respondent meerdere woorden noemt die bij één onderwerp passen of synoniemen van elkaar zijn (bijv. verduurzamen, energiezuiniger, zonnepanelen), wordt dit geteld als 1.
- Om een onderwerp op de lijst te krijgen moest het bij een vraag minimaal 5x genoemd worden. Anders komt het onder 'overig' terecht.
- Nadeel van op deze manier data verwerken is dat je altijd info mist
- Andere kanttekening: digitale formulieren wel door huurders ingevuld, maar fysieke formulieren ook nog wel eens door de medewerker van de woningcorporatie die het gesprek voelde. Dit kan net wat anders opgeschreven zijn dan hoe de huurder het bedoelt heeft (zit interpretatie van de medewerker bij in)
- In de samenvatting die voor het Woonactieplan is gebruikt, waren slechts de 116 digitale formulieren meegenomen. Meer dan de helft van de input is daarmee gemist.
- Dikgedrukt betekent meer dan eens in de top 5

Lijst met codes (onderwerpen)

- Bereikbaarheid (OV)
- De mens voorop stellen
- Duidelijkheid
- Duurzaamheid
- Een goede buur(t)
- Financiële tegemoetkoming
- Groen
- Indeling woning
- Karakter
- Levensloopbestendig
- Onderhoud en beheer
- Overig
- Ruimte
- Rust
- Samenwerking met andere partijen
- Veiligheid
- Verkeer
- Versterking (sloop/nieuwbouw of versterken en schadeherstel)
- Vertrouwen
- Voorzieningen
- Voorzieningen voor de jeugd
- Woningaanbod

Antwoorden per vraag

*Onderwerpen gerangschikt op vaakst genoemd

Vraag 1: wat vind je belangrijk voor jouw huis, nu en in de toekomst?

- 1. Duurzaamheid
- 2. Indeling woning
- 3. Onderhoud en beheer
- 4. Veiligheid
- 5. Versterking (sloop/nieuwbouw of versterken en schadeherstel)

Vraag 2: wat vind je belangrijk voor jouw woonomgeving, nu en in de toekomst?

- 1. Groen
- 2. Onderhoud en beheer
- 3. Rust
- 4. Voorzieningen voor de jeugd
- 5. Een goede buur(t)

Vraag 3: wat moet er eerst volgens jou?

- 1. Duurzaamheid
- 2. Onderhoud en beheer
- 3. Versterking (sloop/nieuwbouw of versterken en schadeherstel)
- 4. Veiligheid
- 5. Groen

Vraag 4: wat kunnen wij als woningcorporatie(s) hierin voor jou betekenen?

- 1. De mens voorop stellen
- 2. Duurzaamheid
- 3. Onderhoud en beheer
- 4. Duidelijkheid
- 5. Versterking (sloop/nieuwbouw of versterken en schadeherstel)

<u>Vraag 5: wat is jouw toekomstbeeld voor het wonen en leven in Groningen, ook voor volgende</u> <u>generaties?</u>

<u>Vraag 6: wat is verloren gegaan en wat zie je graag terug?</u>

- 1. Voorzieningen
- 2. Een goede buur(t)
- 3. Karakter
- 4. Groen
- 5. Vertrouwen

Vraag 7: waar ben je trots op als Groninger?

Onderwerp	Hoe vaak genoemd?	Steekwo	oorden	Meest voorkomend
Duurzaamheid	166x	1.	Isoleren	
		2.	Zonnepanelen	
		3.	Warmtepomp	
		4.	Energiezuinig maken	
		5.	Hoge energielasten	
			omlaag	
Indeling woning	67x	6.	Nieuwe keuken	
		7.	Gelijkvloers	
		8.	Meer kamers	
		9.	Groter	
			Stopcontacten aarden	
			Extra toilet boven	
			Andere indeling	
			Dieper balkon	
			Traplift	
			Levensloopbestendig	
Onderhoud en beheer	51x	16.	Goed onderhouden	Goed onderhoud,
			Huizen opknappen	tochtvrij
		18.	Schimmel, vocht en	
			tochtproblemen	
		19.	Woningverbetering	
		20.	Tuinen netter	
		21.	Lekkages verhelpen	
Veiligheid	25x	22.	Een veilig huis	Heeft betrekking op aardbevingsschade
Versterking (sloop/nieuwbouw of	24x	23.	Aardbevingsschade herstellen	
versterken en		24.	Scheuren herstellen	
schadeherstel)			Stevig huis	
·····,			Schadevrij	
			Sloop/nieuwbouw	
			Aardbevingsbestendig	
			huis	
Levensloopbestendig	20x	29.	Langer thuis wonen	
			Zorg aan huis	
			Je moet er jong in	
			kunnen zijn en oud in	
			kunnen worden	
Rust	10x			
Voorzieningen	7x	32.	Goede voorzieningen	
<u> </u>		33.		
Overig	27x	34.	Betaalbaar	
0,000		35.	Hondenuitlaatveldje	
			Fiets en wandelpaden	
			Bankjes	
			Privacy	
		0.01		1
		39	Verkeersluw	
			Verkeersluw Ruimte	
		40.	Ruimte	
		40. 41.	Ruimte Een goede buurt	
		40. 41. 42.	Ruimte Een goede buurt Groen	
		40. 41. 42. 43.	Ruimte Een goede buurt	

Vraag 1: wat vind je belangrijk voor jouw huis, nu en in de toekomst?

