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About...

How the strategic plan and urban design can create mutual, local benefits between the residential neighbourhood Van der Pekbuurt and the contemporary flagship area Overhoeks Amsterdam, in socioeconomic and spatial terms
FLAGSHIP DEVELOPMENT
Flagship development

“significant, high-profile and prestigious land and property development which plays an influential and catalytic role in urban regeneration”

(Bianchini et al., 1992, p.252)

Rationale

*De-industrialisation*
*Neoliberalism*
*Globalisation*
Examples

Canary Wharf - London - 1980s
Kop van Zuid - Rotterdam - 1990s
Docklands - Dublin - 1990s
Lisbon - former EXPO - 1990s
Flagship development

Positive

Create wealth
Create jobs
Housing
Attract tourists
Attract investors

Negative

Benefits unevenly distributed
Fragmentation
Areas unwelcoming
appearance
CONTEXT
Amsterdam

Author 2012 (source: Geoloket TU Delft, 2011)
Overhoeks & Van der Pekbuurt

Overhoeks

Van der Pekbuurt

border
Overhoeks

Since 2004

Shell moved out

Film museum
Overhoeks

2012

*High income households*

*Expensive apartments*

*Elite*
Overhoeks

Plans for 2017

More housing

Prestigious office towers
Van der Pekbuurt

1 Tolhuistuin

2 Van der Pekplein

Attention area

Flagship development  Context  Problems & aim  Benefits & disadvantages  Strategic plan  Urban design  Implications

- High percentage 0-18 years
- High percentage non-western immigrants
- Low ratio jobs/labour force
- High share of minima households
- High percentage one-parent families
- Valuation of Immovable Property Act (WOZ)
- Low rate satisfaction with neighbourhood
- Low objective safety
- Low subjective safety
- Low Cito-score
- Low percentage with start qualification
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- Low rate satisfaction with neighbourhood
- Low objective safety
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Van der Pekbuurt

Since 1920

Low income households

95% Social housing

50% Foreign background
PROBLEMS & AIM
Problem statement

Negative effects

Disbalance local and global needs
Let the residential **neighbourhood** Van der Pekbuurt **benefit from** the adjacent contemporary **flagship development** Overhoeks and vice versa, in spatial and socioeconomic terms.
BENEFITS & DISADVANTAGES
**Effects of flagship development**

### Aims of flagship developers
- Create more wealth for the city
- Changing local perceptions
- Put cities on the map
- Catalyse regeneration
- Promote “organic” growth
- Place-marketing
- Attract private sector finance
- Inter-city competition
- Attract high income residents
- Local economic development
- Attract visitors
- Defend position in global hierarchy
- Boost municipal revenues
- Revitalising an attractive image for the city

### Municipal aims
- Local quality and benefit
- Helping people out of poverty
- Attention towards deprived communities
- Resident participation in planning flagship projects

### Benefits & disadvantages

#### Strengths
- Boost civic pride
- Boost business confidence
- Raising property values
- Raising development activity in adjoining areas
- Arrest the spiral of decline in urban areas
- Benefits for all residents: wealth, jobs, places

#### Weaknesses
- Social polarisation
- Fragmentation of cities
- Individual planning, not integrated
- Concentrate investment on few places only
- High financial risk
- Alien, unwelcoming appearance
- No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods
- Benefits are unevenly distributed
- Residents distrust expenses of government
- Low economic returns

#### Threats
- Instability of market: no reliable regeneration
- Delay, curtailment, failure of projects
- Oversupply of prestigious projects

#### Opportunities
- Generate socially just outcomes
- Create more inclusive spaces
- Inclusive aims of key actors
- Provide possibilities for housing career for residents
- Amenities, transport, recreational facilities, jobs, housing

### References
- Loftman, Nevin:303
- Loftman, Nevin:303
- Loftman, Nevin:303
- Loftman, Nevin:303
- Loftman, Nevin:303
- Loftman, Nevin:304
- Loftman, Nevin:305; Doucet 2009:105
- Wilkinson in Loftman, Nevin:306
- Doucet 2009
- Loftman, Nevin:307
- Loftman, Nevin
- Loftman, Nevin
- Loftman, Nevin:309; Temelova:3
- Eisinger:323
- Wille:2010
- Doucet et al, 2010
Local effects of flagship development

**Benefits/opportunities**

1. Attention towards deprived communities
2. Resident participation in planning flagship projects
3. Raising development activity in adjoining areas
4. Inclusive aims of key actors
5. More inclusive spaces
6. Provide possibilities for housing career
7. Amenities
8. Possibilities for transport
9. Recreational facilities
10. Housing
11. Urban places
12. Economic opportunities (jobs)

**Disadvantages/threats**

1. Fragmentation of cities
2. Social polarisation
3. No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods
4. Residents distrust expenses of government
5. Alien, unwelcoming appearance of flagship area
6. Delay, curtailment, failure of projects
7. Individual planning, not integrated
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Opportunities & threats Overhoeks & Van der Pekbuurt

“Residents of Van der Pekbuurt look at Overhoeks with suspicion”
(Stuart, 2012, chairman housing association Van der Pekbuurt)

- No possibilities housing career
- Unwelcoming appearance
- Spatial fragmentation
- Residents distrust municipal spending

- €350 social housing
- €550
- €650 market rent
- for sale - mid prices
- for sale - high prices
STRATEGIC PLAN
Stakeholders

- ING Real Estate
  - Ymere
  - Municipal board Amsterdam North
  - EYE
  - Projectbureau Noordwaarts
  - Shell
  - Vesteda
  - Tolhuistuin team

- Atelier Shell
  - Geurst and Schulze arch.

