

# Negotiating interests in new spatial planning: Social initiative takers as public value creators and the negotiations with their surroundings

Sven Schroots – University of Technology Delft, faculty of Technology, Policy and Management

---

## Abstract

Spatial planning is moving towards more decentralised forms. Decentralization have led to a new steering perspective for the national government and an increasing amount of social initiative takers. The newest steering perspective focuses on supporting the increasing amount of social initiative takers. Facilitating and supporting the social initiative takers is not without controversy. Supporting social initiative takers is based on the assumption that the social initiative takers can support the public interest equal as good as a government. So, *how are public interests handled in projects of social initiative takers?* That question is answered by analyzing five successful (bottom-up) projects in Shrinkage region. The theory of spatial quality is used to assess whether the public interest is served and if public value is created. The five projects show that the social initiative takers are willing to invest extra effort to serve the interests of neighbours and villagers. Also, the social initiative takers seem self-sufficient in serving the direct surroundings' interest. However, additional research is needed. Only successful social initiative takers are analyzed. Additional research with other stakeholders and failed projects could show whether the social initiative takers are sincere in serving the public interest or have to adapt to the direct surroundings to succeed.

*Keywords:* Energetic society, Spatial planning, Bottom-up initiatives, Spatial quality, Public interest, Shrinkage, Social initiative takers

---

## Introduction

Spatial planning is moving towards more decentralised forms (Janssen-Jansen & Woltjer, 2010). This statement can be drawn as conclusion to the Dutch National Spatial Planning policy documents throughout the years. Especially in the last 30 years a transition is made from a national government approach with a strong relation between plan and policy instruments to a decentralised approach with boundary conditions. A transition in which the national government sees itself as a partner in a facilitating role (Alpkokin, 2012). Parallel to this transition is the transition of Dutch spatial planning from a

facet policy, co-ordinating sector policies, towards one more sectoral approach. In these years the political priority has shifted changing the priority level of Dutch spatial planning with it.

In practice the decentralisation transition resulted in a national government that handed over responsibilities to provincial and local governments (Salet & Woltjer, 2009). Since 2006 the principle of “decentralized if possible; centralize if necessary” structures national spatial planning policy (Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, 2006).

In Dutch politics the debate on decentralization is an ongoing process. The last few cabinets changed the perception on spatial planning and policy in general. The result is an ambition to reduce the size of the government, to reduce the amount of legislation and to give a more central role to the civil society in problem solving.

The decentralized approach and shift in the political priority is seen in the changing national governmental approaches and new phenomena in planning. The time of purely hierarchical approaches in spatial planning is gone. The newest form of governmental steering is the government as participating government with social entrepreneurship and active citizens as partners in spatial planning. These social entrepreneurs and active citizens are referred to as the energetic society (Hajer, 2011).

The energetic society is no new phenomena in Dutch planning. The past decades the energetic society is also indicated as a participating society, private initiative or self-organization (Oude Vrielink & Verhoeven, 2011). The difference between the past and the present decades is the ongoing decentralization. The role of energetic society in problem solving is increasing. Vice versa the role of the national government in spatial planning is declining. The newest governmental steering form is a representation of the new Dutch approach. Facilitating and stimulating the energetic society are core values of a participating government (NSOB and PBL, 2014).

Facilitating and supporting the energetic society is not without controversy. The assumption is made: the energetic society serves society. So, support should be a good thing. However, is facilitating the energetic society the same as serving the society and their interests? Energetic citizens start

projects in the living environment of others. A participating government could support such a project leaded by a shared goal, for example increasing the renewable energy supply. But locals are unhappy with the new project. The new project either blocks their view or harms their picturesque living environment with new and 'ugly' solar panels. A conflict is born.

Conflicts are not new in hierarchal national government led spatial projects. Large or small infrastructure projects often lead to a conflict of interest between government and locals. Question is: how do energetic citizens with a project (from here on social initiative takers<sup>1</sup>) handle such conflicts? Social initiative takers may act differently. A conflict of interest could be prevented or solved. Known is that a shared process could solve or prevent many of the prospective conflicts (Ruimte met toekomst, 2015).