Onderwerp	Hoe vaak genoemd?	Steekwoorden	Meest voorkomend
Groen	67x	- Meer groen	Meer groen
		- Parkjes	
		- Bomen en struiken	
		- Groene afscheiding	
Onderhoud en beheer	66x	- Afwatering - Tuinonderhoud	Tuinonderhoud
Oliderhoud en belieer	OOX	- Onderhoud van wegen	Tumonuel nouu
		en trottoirs	
		- Onderhoud van	
		algemeen groen	
		- Netjes	
		- Schoon	
Rust	40x	- Geen (geluids)overlast	50/50 overlast van andere
		- Geen bouwverkeer van	huurders of de versterking
		versterking	
Voorzieningen voor de jeugd	36x	- Speeltuinen	Speeltuinen
		- Jeugdsoos - Skateplaats	
		- Skateplaats - Uitgaansgelegenheden	
Een goede buur(t)	33x	- Noaberschap	
Len goede buur (t)		- Sociaal contact	
		- Saamhorigheid	
		- Gezelligheid	
		- Nette mensen	
		- Jong en oud gemixt	
		 Niet teveel culturen 	
		door elkaar	
Veiligheid	28x	- Criminaliteit	
		- Vandalisme	
		- Versterking	
		- Drugsoverlast	
		- Leegstand	
Voorzieningen	26x	 Meer toezicht id. wijk Winkels 	Winkels
voorziennigen	LUX	- Supermarkt	vv IIIKels
		- Restaurants	
		- Buurt/dorpshuis	
		- Sportclubs	
Verkeer	24x	- Parkeerplaatsen	Parkeergelegenheid en
		- Veiligheid	afremmende maatregelen
		- Afremmende	
		maatregelen	
		- Meer 30km	
		- Trottoir afbakenen met	
		drempels Verbe erstwur	
		 Verkeersluw Eenrichtingsverkeer 	
Ruimte	17x	- Eenrichtingsverkeer - Uitzicht	
Nullite	1/X	 Officient Niet te vol bouwen 	
Bereikbaarheid (OV)	15x	- Goed OV belangrijk	
	104	 Busverbinding met 	
		Hoogezand	
Overig (losse dingen)	27x	- Lage trottoirs	Bankjes, hondenuitlaatplekken
0 (-	- Straten vlakker	en verlichting meest genoemd
		- Hondenuitlaatveldje	0
		- Verlichting	
		- Bankjes	
		- Fiets en wandelpaden	
		- Meer prullenbakken	
		- Laadpalen	
		- Fitnesstoestellen	

Vraag 3: wat moet er eerst volg	ens jou?
---------------------------------	----------

Onderwerp	Hoe vaak genoemd?	Steekwoorden	Meest voorkomend
Duurzaamheid	59x	- Energiezuinig(er)	Energiezuinig(er) maken
		maken	
		- Isoleren	
		- Verduurzamingsinitiatie	
		ven van huurders	
		supporten	
		- Zonnepanelen	
		- Energielasten omlaag	
		- Van het gas af	
Onderhoud en beheer	40x	- Straten	Tuinonderhoud
		- Tuinen	
		- Groen	
		- Achterstallig onderhoud	
		aanpakken	
		- Ook als er niemand	
		woont onderhouden	
		- Rommel in brandgang	
		- De omgeving netjes	
		houden	
		- Leegstand voorkomen	
		- Schimmel, vocht en	
		tochtproblemen	
Versterking	35x	- Meer woningen bouwen	
(sloop/nieuwbouw of	0011	- Toekomstbestendige	
versterken en schadeherstel)		woningen	
versterken en senatenersterj		- Aardbevingsbestendig	
		bouwen	
		- Gedateerde woningen	
		met gebreken moeten	
		vervangen worden	
		- Schadeafhandeling IMG	
		- Versterken sneller	
		- Scheuren herstellen	
	22		
Veiligheid	23x	- Veiligheid op 1	
		- Meer controle op het	
		wonen in de buurt	
2		- Veilige woning	
Groen	23x	- Mooiere tuin	
		- Park	
		- Zorgen dat het groen	
		blijft	
		- Meer bomen	
		- Beter waterbeheer	
Verkeer	16x	- Meer parkeerplaatsen	
		- Strepen voor	
		parkeervlakken	
		- Minder hard rijden	
		- Drempels aanleggen	
		- Eenrichtingsverkeer	
		maken	
		- Verkeersluwe straat	
Voorzieningen voor de jeugd	13x	- Voetbalkooi	
	1	- Activiteiten	
, confine and the longer		- Activiteiteit	
		- Speeltuin	
,		- Speeltuin	
, oor noningon , oor ac joaga			
, oor noningon , oor ao joaga		- Speeltuin - Speelplekken - Skatebaan	
	13x	 Speeltuin Speelplekken Skatebaan Uitgaansgelegenheden 	
Financiële tegemoetkoming	13x	 Speeltuin Speelplekken Skatebaan Uitgaansgelegenheden 	

Rust Voorzieningen	12x 8x	 Compensatie voor al het leed Gelijke vergoedingen Lagere huur Overlast aanpakken Winkels Huisarts Investeren in mooi centrumgebied Buurt/dorpshuis Zwembad moet blijven
Duidelijkheid	7x	 Communicatie Waar zijn we aan toe?
Bereikbaarheid (OV)	бx	- Goed OV
Een goede buur(t)	5x	 Andere buren Zorg voor sociale cohesie Saamhorigheid bevorderen Gezelligheid
Overig (losse dingen)	25x	 Minder aardbevingen Glasvezel Mensen helpen, geen woorden maar daden Leefbaarheid aanpakken Sport goedkoper voor arme gezinnen Uitzicht behouden Stroomvoorziening moderniseren Laadpaal Honden uitlaatveldje Bankjes Fiets- en wandelpaden Ontmoetingsplekken Verbeteringen aan woning (bv. Nieuwe badkamer)

Onderwerp	Hoe vaak genoemd?	Steekwoorden	Meest voorkomend
De mens voorop stellen	43x	 Huurders serieuzer nemen Meedenken met huurders Luisteren Bemiddelen Meer begeleiding (voor ouderen) Betrokken zijn Opkomen voor de huurder Mensen samenbrengen Respect Realisatie van bewoners wensen en ideeën In de wijk aanwezig zijn Laat bewoners 	Serieus nemen
Duurzaamheid	30x	meedenken - Energiezuinig maken - Zonnepanelen - Isolatie - Dubbel glas - Warmtepomp - Gasvrij maken	
Onderhoud en beheer	28x	 Achterstallig onderhoud aanpakken Sneller reageren op reparatieaanvragen Schimmel aanpakken (Toezicht op) nette tuinen Tuinonderhoud Beter onderhoud uitvoeren Leegstand voorkomen 	
Duidelijkheid	17x	 Communiceer wat je als woningcorporatie nu al weet Betere communicatie Duidelijke afspraken Kom afspraken na Doe wat je zegt en zeg wat je doet Wees eerlijk Sneller reageren Wat gaat er met mijn woning gebeuren? 	
Versterking (sloop/nieuwbouw of versterken en schadeherstel)	16x	 Meewerken aan sloop/nieuwbouw Oplevering checken EFG woningen voorrang geven bij sloop/nieuwbouw Niet overal tegelijk beginnen Het uitvoeren Levensloopbestendige woningen Aanbieden van een passende woning Hulp met verhuizing 	

Vraag 4: wat kunnen wij als woningcorporatie(s) hierin voor jou betekenen?

		- Bouwen voor doorstroom	
Samenwerken met andere partijen	14x	 Denkgroepje met gemeente Doorgeven aan gemeente Samenwerking voor mensen moet beter Goed contract sluiten met aannemer Druk uitoefenen Aankloppen bij geëigende instantie Brug vormen tussen huurder en gemeente 	Samenwerking met gemeente
Veiligheid	9x	 (meer) toezicht Controle met politie/gemeente Screenen wie er komt wonen Aanpakken drugsoverlast Problemen in de wijk eerder signaleren en afhandelen 	
Overig	24x	 Picknickbank Kijken naar woonsituaties Meer prullenbakken Lobbyen? Verlichting Modernisering Ermee aan de slag gaar Zaken aanpakken Gevarieerde wijken (huur/koop) Huizen soundproof maken Meer bomen planten Voorzieningen voor de jeugd 	

Vraag 6: wat is verloren gegaan en wat zie je graag terug?

Onderwerp	Hoe vaak genoemd?	Steekwoorden	Meest voorkomend
Voorzieningen	42x	- Winkels	
		- Clubhuizen	
		- Sportschool	
		- Lokale supermarkten	
		- Bakker	
		- Slager	
		- Buurthuis	
		- Markt	
		- Peuterspeelzaal	
		- School	
		- Toegankelijke zorg	
Een goede buur(t)	39x	- Eenheid	
		- Saamhorigheid	
		- Noaberschap	
		- Gezelligheid	
		- Sociaal contact	
		- Gemengde wijken	
		- Buurtvereniging	
		- Nette mensen	
		- Individualisme	
		- Ons kent ons	
Karakter	15x	- Aanzichten van	
		aardbevingsdorpen	
		- Oude	
		huizen/boerderijen	
		- Historische architectuur	
Groen	13x	- Groenvoorziening	
		- Tuininrichting	
		- Gras, bomen, bloemen	
		- Biodiversiteit	
		- Natuur	
		- Openbaar groen	
Vertrouwen	11x	- In de politiek	
		- In de overheid	
		- In gemeente	
		- In woningcorporatie	
Woningaanbod	8x	- Woningtekort	
		- Voldoende woningen	
		- Een meer gevarieerd	
		woningaanbod	
		- Betaalbare woningen	
		- Levensloopbestendige	
		woningen	
		- Aanleunwoningen	
Voorzieningen voor de jeugd	8x	- Speeltuinen	
voorziennigen voor de jeugu	UA	- Voetbalveld	
		- Activiteiten	
		- Uitgaansleven	
Veiligheid	7x		
Onderhoud en beheer	7x	- Groenbeheer gaat	
		achteruit	
		- Netheid	
		- Verloedering	
Bereikbaarheid (OV)	7x	- Openbaar vervoer	
		- Aansluiting op randstad	
2		via Lelielijn	
Overig	27x	- Vogels	
		- Normen en waarden	
		- Tuinen voor	
		wisselwoning	
	1	- Tijd	

 Geld Onpersoonlijker Goed verhuurder schap Passie Verdraagzaamheid Woonplezier/woongenot (5x) Menselijkheid (vanuit corporaties) Leefbaarheid Wandel en fietspaden Rust Ruimte Toekomstnerspectief
 Toekomstperspectief Geld

APPENDIX G

Summary data analysis

Factsheet data analyse Kr8 week



1 vragenlijst met 7 open vragen

263 respondenten

- 147 huurders vulden een fysieke vragenlijst in
- 116 huurders deden dit online

Wat is er volgens jou nodig om veilig, fijn en met trots in Groningen te wonen?

De Kr8 corporaties gingen in mei 2023 in gesprek met hun huurders om wensen en ideeën op te halen. Deze werden gebruikt als input voor het Woonactieplan.











Hieruit komen 4 thema's naar voren die bij de helft van de vragen in de top 5 staan:





Du





Onderhoud en beheer (4x)

ırzaamheid	
(3x)	

Groen (3x)

Versterking (3x)



APPENDIX H

The Woonactieplan

WOONACTIEPLAN

Een handreiking voor veilig, fijn én met trots wonen in Groningen SAMEN STERK WONEN

Concept, september 2023

INHOUDSOPGAVE

03 1. Aanleiding

23

29

- **05** 2. Stem van de huurder
- **12** 3. Woonactieplan
 - > Versterken van vertrouwen
 - > Versterken van sociaal fundament
 - > Versterken van woonomgeving
 - > Versterken van de woningen
 - 4. Kracht van de Kr8
 - 5. Handreiking



1. AANLEIDING



NIJ BEGUN? OP WEG NAAR ERKENNING, HERSTEL EN PERSPECTIEF.

Wij zijn trots op onze bewoners èn Noordoost-Groningen en voelen ons verantwoordelijk voor trots wonen in Groningen.

De Kr8-corporaties bezitten een derde van de woningen in het aardbevingsgebied. Nog belangrijker is dat we een derde van de huishoudens een thuis bieden in dit gebied.

De versterkingsoperatie is de afgelopen jaren verworden tot een stille ramp. De uitkomsten van de parlementaire enquête liegen er niet om. Groningers hadden al die tijd gelijk, financiële afwegingen wonnen het van de menselijke. Groningers verdienen eerherstel.

Wij, de Kr8, kunnen en willen bijdragen in het realiseren van de erkenning, het herstel van vertrouwen en bieden van perspectief aan de inwoners van het aardbevingsbied. Wij stelden daarom samen met de HPAG (Huurders Platform Aardbevingsgebied Groningen) dit woonactieplan op. Dit plan begon bij onze huurders en onze samenwerkingspartners, waaronder marktpartijen. Wij geloven dat de plannen die wij hebben geformuleerd bijdragen aan het eerherstel dat de Groningers verdienen en aan een rooskleurigere toekomst voor Groningen.

September 2023

2. STEM VAN DE HUURDER



Wat de parlementaire enquête ons bevestigde, is dat de mens centraal moet staan in het zoeken naar en vinden van oplossingen. Dit bereiken we alleen door met mensen in gesprek te gaan en naar hen te luisteren.

WAAROM ÓÓK HUURDERS EEN STEM VERDIENEN.