This article analyzes the handling of social initiative takers when planning and implementing a project. The article focuses on the negotiations between social initiative takers and its direct surroundings<sup>2</sup>. Are interests shared? Are conflicts solved or prevented? Or do interests of social initiative takers better align with the ones of the direct surroundings? The research question to analyze these questions is:

*How are public interests handled in projects of social initiative takers?*

---

<sup>1</sup> Social initiative takers: The initiative takers are active citizens, small group of active citizens which might be united in a corporation, foundation or club, small entrepreneurs or a small group of entrepreneurs. The initiative takers are social initiative takers because the initiative takers create public value with their initiative.

<sup>2</sup> The direct surrounding as in citizens who are faced with the social initiative of a social initiative taker and living nearby. For example: social initiative's direct neighbors, citizens overlooking the social initiatives, citizens who are directly or indirectly influenced by a social initiative, etc.

This article tries to give insight in the research question. To answer the research question, five exemplary projects<sup>3</sup> of social initiative takers are analyzed. The five small 'cases' are all successfully planned and/or implemented in Shrinkage regions. Shrinkage is a national policy challenge where the national government chooses to play a role as a participating government. The national approach on Shrinkage makes that social initiative takers operate 'freely'. The social initiative takers are in charge of their social project.

The five small cases will discuss the negotiating interest between social initiative takers and its direct surroundings. Also, the cases show how social initiative takers create public value in the physical living environment.

The public interest is tested with the help of spatial quality. Spatial quality analyzes the quality of spatial development. The perception of spatial quality differs per person.

This article continues with a description of Shrinkage region. The following section describes the setting of Shrinkage region. The next section explains the use of spatial quality as 'public interest method'. The third section continues with the five small cases. This section analyzes whether the (local) public interest is maintained. This article finalizes with a conclusion and discussion. The conclusion answers the research question. The discussion describes future research and limitations on the results presented.

---

<sup>3</sup> The projects analyzed are project implemented or planned with a 'long term' impact on the physical living environment. The project has a (partial) public goal.

## **Participating government in Shrinkage regions**

Shrinkage regions are regions that are confronted with declining number of inhabitants. Within the next 15 years several Dutch regions will face this problem (PBL, 2010). The declining number of inhabitants in shrinkage regions has consequences for the housing- and labour market and the economic activity. The population of many of these (small) villages and or cities is aging and many of the young inhabitants are moving out of the shrinkage regions in search for work and income. The trend of shrinkage leads to population losses, declining number of households and workforce. Furthermore, facilities such as sport facilities, libraries, stores, schools, culture and housing are under pressure. The potential result is vacancy, declining housing prices and deterioration of the regional economy. Shrinkage regions are for these reasons faced with the issues of maintaining the liveability (Ruimtevolk, 2014).

In February 2009 Minister Van der Laan visited Parkstad (a shrinkage region in southern Netherlands). During his visit he made a clear statement: 'shrinkage needed a clear and strong agenda on national scale' (Crooy, 2015). One of the first steps the minister made, was installing a Topteam Shrinkage lead by former minister Hans Dijkstal. The Dijkstal commission observed shrinkage in several peripheral regions of the Netherlands and noted that the Dutch government needed to act on this shrinkage (Dijkstal & Mans, 2009). In the end of 2009 the first action plan on population decline (shrinkage) was founded. Currently shrinkage is as a theme in which liveability of an area is the core criteria for intervention.

Shrinkage is an issue where energetic citizens, with bottom-up initiatives, directly helps strengthening the liveability in the regions.

Also, shrinkage regions are precursors in societal change (Crooy, 2015). The citizens of Shrinkage regions have more responsibility and collaborate with the local government. Shrinkage region are an example of a participating government. Municipalities, provinces and the national government facilitate projects developed bottom-up. The market and society is in charge.

### Spatial quality and the public interest

Conflicts could arise between social initiative takers and the initiative's neighbours. Social initiative takers start initiatives in a certain area. The surroundings (or neighbours) react on the plans made. In the eyes of the neighbour(s) the plan could be 'ugly, pretty, good or bad'. In the eyes of the social initiative taker the project is 'contributing to society or saving the environment, pretty or original'. Opinions about a planned or implemented project can differ (severely). The consequence: a conflict of interest is born.