De versterking tot nu toe ging over de stenen, met de focus op eigendom. Doordat huurders geen eigenaar zijn, is hun afhankelijkheidspositie groot en zijn ze niet tot nauwelijks gezien. Door de focus te verbreden van versterken van woningen naar versterken van wonen worden huurders weer volwaardige bewoners van Groningen. De andere positie van huurders uit zich in heel basale zaken als: het huurcontract moet worden ontbonden als de woning gesloopt wordt, huurders hebben andere vergoedingsstructuren, huurders hebben niet de regie over hetgeen teruggebouwd wordt en versterking vindt over het algemeen grootschalig plaats in plaats van individueel of kleinschalig.

Doordat huurders dikwijls niet allemaal kunnen terugkeren naar hun oude plek wordt het sociale fundament van buurten en wijken met veel sociale huurwoningen, die vaak al kwetsbaar zijn, nog meer ontwricht dan in buurten met veel koop.

Een veilig dak boven ons hoofd staat aan de basis van de Piramide van Maslow. Daarna volgen bestaanszekerheid, sociale behoefte en erkenning. Op alle lagen van de piramide hebben huurders niet dezelfde positie als eigenaren. Dit komt onder andere doordat de onzekerheid over het wel of niet moeten versterken van de woning groter is. Straten met veelal huurwoningen worden, doordat niet iedereen terugkeert, meer ontwricht. En vergoedingen waren en zijn niet gelijk aan die van eigenaren. Ook bewoners van sociale huurwoningen verdienen het om gehoord en gezien te worden.

WIJ STELLEN DAAROM: GEEF HUURDERS EEN GEZICHT EN POSITIE.

2. STEM VAN DE HUURDER

De Kr8-week

Om de huurders een stem te geven organiseerden we samen met de HPAG in mei 2023 een Kr8-week.

ONZE KR8-WEEK

Op maandag 22 mei 2023 om 9.30 uur verzamelden we in de wijk Tuikwerd in Delfzijl. Het was de start van de Kr8-week. Een mooie, indrukwekkende, week waarin we met een grote groep collega's van de Kr8-corporaties, samen met leden van onze huurdersorganisaties het aardbevingsgebied bezochten. Elke ochtend en elke middag waren we aanwezig in een ander dorp of een andere buurt.

Wat we gedaan hebben? Het was zo simpel, maar werd zo gewaardeerd. We hebben bij bewoners aangebeld en zijn in gesprek gegaan over het wonen en leven in het gebied. We vroegen hen: Wat vindt u belangrijk aan uw woning en uw woonomgeving? Wat vindt u belangrijk voor de toekomst? Waar bent u trots op? En wat kunnen wij als corporaties doen?

We hebben geluisterd. We hebben verhalen gehoord. We hebben gezien wat het wonen in het gebied met mensen doet. En dat maakt indruk. Bewoners hebben dagelijks te maken met de gevolgen van de gaswinning in het gebied. Het waren vaak ook lange gesprekken, mensen wilden echt hun verhaal kwijt.

We hebben ons nog meer gerealiseerd hoe belangrijk het is om de verhalen van de bewoners te horen. De stem van onze huurders. En ook dat het om zoveel meer gaat dan alleen het huis, de stenen. Het gaat ook om de buurt, de woonomgeving en het sociale fundament. We hebben de betrokkenheid van bewoners ervaren. De gastvrijheid. De bereidheid om hun verhaal, soms met veel emoties, met ons te delen.

KR8-WEEK IN CIJFERS

 > Ongeveer 10.000
 uitnodigingskaarten verstuurd
 > In vier dagen, 8 dorpen en wijken bezocht
 > Met ruim 50 collega's van de Kr8 corporaties en leden van de huurdersorganisaties
 > Ruim 160 huurders gesproken
 > 111 mensen vulden online een vragenlijst in

2. STEM VAN DE HUURDER

Wat we hebben gehoord

WAT HEB JE VERLOREN ZIEN GAAN?

Karakter van omgeving
Dingen voor kinderen en jeugd

Noaberschap
Gemengde wijken

Saamhorigheid en burencontact

Vertrouwen
Voorzieningen, winkels
Openbaar vervoer

Al het geld wat er aan Groningen

is uitgegeven
Buurtleven, de soos
Vogels
Een levendig centrum
Het leeft niet meer echt
De ziel

WAT VALT OP: Het sociale fundament valt uiteen.

WAT VIND JE BELANGRIJK?

• Inspraak · Goed contact als er iets is · Energiezuinige woningen · Speeltuin • Koffie drinken · Veel groen · Logische indeling woningen • Tuinen · Levensloopbestendig · Langer thuis kunnen wonen in dezelfde woning · Jongeren woningen Nette omgeving · Toezicht op nette tuinen en omgeving • Minder bouwverkeer Veiligheidsgevoel • Nette uitstraling straat

WAT VALT OP:

Groningers vragen niet veel. Het zijn heel basale wensen.

WAAR BEN JE TROTS OP?

Op de mensen in Groningen, omdat ze nuchter met de problemen opgaan

Gewoon normaal
Wonen zoals we wonen
Rust en Ruimte
Nuchter
Veel groen
Schone lucht
De Groninger
De nuchterheid

Even een kopje suiker halen bij de buren is hier niet gek
De uitgestrektheid van het platteland en de hoge luchten
Niets

WAT VALT OP:

Het gaat met name over het karakter van Groningers en het landschap. Over trots op de woning of buurt wordt nauwelijks gesproken.

WAT KUNNEN WIJ ALS CORPORATIES VOOR JOU BETEKENEN?

Sneller duidelijk maken wat er met een woning gaat gebeuren
Handelen naar beloftes en deze nakomen
Mensen bij elkaar brengen
Luisteren naar en betrekken bewoners
Zie ons als bewoners
Blijven communiceren, ook al lijkt het alsof er niets nieuws te melden is
Eén aanspreekpunt
Aandacht voor aanleg en tuinonderhoud
Huurders ondersteunen waar nodig

WAT VALT OP:

Communicatie staat bovenaan. Maar ook blijvende aandacht voor het wonen in de buurten en dorpen is van belang.

3. WOONACTIEPLAN

SAMEN STERK WONEN

DE THEMA'S

De stem van de huurder geeft een duidelijk geluid. Er zijn 4 thema's te herleiden waarop actie gewenst is:

Versterken van:

- **VERTROUWEN**
- **> SOCIAAL FUNDAMENT**
- **> WOONOMGEVING**
- **> WONINGEN**

LEESWIJZER

Per onderwerp staat beschreven wat het thema betreft, gevolgd door de acties die noodzakelijk zijn om de wens van de huurder te bewerkstelligen en welke randvoorwaarden hiervoor nodig zijn.

Het geluid van 271 van onze huurders hebben we op 19 juni 2023 laten horen aan onze partners tijdens het Kr8-congres.

We hebben onze partners en marktpartijen gevraagd hoe hun droombeeld op de vier thema's eruit ziet, wat ervoor nodig is om dit te bereiken en welke concrete acties we (gezamenlijk) moeten uitvoeren om dit te realiseren.

Het is hiermee een woonactieplan geworden van ons samen. Met de thema's als basis. En de acties als vervolg.

ONZE GESPREKPARTNERS

271 huurders, HPAG, Gemeente Eemsdelta,

Gemeente Midden Groningen, Gemeente Oldambt, Gemeente Het Hogeland, Provincie Groningen, Cadanz Welzijn, Adema architecten, Bouwbedrijf Kooi, Bureau Woontalent, Change.nl, DAAD architecten, Energiewacht, Groninger dorpen, Heijmans, HKB, IMG, KAW, Kerk en aardbevingen, Natuur & Millieu Groningen, NCG, Nijhuis Bouw bv, Plegt- Vos, Sociaal werk Oldambt, WIJ Groningen, Woonbond, Aedes, Gasberaad, Groninger Bodembeweging, Wold & Waard, Nijestee, Woonborg, Noorderzorg.

VERSTERKEN VAN VERTROUWEN

"NA 4,5 JAAR KREEG IK EINDELIJK UITSLAG: IK KAN HIER BLIJVEN WONEN. DAT WAS ZO'N OPLUCHTING! IK HEB ER ECHT VAN IN DE RATS GEZETEN.' BEWONER

"DIT VRAAGT OOK IETS VAN ONS. BOKITOGEDRAG IS DAN VERLEDEN TIJD." SAMENWERKINGSPARTNER

"DURF EERST TE LUISTEREN EN DAARNA PAS TE HANDELEN." SAMENWERKINGSPARTNER

HOREN, ZIEN EN BETREKKEN

Veel inwoners van Groningen ervaren leed dat voortkomt uit de gaswinning. Dit geldt ook voor onze huurders. Het vertrouwen in de overheid en instanties is laag. Omdat huurders geen eigenaar zijn van de woningen, worden zij minder gehoord en gezien. Daarom hebben zij weinig inzicht en invloed op het verloop van de versterking. Dit veroorzaakt een grote mate van onzekerheid. Corporaties komen bij mensen thuis: ze zitten aan de keukentafel en luisteren naar de verhalen en wensen. Zo kunnen corporaties helpen om het vertrouwen te herstellen en de wensen en beloften te vertalen naar acties.

HOE GAAN WE HET VERTROUWEN VERSTERKEN?

 We zijn er onvoorwaardelijk voor onze bewoners.
 We bouwen samen met onze partners een systeem van vertrouwen: dat betekent het betrekken van bewoners, duidelijke afspraken maken die nagekomen worden, luisteren, verantwoorden en de dingen simpel en uitlegbaar houden.

1. WE ZIJN ER ONVOORWAARDELIJK VOOR ONZE BEWONERS

Bij onzekerheid, wanneer vertrouwen geschaad is, geldt: geen nieuws is slecht nieuws. Communicatie is niet een middel, maar de weg naar het hervinden van vertrouwen. We zijn er blijven er voor bewoners. We moeten de stem van de huurders continu laten spreken. We moeten naar ze luisteren, we moeten bij ze blijven. We zijn daarom ook echt aanwezig in de wijken en dorpen. Net zo lang tot bewoners geloven dat geen bericht een goed bericht is. En ook dan moeten ze er op mogen vertrouwen dat we gewoon weer komen, mochten ze ons nodig hebben. We waren misschien wat op de achtergrond, maar zijn nooit weggeweest.

2. WE BOUWEN SAMEN MET ONZE PARTNERS EEN SYSTEEM VAN VERTROUWEN

Bewoners moeten niet overgeleverd zijn aan de grillen, regelingen of kaders van instanties.Wij voelen ons verantwoordelijk om bij te dragen aan het herstel van vertrouwen. Dit doen we door samen met onze partners te werken vanuit een gezamenlijke visie. We moeten óók als instanties elkaar vertrouwen. Vertrouwen hebben in elkaars expertise en in goede intenties. Dit betekent dat we elkaar meer moeten opzoeken, samen moeten werken, onze individuele belangen ondergeschikt moeten maken aan het grotere plaatje, transparant moeten zijn in ons denken en doen, minder politiek moeten bedrijven en soms meer moeten willen geven dan nemen. Soms betekent dit dat we buiten de lijntjes moeten kleuren en een beetje burgerlijk ongehoorzaam zijn. Alles ten dienste van ons gezamenlijke doel: dat onze huurders veilig, fijn en met trots kunnen wonen in Noordoost-Groningen.

'NA 4,5 JAAR KREEG IK EINDELIJK UITSLAG: IK KAN HIER BLIJVEN WONEN. DAT WAS ZO'N OPLUCHTING! IK HEB ER ECHT VAN IN DE RATS GEZETEN.'

> ELS KLOMPSTRA TEN BOER



BETER EEN GOEDE BUUR...

De buurt, de buren en de omgeving: ze zijn belangrijk voor onze huurders. Het is de plek waarmee ze zich identificeren. Het versterken van woningen heeft invloed op de sociale structuur van een wijk. Ook verdwijnen ontmoetingsplekken voor jong en oud. Na versterking van de woning keren niet alle huurders terug naar hun oude buurt. Hierdoor wordt het sociale fundament van buurten en wijken met veel sociale huurwoningen nog meer ontwricht.

HOE GAAN WE HET SOCIAAL FUNDAMENT VERSTERKEN?

1. We investeren in sociale infrastructuur.

- 2. We hebben oog voor bestaande sociale netwerken in buurten.
- 3. We ondersteunen versterking van sociale netwerken waar nodig en gewenst.