What do these conflicts mean? And how are these conflicts analyzed? The theory of spatial quality helps explore. Spatial quality helps analyzing the conflicts of interest. The three factors experience value; user value and future value describe the quality of a spatial development, such as (social) project. An increase in one of the values (or a

combination) means an increase in spatial quality. The experience value addresses the value one experiences. Experience value can also be the experience of the area's history. The user value describes the value for the users. And the future value describes the value increase of an area in the future. The interpretation of these values can differ between people (Ruimte met toekomst, 2015). The experience value of the project is probably higher for a social initiative taker than for the neighbour. Some examples of users value, experience value and future value are shown in table 1.

However, this article does not focus on the differences between people. This article focuses on the final interpretation of the spatial quality. The assumptions are that the (local) public interest is maintained when: 1) the spatial quality perception of the neighbours (direct surroundings/direct surroundings) is comparable or higher than before the project was planned and 2) the spatial quality perception of the social initiative taker is comparable or higher than before the project was planned.

So how is this scenario reached? The social initiative taker has certain negotiating interests. The social initiative taker has preferences used as interests in negotiating.

|                  | Economic purpose                 | Social purpose                      | Ecological purpose                          | Cultural purpose                      |
|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Users value      | Accessibility; Smart positioning | Fair distribution; Ownership        | External safety; Clean environment          | Cultural diversity; Freedom of choice |
| Experience value | Image; Attractiveness            | Equality; Social security           | Peace and quiet; Healthy living environment | Uniqueness; Cultural effect           |
| Future value     | Agglomeration; Flexibility       | Social support; Everyone 'on board' | Healthy ecosystem                           | Cultural heritage; Integration        |

Table 1: Examples of users-, experience- and future value in combination with different purposes

However, the direct surrounding (for example a neighbour) has a negotiating interest. Also, the assumption is, that when these negotiating interests are exchanged and fully negotiated a higher spatial quality can be reached (Ruimte met toekomst, 2015). The social initiative taker knows what neighbours think of his initiative. And the neighbours know what a social initiative taker wants to achieve. Shared the thoughts and interest could help increase the spatial quality. To further increase the spatial quality the social initiative taker could incorporate the interests of the neighbours. Or the interests can be exchanged. For example, the experience value of a neighbour decreases because of a planned tree blocking his sight (decrease in experience value). Problem is that the initiative needs that tree for the shade (user value). In a shared process the neighbour and social initiative taker could exchange their thoughts and interests in order to find a solution. Solution: the tree is planted somewhat to the right. Result: The neighbour's experience value after project is equal to the experience value before the project and the social initiative taker increases his user value.

The spatial quality is used as method to analyze the quality of spatial development and the negotiating interests. The spatial development refers to the social initiatives or projects implemented and planned by social initiative takers. The negotiating interests refers to the negotiation of interests between social initiative takers and their direct surroundings.

Clearly identifiable indicators are used to analyze the outcome of negotiations. The quality of projects is identified with an increase in quality. Either the experience value, users value and/or future value is increased. A project that increases the quality of the physical living environment is

considered to be a 'good' project. Or in other words, a project that considers the public interests (or at least the interest of its direct surroundings) in a proper way. The outcome of negotiations is analyzed by identifying the perception of the spatial quality of the direct surroundings and the perception of the spatial quality of the social initiative taker. The project is well implemented when the perception of the spatial quality of the social initiative taker and the perception of the direct surrounding is equal or increased and of course when the quality of the area increases.

Concluding, the indicators used to analyze the outcome of negotiations are the perception of spatial quality of the social initiative takers and the perception of the direct surroundings. To examine whether the projects are well implemented the increase, decrease or retain of experience value, users value and /or future value is analyzed through the eyes of the social initiative takers and through the eyes of the direct surroundings.