"EVEN EEN KOPJE SUIKER HALEN BIJ DE BUREN IS HIER NIET GEK." BEWONER

"INFRASTRUCTUUR IS NIKS ZONDER DE SOCIALE RELATIES DAAROMHEEN." SANDER VAN LANEN, RUG

"EEN JONG GEZIN, OP DE BAKFIETS. DE KINDEREN GAAN MET PLEZIER NAAR SCHOOL IN HET DORP. DE OUDERS WERKEN BEIDE IN DE GEMEENTE. WE GROETEN ELKAAR VRIENDELIJK," SAMENWERKINGS-PARTNER

1. WE INVESTEREN IN SOCIALE INFRASTRUCTUUR

Sociale infrastructuur is in het kort de infrastructuur die sociale contacten en ontmoetingen mogelijk maakt, zoals een buurthuis. Dit is belangrijk omdat deze contacten toegang geven tot essentiële kennis, producten en steun. Het begint met bewustwording over het belang van sociale infrastructuur. In onze dagelijkse activiteiten, bij projecten en ingrijpende versterking of herstructurering.

2. WE HEBBEN OOG VOOR BESTAANDE SOCIALE NETWERKEN IN BUURTEN

Sociale netwerken in buurten zijn van grote betekenis voor de bewoners. Wanneer deze, door bijvoorbeeld herstructurering of verbetering verstoord worden, neemt hun thuisgevoel en welzijn af. Buren zijn geen buren meer. Positieve effecten van de eventuele fysieke verbetering van woningen en woonomgeving op de levenskwaliteit van bewoners worden te niet gedaan als langlopende sociale netwerken verstoord worden. Bij de keukentafel gesprekken nemen we de tijd voor gesprekken over dit onderwerp en in de planvorming wordt er rekening gehouden met bestaande netwerken.

3. WE ONDERSTEUNEN VERSTERKING VAN SOCIALE NETWERKEN WAAR NODIG EN GEWENST

Soms is het netwerk al verstoord of kwetsbaar. En hebben mensen weinig contact. Als corporaties hebben we hierin een signalerende rol. Daar waar het fundament kwetsbaar is schakelen we bij. We schromen niet om (tijdelijk) in te stappen en verbindingen te leggen.


VERSTERKEN VAN WOONOMGEVING

GROEN, RUST EN RUIMTE...

Zo omschrijven veel Groningers hun woonomgeving. Maar het is méér: het is de winkel in het dorp, het openbaar vervoer én het dorpshuis. Door versterkingen zitten mensen jarenlang in een bouwput. De kwalitatief goede woningen die daarvoor terugkomen, veranderen het karakter en de uitstraling van de wijk. De plek waar ze vroeger elkaar ontmoetten is verdwenen. Het mooie groen is vervangen door jonge perkjes en speeltuinen ontbreken regelmatig. En ook de eigen tuin is niet meer wat het was.

HOE GAAN WE DE WOONOMGEVING VERSTERKEN?

 We behouden en versterken het karakter van Groningen.
 We werken gebiedsgericht samen aan de sociale en fysieke infrastructuur van Groningen. "HET PROBLEEM IS NIET OPGELOST BIJ DE EENMALIGE AANLEG VAN EEN TUINTJE. WE MOETEN BLIJVEN VASTHOUDEN EN ONDERSTEUNEN ALS DAT NODIG IS". SAMENWERKINGSPARTNER

> "MAAK EEN COALITIE VAN DE MENSEN DIE WILLEN." SAMENWERKINGSPARTNER

> > "DE ZIEL IS ERUIT". BEWONER

"SOMS MOET JE AUTONOMIE INLEVEREN. ALLEEN DAN KAN 1+1 DRIE WORDEN.". SAMENWERKINGS-PARTNER

1. WE BEHOUDEN EN VERSTERKEN HET KARAKTER VAN GRONINGEN

De wijken, buurten en dorpen in Noordoost Groningen hebben allemaal hun eigen karakter, sfeer en architectuur. Bewoners vragen nadrukkelijk om behoud hiervan en herstel waar dit verloren is gegaan. Met oog voor zowel het verleden, als het hier en nu, en een blik op de toekomst. Het behoud van het karakter maakt onderdeel uit van de planvorming. Dat is en wordt nog meer onze manier van werken.

2. WE WERKEN GEBIEDSGERICHT SAMEN AAN DE SOCIALE EN FYSIEKE INFRASTRUCTUUR.

Openbaar vervoer, het buurthuis, groen, een school en een winkel in de buurt. Dat is belangrijk voor onze bewoners. Evenals verzorgde tuinen, geen vandalisme of criminaliteit. We noemen dit ook wel brede welvaart. We willen samen met bewoners en lokale partners vanuit een gezamenlijke visie werken aan sterke wijken en dorpen. Gebiedsgericht kijken we wat er nodig is om dit te realiseren. We zetten onze expertises in en versterken elkaar. Wij voelen ons blijvend verantwoordelijk. Een aantrekkelijke buurt houdt niet op bij de oplevering. Waar nodig blijven we bewoners ondersteunen in het wonen, zoals bijvoorbeeld bij het onderhouden van tuinen of het aanpakken van overlast. We zijn er en we blijven er om buurten en dorpen aantrekkelijk te houden.





BETER MAKEN DAN HET WAS

Het versterken van een woning verandert het 'thuis'. Het wordt niet meer zoals het was. Om er een thuis van te maken, moeten huurders een stem krijgen in de versterkingsopgave. Ze verdienen het om gehoord en gezien te worden. Wat kunnen we extra bieden? Wat zij de woonwensen? Bijvoorbeeld de woningen duurzamer en geschikt voor jong en oud maken.

HOE GAAN WE DE WONINGEN VERSTERKEN?

- 1.We bieden bewoners ruimte om hun nieuwe huis hun thuis te maken.
- 2. We hanteren geen was-wordt, maar was-wordt beter.
- 3. We begeleiden bewoners van A tot Z.

"DE NIEUWE GENERATIE DIE ZEGT: "DE VERSTERKING IS GOED OPGELOST DOOR MIJN VADER."

"JE WORDT ER ELKE KEER MEE GECONFRONTEERD, JE KUNT HET NIET VAN JE AFZETTEN." BEWONER

"HELP EERST DE MENSEN DIE ÉCHT IN DE SHIT ZITTEN". BEWONER

1. WE BIEDEN BEWONERS RUIMTE OM VAN HUN NIEUWE HUIS HUN THUIS TE MAKEN

Bewoners hebben een stem in de versterking. In gesprek en met bewoners aan de tekentafel, dat wordt onze manier van werken. Met ruimte voor individuele wensen en behoeften om van hun huis een thuis te maken.

2. WE HANTEREN GEEN WAS-WORDT, MAAR WAS-WORDT BETER

De woningen die we versterken staan er al decennia. Terugbouwen wat was, doet geen recht aan het heden en de toekomst. Niet voor de huidige bewoners en ook niet voor toekomstige bewoners. We moeten dit moment aangrijpen om ook voor toekomstige generatie sterk wonen in Groningen mogelijk te maken. Dit vraagt oog voor de mogelijk conflicterende belangen van huidige bewoners en toekomstige huurders. Een continu dialoog is hiervoor noodzakelijk. Gesprekken over generatiebestendig wonen moeten worden gevoerd.

3. WE BEGELEIDEN BEWONERS VAN A TOT Z

Versterking brengt onzekerheid met zich mee. Wat gebeurt wanneer, waar heb ik recht op? Wat wordt er voor mij geregeld? We zorgen dat we er zijn voor bewoners: een aanspreekpunt en begeleiding van A tot Z. Dat betekent goede communicatie en nazorg afgestemd op de behoefte van de individuele bewoner, maar ook duidelijke regelingen die niet ongelijkheid in de hand werken.



4. KRACHT VAN DE KR8

ASAMEN STERRS BOONEN Als corporaties kunnen wij een brug vormen. Wij zijn niet de 'dader' en ook niet het slachtoffer van dit beleid. Wij, onze gebundelde kr8, vormen een deel van de oplossing die gezocht wordt. Een oplossing die Groningers weer vertrouwen moet geven in de toekomst, perspectief voor de regio en haar bewoners. Wat hebben ze verloren zien gaan en hoe kunnen we dit weer terug vinden?

DE KRACHT VAN DE KR8?

We zijn dichtbij (kennen het gebied en de bewoners) en gebundeld groot (vertegenwoordigen een derde van alle woningen/bewoners in het gebied). Wij komen bij de mensen thuis. Wij zijn niet verantwoordelijk voor zorg en welzijn, maar we kunnen wel signaleren dat iets nodig is. Maar we voelen ons wel verantwoordelijk. Het gaat om stenen en mensen. We staan dichtbij en kennen onze huurders we kunnen slagvaardig opereren. We weten sociaal en fysiek goed aan elkaar te verbinden. We weten dat goed wonen zoveel meer behelst dan alleen stenen.

We werken nauw samen met onze huurdersorganisaties. Zij weten wat er leeft onder onze huurders. Daarnaast hebben we een groot netwerk van partners en marktpartijen, en een enorme drive om met elkaar het juiste te doen voor onze regio, voor de bewoners, voor onze huurders, van nu en in de toekomst.

Zet ons in onze Kr8. Vertrouw ons erop dat we het juiste doen en de middelen verantwoord inzetten. Altijd en alles ten gunste van de huurders / bewoners. Wij pakken graag deze rol om mee te werken aan het herstel van vertrouwen.

4. KRACHT VAN DE KR8

Onze acties

PER DIRECT:

- Vragen wij om erkenning dat goed en veilig wonen, niet alleen een goede woning betekent, maar ook een goede woonomgeving en sociale infrastructuur en dat hier aandacht èn middelen voor komen in de versterking.
- Gaan we met gemeenten, huurdersorganisaties en andere partners in gesprek over het ontwikkelen van een gebiedsgerichte visie.
- Bij elk project is er een vast aanspreekpunt voor bewoners.
- Zetten we waar nodig capaciteit in op de ondersteuning van huurders. In projecten, maar ook structureel de komende jaren. Bijvoorbeeld bij tuinonderhoud. Hiermee dragen we ook bij aan zichtbaarheid in de wijk.
- Organiseren we elk kwartaal een versterkingscafé of andere vorm van ontmoeting voor alle partners in noordoost Groningen, waarin niet de versterking van woningen, maar het versterken van Groningen centraal staat. Zo leren we elkaar steeds beter kennen.
- Nodigen we bij elk project vroegtijdig bouwmeesters, stedenbouwkundigen en architecten uit aan tafel met kennis over en gevoel bij het karakter van de Groningse wijken en dorpen. We vragen ruimte en middelen om dit te realiseren.
- Betrekken we bouwbedrijven vroegtijdig bij de planvorming.
- Bij verhuizingen naar wisselwoningen en terugkeer naar de buurt wordt rekening gehouden met bestaande sociale netwerken.
- Zitten bewoners bij de ontwerpfase van de nieuwe woning al aan tafel.

OP KORTE TERMIJN:

- Stellen we een communicatieleidraad bij versterking op, waarin per fase staat wat bewoners kunnen verwachten en hoe ze worden betrokken.
- Richten we een Kr8-bureau op ten dienste van het woonactieplan om uitvoering en voortgang te borgen.
- Blijven we strijden voor eerlijke, gelijke en zo eenvoudig mogelijke regelingen voor iedereen (kopers en huurders). Huurders moeten vertrouwen houden in het proces en niet tegen een woud van regelingen aanlopen. Als corporaties zijn bereid op korte termijn de afhandeling van regelingen van de NCG over te nemen. En vragen daarom handelingsruimte.
- Maken we onze duurzaamheidsambities concreter. We versnellen waar we goed in zijn. We sluiten graag aan bij de Standaard (RVO) en willen inzetten op een koploperpositie in de provincie Groningen. We vragen hiervoor draagvlak en middelen.
- Organiseren we een kennissessie over sociale netwerken en wijkontwikkeling en passen de opgedane inzichten toe in onze gebiedsplannen, projectplannen en programma's van eisen.
- Hebben we (waar nog niet aanwezig) gebiedsteams samengesteld voor de gebieden waar tussen nu en één jaar versterking gaat plaatsvinden. In deze teams wordt met bewoners samengewerkt ten behoeve van het dorp of de buurt.
- Zetten we extra capaciteit in als het nodig is om onze huurders een betere toekomst te bieden. Huurders verdienen onze onverdeelde aandacht. Wij schromen niet extra FTE's in te zetten. We zijn daarom wars van benchmarks op FTE's. Wij stellen daarom voor om corporaties op korte termijn corporaties een vergoeding te geven voor extra bewonersbegeleiding.
- Gaan we zoveel mogelijk structureel, maar in ieder geval jaarlijks de dorpen, buurten en wijken in om in gesprek te gaan met bewoners. Met in bijzonder ook aandacht voor de verschillende doelgroepen (zoals jongeren en senioren).