### **Initiatives in Shrinkage region**

The five projects are discussed as small cases. The small cases show how negotiations between social initiative takers and the direct surroundings are shaped. The five projects are discussed one by one. Spatial quality is used to analyze how the social initiative takers incorporate the needs and interests of others. All of the five projects are implemented or planned in a Shrinkage region.

#### *Solar farm park – the 'Kwekerij'*

The 'Kwekerij' is a solar farm planned in a park outside Hengelo. Before the financial crises the municipality of Hengelo had acquired a piece of land on the outskirts of the town. Due to the financial crises and Shrinkage the municipality of Hengelo was forced to change its plans. The planned housing was cancelled and a park function introduced.

Some time after the social initiative taker of the 'Kwekerij' came into contact with an alderman of Hengelo. And the 'Kwekerij' project was born. The social initiative taker and his colleague made plans for solar park the 'Kwekerij'. The solar park was a solar farm implemented in park scenery. The goal was to produce solar power while citizens of Hengelo could enjoy a walk in the park.

However, not every neighbour was satisfied with the new solar park. To prevent any issues, the social initiative taker of the 'Kwekerij' actively communicated with the neighbourhood. The neighbourhood was incorporated in the process as early as possible. Many evening meetings were arranged to gather the needs and interest of the neighbourhood. Also, the meetings were held to improve the mutual understanding. Furthermore, the neighbourhood was informed if something happened or changed within the project.

The meetings revealed that the current plan gave some problems. These problems were noted and incorporated within the project. And the social initiative taker was gladly implemented those alterations. The neighbourhood helped him with potential vandalism and loiterers. The mutual understanding resulted in a win-win situation. There were no objections made.

In terms of spatial quality the social initiative taker incorporated the interest and needs of the neighbourhood, while his users value remained equal. The neighbourhood was satisfied since their interests were heard. So, the spatial quality should rise if the project is realized. The only help the social initiative taker of the 'Kwekerij' used was the municipality attending the evening meetings.

Concluding, in the eyes of the social initiative taker the users value is increased. The

previous vacant lot is used to create solar energy. After negotiations the spatial quality was increased in the eyes of the direct surroundings. Every negotiating interests was incorporated, meaning all values are at the very least retained.

This case also shows how far initiative takers are willing to go. An old couple in the neighbourhood criticized the plans. The social initiative taker thought that the couple would be objecting to the plan. So, he came by and sat at their dining table. He explained in more detail what his plans were and what the goal of the project was. After that dining table meeting the old couple became his ambassadors. The difference of opinion or interest was in fact a misunderstanding. The extra effort helped to solve that misunderstanding.

#### *Social entrepreneur - Outbound*

Outbound is an outdoor equipment business in Boekel. Boekel is a small municipality in the province North-Brabant. Boekel is a precursor in supporting bottom-up initiatives. Outbound is a business that grew too big and needed a new barn to enlarge the business. The entrepreneur chooses to build a new barn to replace the old one. Also, some nature was to be developed as social goal for the project.

During the process of planning and implementing, the entrepreneur made sure no-one was harmed significantly. To reach that goal the building permit was shared with his left neighbour. An increase in risk, but a win-win created for both Outbound owner and neighbour. Also, the right neighbour was asked if he had any wishes or interests. The right neighbour was interested in enlarging his garden. So a trade was made to enlarge the driveway for the Outbound owner and to enlarge the garden for the neighbour on the right.

All these trades were made and negotiations were undertaken in order to improve the value for the owner of Outbound and his neighbours. He could have done it by himself, but he chooses to cooperate with his neighbours. The trades also show how the spatial quality can be improved in by negotiations. Every neighbour is satisfied due to negotiations. The area improves in the eyes of the two neighbours and the owner.

However, all these neighbours had something to gain from the project. The neighbour living on the other side of the road had nothing to gain and had something to lose. The barn was realized inside the neighbours so called 'stink zone'. The neighbours pig farm was the reason of the 'stink zone'. No working and housing activities could be developed inside the 'stink zone'. In a difficult negotiation process the pig farm neighbour and owner found a compromise. The owner developed a technical solution to the problem so he was able to build inside the 'stink zone'. An arrangement had to be made. The thoroughness of incorporating the interest of others in his project is summarized by a statement. The Outbound owner stated that if one of his neighbours had said no to his project, he would not have done it.

Concluding, the values (users, future and experience) is increased and retained. On the one hand, the social initiative takers increases the value of the plot (in his eyes). While on the other hand the future value is retained. The pig farm neighbour can continue farming pigs. Another neighbour used the project to increase the value of his own plot. Thereby increasing the users value of both plots. Concluding, the future value is retained and users value is increased in the eyes of the direct surroundings and in the eyes of the social initiative taker the spatial quality is increased.

### *Initiative catalyst – BS22*

BS 22 is a social initiative which helps other initiatives. BS 22 works as a catalyst for other initiatives. BS 22 is located in a small village named Groenlo. The office is settled in a vacant shop in a previous pauperizing shopping street.

BS 22 is created by a social initiative taker who wanted to help, coach and facilitate other bottom-up initiatives. The eventual project started in a vacant shop. The shop was owned by the municipality who made it available (after asking).

Some time after, BS 22 had helped, coached and facilitated many of his new shop neighbours. Many small boutiques, stores, concept stores, etc. opened in the shopping street of BS 22 (all new stores). The neighbourhood had an increase in spatial quality. Especially the future value of the area had risen. The rise in spatial quality reflected in satisfied neighbours.

This case shows how social initiative takers are well aware of what can be done in order to improve the quality. The social initiative taker of BS 22 moved to the pauperized area and created a new destination for many of the nearby shops. An alternative solution to vacancy conceived by the social initiative taker.

The project increased the users value of the previous empty shop. The shop is now in use and thereby increases the users value in the eyes of the social initiative taker. For the neighbourhood the experience value is increased, since the shop attracts other activity. Furthermore, the future value of the area is increased, since there is a perspective of a growing amount of shops in the area. The liveability is increased. So, BS22 increases the quality for both the social initiative taker and the direct surrounding.

### *Carnival hangar – Leutfabriek*

The Leutfabriek is a location for associations and clubs in Sas van Gent. The Leutfabriek is settled in an old municipal office. The project started when the municipality of Terneuzen made a policy on pauperized buildings. The plan was to fine the owners of pauperized buildings in order to motivate them to improve the quality. The social initiative taker of the Leutfabriek responded on that policy. He claimed that the policy was no good, since the municipality itself was owner of some pauperized buildings. After negotiations between him and the municipality, he created a plan to transform one of the pauperized municipal buildings into a location for carnival associations.

During the plan-making the social initiative taker held some neighbourhood meetings. The meetings revealed that there were some problems with loiterers who used the dead end street as 'racing track'. The neighbourhood urged to solve the problem when the new project was realized. The social initiative taker saw a possibility. The dead end street could be cut off with a fence. In return he asked the neighbourhood to keep an eye open when he or any of his companions was not around.

The negotiations opened by the social initiative taker made it possible to openly share interests. Currently the collaboration is still ongoing. The neighbourhood is pleased that the pauperized municipal building is renovated. And the dead end street is cut off. As long as the new owner (several associations) properly use the location. The social initiative taker actively communicated that noise disturbance is prevented. And is pleased with the social control he gets in return. A trade that leaves both stakeholders with quality improvement.

Concluding, the carnival hangar is again used. In the eyes of the social initiative taker the users value of the previous vacant building is increased. In the eyes of the neighborhood the experience value is increased. The vacant building and plot resulted in a decrease in experience for the direct surroundings. By putting the old municipal office into use the experience value has increased again.

### *Eco village – Ecodorp Boekel*

In Boekel, province North-Brabant, an eco village is planned. The plan started when the municipality of Boekel was searching for alternative solutions. A location just outside the village stood empty for quite some time. The initial housing plans were cancelled and the location had a negative response on the municipal budget. At the same time the social initiative taker of Ecodorp Boekel was searching for a location to create an eco village.

The social initiative taker and alderman of Boekel found each other. The social initiative taker was delighted by the reputation Boekel had with helping social initiative takers. And the alderman found a solution to his empty location. Problem was: an eco village in a small farming village. The principle of an eco village gave unintended biases. The villagers thought the eco village implemented a hippy town in their farming village.