OP LANGE[RE] TERMIJN:

• Ontwikkelen we samen met onze partners gebiedsgerichte visies. Met aandacht voor:

° Ontmoeting;

- ° De wensen van nu en die van toekomstige generaties;
- ° Sociale netwerken;
- ° Architectuur;
- ° Brede welvaart;
- ° Verduurzaming. In één keer gasloos en energiearm;
- ° Over grenzen heen. Gespikkeld bezit nemen we mee in onze eigen opgave;
- ° Onuitlegbare verschillen. Buurt-, wijk- en straatgrenzen zijn het uitgangspunt in onze aanpak.
- Hebben we een eigen Groninger school (werkwijze) voor dorps- en wijkaanpak. We maken hiervoor gebruik van alle kennis en kunde die er al is in de provincie. Dit betekent dat we een langjarige gebiedsgerichte samenwerkingsstructuur hebben. Op elk niveau. Wij zijn aanjager van deze aanpak.

5. HANDREIKING

SAMEN STERK WONEN

WAT HEBBEN WIJ CONCREET NODIG?

Natuurlijk gaat voor niks de zon op. Naast anders denken, doen en willen is er ook geld nodig. Geld voor het versterken en verbeteren van de woningen en woonomgeving. Maar ook geld voor mensen die gaan werken aan het fijn, veilig en met trots wonen in Groningen. En bovenal hebben we ruimte nodig (Groningen is trots op haar ruimte). Ruimte in bredere zin. Vertrouwen in ons, in dat we de middelen goed inzetten. Ruimte om die extra stap te zetten voor de wijk, in de verduurzaming, ontmoeting, behoud van het karakter, voor de huurder, samen met de huurdersorganisaties, onze partners en marktpartijen. En ruimte in tijd. Hoe anders zouden we met minder regelgeving vooraf en minder verantwoording achteraf de versterkingsgelden ingezet hebben? Hadden we dan niet betere keuzes gemaakt? Keuzes die een grotere positievere impact hebben op de levens van onze huurders en wonen in Groningen. We hebben dus niet alleen geld maar bovenal vertrouwen nodig, minder regelgeving en bureaucratie, waardoor er weer meer ruimte is om te luisteren naar de bewoners. Ruimte voor creativiteit en innovatie. Zo kan Groningen weer dromen, vooruitkijken, perspectief zoeken en vinden.

PAK ONZE HAND!

Uiteindelijk willen we met elkaar allemaal hetzelfde: Groningen weer vertrouwen en perspectief geven. Met het aanbieden van deze handreiking aan het ministerie, de provincie en de gemeenten vragen wij om ons te helpen om het mogelijk te maken deze verbeteringen werkelijkheid te maken.

WAT VRAGEN WIJ?

Een pot vol vertrouwen. Veel van de acties zijn uit te voeren door anders doen, denken en willen. Maar het lukt niet om alles op deze manier op te lossen. Daarom vragen we ook een pot met bureaucratievrij geld. Waarbij we beloven elke cent nuttig te besteden en we elke euro achteraf verantwoorden. In onze financiële onderbouwing beschrijven we per thema welke middelen we nodig hebben en koppelen we deze aan de aanbevelingen vanuit Nij Begun.

APPENDIX I

The 'praatplaat Woonactieplan' by Kr8



WOONACTIEPLAN



'NA 4,5 JAAR KREEG IK EINDELIJK UITSLAG: IK KAN HIER BLIJVEN WONEN. DAT WAS ZO'N OPLUCHTING! IK HEB ER ECHT VAN IN DE RATS GEZETEN.'

ELS KLOMPSTRA TEN BOER



'ER IS HIER BEHOEFTE AAN WONINGEN VOOR JONGEREN. EIGENLIJK ZIJN DIE ER NIET.'

WIETSKE VAN DER VEEN UITHUIZERMEEDEN



HOE GAAN WE HET VERTROUWEN VERSTERKEN?

- 1. WE ZIJN ER ONVOORWAARDELIJK VOOR ONZE BEWONERS.
- 2. WE BOUWEN SAMEN MET ONZE PARTNERS EEN SYSTEEM VAN VERTROUWEN: DAT BETEKENT HET BETREKKEN VAN BEWONERS, DUIDELIJKE AFSPRAKEN MAKEN DIE NAGEKOMEN WORDEN, LUISTEREN, VERANTWOORDEN EN DE DINGEN SIMPEL EN UITLEGBAAR HOUDEN.

HOE GAAN WE VERDER...

...OM SAMEN ONZE DOELEN TE HALEN?

WAT MOETEN WE ANDERS DOEN? WAT MOETEN WE LATEN? WAT MOETEN WE JUIST WEL BLIJVEN DOEN? WE GAAN HIER GRAAG MET JULLIE OVER IN GESPREK.

HOE GAAN WE HET SOCIAAL FUNDAMENT VERSTERKEN?

- 1. WE INVESTEREN IN SOCIALE INFRASTRUCTUUR.
- 2. WE HEBBEN OOG VOOR BESTAANDE SOCIALE NETWERKEN IN BUURTEN.
- 3. WE ONDERSTEUNEN VERSTERKING VAN SOCIALE NETWERKEN WAAR NODIG EN GE-WENST.









'IK VIND HET HEEL BELANGRIJK DAT ZE WANDEL- EN FIETSPADEN AANLEGGEN EN DAT ZE HET GROEN GOED ONDERHOUDEN.'

> KLAZIEN FELDMAN WIRDUM



'IK VIND HET BELANGRIJK DAT HUURDERS OOK EEN STEM HEBBEN. HOE GROTER DE GROEP, HOE MEER JE VOOR ELKAAR KRIJGT.'

> KIM VELLEMAN APPINGEDAM

HOE GAAN WE DE WOONOMGEVING VERSTERKEN?

- 1. WE BEHOUDEN EN VERSTERKEN HET KARAKTER VAN GRONINGEN.
- 2. WE WERKEN GEBIEDSGERICHT SAMEN AAN DE SOCIALE EN FYSIEKE INFRASTRUCTUUR VAN GRONINGEN.

HOE GAAN WE DE WONINGEN VERSTERKEN?

- WE BIEDEN BEWONERS RUIMTE OM HUN NIEUWE HUIS HUN THUIS TE MAKEN.
 WE HANTEREN GEEN WAS-WORDT, MAAR WAS-WORDT BETER.
- 3. WE BEGELEIDEN BEWONERS VAN Λ TOT Z.

APPENDIX J

Timeline Kr8 associations



2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2
Ontwikkelir	naen woninacor	poraties in Gra	ningen					



Ontwikkelingen in de landelijke corporatiesector