Potential conflicts of interests. It seemed that the perception of spatial quality could be quite different from the social initiative taker's perception. After the plans were initiated the social initiative taker planned a town meeting. He wanted to clear the air. After the villagers saw and heard what the plans were and who these 'hippies' were, the perception of villagers changed. The hippies were no hippies, but just 'ordinary people'. Also, the plans seemed more solid than expected.



In the negotiation between social initiative taker and the villagers some plans with the area were shared. The villagers had plans to make a 'experience-forest'. The social initiative taker saw possibilities to create that experience-forest. Although the experience-forest brought him nothing, the social initiative taker choose to create the experience-forest as gesture to the villagers. The initiative taker implemented the experience-forest in his plans and took care of potential subsidies. The additional effort was done, because the experience-forest served the public interest.

The experience-forest was of course an increase of the spatial quality for the villagers. To further increase the value/quality of his plans the social initiative taker planned a food-corporation. The food corporation was an additional asset to villagers. Normally villagers were destined to travel to Uden (a village nearby) for groceries. The food corporation could lighten that burden with some home-grown vegetables and fruits.

The eco village in Boekel showed that social initiative takers are willing to 'walk the extra mile' for serving the direct surroundings' interest. The spatial quality of this area was increased by several additional projects, besides the eco village. Also, the social initiative taker was keen in showing his plans and the people behind the project. The result is an increase in value for the social initiative taker and its direct surroundings. The social initiative taker had an increase in users value and future value. The project makes a dream come true, now and in the future. Also, the experience value of the direct surrounding is increased with the newly developed 'experience forest'. While their previous concerns about the project have been overcome.

## Discussion

Five successful projects in Shrinkage region are analyzed. The five projects all reflect on the main question of this article. An answer is framed based on the findings in the five small cases. The question referred to is:

*How are public interests handled in projects of social initiative takers?*

If the five successful projects are analyzed as cases, the answer is clear. The social initiative takers serve the public interest on a local scale and handle the public interest good. The municipalities offer little help in this process. The help consists of facilitating town and neighbourhood meetings and attending these meetings. The social initiative takers can almost self-sufficiently handle the public interest on a local scale. Condition is that the negotiations are started. Some type of information exchange is needed in order to reach a mutual understanding. In all case studies the social initiative taker could use negotiations to reach mutual understanding.

A remarkable conclusion, if compared to studies done on the Dutch civil society. These studies explain how the civil society (such as social initiative takers) are well capable of starting projects on their own, but the conclusion is that facilitation is needed. The studies openly question if citizens are well-equipped enough to self-sufficiently succeed in self-organization (Verdoolaege & van Vliet, 2015; Brouwer & Engbersen, 2013; Ham & van der Meer, 2015). The WRR report (2013) says that citizens are often incompetent for incorporating citizens who object. This article claims however, the social initiative takers are at least self-sufficient in maintaining the public interest on local scale. The social initiative takers do not only act on their behalf, but are well capable of acting on 'everyone's' behalf.

In the five projects the social initiative takers ask for the interest of neighbours and villagers. The town meetings seem initiated by the social initiative takers. Furthermore, door-to-door visits and small dining table discussion are common methods to foster the mutual understanding.

The town meetings, door-to-door visits and dining table discussion are followed by a shared process between social initiative takers and neighbours and/or villagers. In the shared process the social initiative takers incorporate the interest of others in their initiatives. Social initiative takers are honest, transparent and open about their goals. Something whereupon is often reflected in literature (Linders, 2010; Verhoeven, 2010; Ham & van der Meer, 2015). They ask their surroundings to reflect on the plans made. In negotiations the mutual understanding seems improved. Also, a project plan is made increasing the quality in the eyes of the social initiative taker and in the eyes of the neighbours and/or villagers.

Concluding, the spatial quality of the area remains equal or increases for social initiative takers, neighbours and villagers. In the Shrinkage region examples given, the social initiative taker does not harm the public interest. The social initiative takers of the five cases are willing to make extra effort to reach stable relations with neighbours and villagers. Some studies support that claim (Linders, 2010; Verhoeven, 2010), while others openly question this conclusion (WRR, 2012). The social initiative takers seem self-sufficient in serving the direct surroundings' interest. Only a little help of municipalities is needed to reach the result wanted. However, this help should not be underestimated (Verhoeven, 2010; Brouwer & Engbersen, 2013).

## Reflection and future research

The cases discussed are all successful initiatives. Also, only one side of the story is analyzed: the story of the social initiative taker. That social initiative takers take into account the needs and interest of others, could be an asset of the social initiative taker (Linders, 2010). However, it could also be a critical factor for succeeding as bottom-up initiative/project (WRR, 2012). Either one of these assumptions could be true. So, the social initiative takers take into account the interests of others (1) because they have to or (2) because they want to. Previous studies and articles support the assumption that social initiative takers want to (Linders, 2010; Verhoeven, 2010). Additional research is needed to fully understand which assumption is true. The assumptions could be important for governments to determine whether social initiative takers should be supported or not.

Furthermore, social initiative takers are researched in a decentralized policy field. The national government and many local governments act or try to act as participating government. The role of participating government makes it easier for social initiative takers to implement and plan their initiatives freely (NSOB and PBL, 2014). Additional research is needed to analyze whether social initiative takers act differently when another steering perspective is chosen.

## References

- Alpkokin, P. (2012). Historical and critical review of spatial and transport planning in the Netherlands. *Land Use Policy*, 536-547.
- Brouwer, J., & Engbersen, R. (2013). *Zelforganisatie gaat niet vanzelf*. Den Haag: Platform 31.

Crooy, I. (2015). *Groot dromen, klein beginnen: Lessen over krimp en ruimte*. The Hague: Platform 31.

Dijkstal, H., & Mans, J. (2009). *Krimp als structureel probleem*. The Hague: Topteam Krimp.

Hajer, M. (2011). *De energieke samenleving. Op zoek naar een sturingfilosofie voor een schone economie*. Alblasterdam: Drukkerij Haveka.

Ham, M., & van der Meer, J. (2015). *De ondernemende burger; De woelige wereld van lokale initiatieven*. Utrecht: Social vraagstukken.nl.

Janssen-Jansen, L., & Woltjer, J. (2010). British discretion in Dutch planning: Establishing a comparative perspective for regional planning and local development in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. *Land Use Policy* , 906-916.

Linders, E. (2010). *De betekenis van nabijheid*. Tilburg: University of Tilburg.

Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment. (2006). *Nota Ruimte: Ruimte voor ontwikkeling*. The Hague: Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment.

NSOB and PBL. (2014). *Leren door doen: Overheidsparticipatie in een energieke samenleving*. The Hague: PBL and NSOB.

Oude Vrielink, M., & Verhoeven, I. (2011). Burgerinitiatieven en de bescheiden overheid. *Beleid en Maatschappij (38)* , 377-387.

PBL. (2010). *Van bestrijden naar begeleiden: demografische krimp in Nederland*. The Hague: PBL.

Ruimte met toekomst. (2015). *Ruimtelijke kwaliteit*. Retrieved 8 19, 2015, from

Ruimtemettoekomst.nl:

<http://www.ruimtexitmilieu.nl/ruimtelijke-kwaliteit>

Ruimtevolk. (2014). *Van Onderop!* Rotterdam: Press Printvisie.

Salet, W., & Woltjer, J. (2009). New concepts of strategic spatial planning dilemmas in the Dutch Randstad region. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* , 235-248.

Verdoolaege, S., & van Vliet, P. (2015, April 22). Bewoners wantrouwen overheid die ze de regie wil geven. *Sociale vraagstukken.nl* .

Verhoeven. (2010). Ruimte geven aan initiatieven van burgers. *Rooilijn nr.4* , 7-13.

Williams, P. (2012). *Collaboration in Public Policy and Practice*. Bristol: University of Bristol.

Wouda, S. (2014, January 6). An exploratory interview about the energetic society. (S. Schroots, Interviewer)

WRR. (2012). *Vertrouwen in burgers*. The Hague: WRR.