- Urban design
  - Architects
  - Branding group

- Instructing parties
  - Developers Overhoeks
  - Developers Van der Pekbuurt
  - Urban designers

- Guiding
Benefits for key actors

*Corporate Social Responsibility*
- Positive for company’s reputation
- Attractive employee
- High demand for companies applying CSR

*Public approval and enthusiasm*
### Local effects of flagship development

#### Benefits/opportunities

1. Attention towards deprived communities
2. Resident participation in planning flagship projects
3. Raising development activity in adjoining areas
4. Inclusive aims of key actors

#### Disadvantages/threats

1. No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods
2. Residents distrust expenses of government
3. Delay, curtailment, failure of projects
4. Individual planning, not integrated

---

#### More inclusive spaces

1. More inclusive spaces
2. Provide possibilities for housing career
3. Amenities
4. Possibilities for transport
5. Recreational facilities
6. Housing
7. Urban places
8. Economic opportunities (jobs)

---

1. Fragmentation of cities
2. Social polarisation
3. No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods
4. Residents distrust expenses of government
5. Alien, unwelcoming appearance of flagship area
6. Delay, curtailment, failure of projects
Strategic plan

Goal 1: Inclusive aims
1. Attention towards deprived communities
2. Resident participation in planning flagship projects
3. Raising development activity in adjoining areas
4. Inclusive aims of key actors
5. No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods
6. Residents distrust expenses of government
7. Delay, curtailment, failure of projects
8. Individual planning, not integrated

Goal 2: Inform local community

Goal 3: Local community participation

Goal 4: Integrate plans
Strategic plan

Goal 1: Inclusive aims

Goal 2: Inform local community

Goal 3: Local community participation

Goal 4: Integrate plans

Target group at Overhoeks
Target group at Van der Pekbuurt
Area to create benefits
Goal 1: Inclusive aims

Cooperation when framing the aims

Monitor goals throughout process

Align rhetorical frames and action frames
Goal 3: Local community participation

AIM: frame socioeconomic and spatial needs and wishes of the local communities of Van der Pekbuurt and Overhoeks

1 Questionnaire
2 Workshop programme
URBAN DESIGN
Urban design
Three areas

- Residential area
- Facilities area
- Green area
**Phasing**

**Phase 1 (2012)**

**Phase 2 (2015)**

**Phase 3 (flexible)**
Phasing

Phase 2

2015
Phasing

Phase 1 (2012)
Phase 2 (2015)
Phase 3 (flexible)

Phase 3

flexible
Phasing
## Local effects of flagship development

### Benefits/opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Attention towards deprived communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resident participation in planning flagship projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Raising development activity in adjoining areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inclusive aims of key actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>More inclusive spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide possibilities for housing career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possibilities for transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recreational facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Urban places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Economic opportunities (jobs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disadvantages/threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residents distrust expenses of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Delay, curtailment, failure of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Individual planning, not integrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Fragmentation of cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social polarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residents distrust expenses of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alien, unwelcoming appearance of flagship area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Delay, curtailment, failure of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design goals

Goal 1: Create social returns
- 1 More inclusive spaces
- 2 Provide possibilities for housing career
- 3 Amenities
- 4 Possibilities for transport
- 5 Recreational facilities
- 6 Housing
- 7 Urban places
- 8 Jobs
- 9 Fragmentation of cities
- 10 Social polarisation
- 11 No public resources for deprived neighbourhoods
- 12 Residents distrust expenses of government
- 13 Alien, unwelcoming appearance of flagship area
- 14 Delay, curtailment, failure of projects

Goal 2: Housing career possibilities

Goal 3: Amenities, facilities, transport

Goal 4: Inclusive, outward focus

Goal 5: Connect neighbourhoods
Goal 1: Create social returns

Goal 2: Housing career possibilities

- €350 social housing
- €550
- €650 market rent
- for sale - mid prices
- for sale - high prices
Goal 3: Facilities, amenities
Goal 4: Inclusive, outward focus

Network of public places and sight lines to main attractors
Goal 4: Inclusive, outward focus

Residential block sight lines concept
Goal 4: Inclusive, outward focus
Goal 4: Inclusive, outward focus
Goal 5: Connect neighbourhoods

Architecture

Kriekohl
Goal 5: Connect neighbourhoods

Section at canal between Overhoeks and Van der Pekbuurt
Goal 5: Connect neighbourhoods

Section at canal between Overhoeks and Van der Pekbuurt
Goal 5: Connect neighbourhoods
Goal 5: Connect neighbourhoods
IMPLICATIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH
## Implications

### Amsterdam

- Developers at Ymere, Vesteda and Noordwaarts have shown their interest in the implementation of local benefits at the area of Overhoeks.

- Developers see their benefits in strategic plan and thus implement local benefits better.

- Urban designers can be inspired by the implementation of mutual, local benefits (ING RE no longer commissioner).

### Western Europe

- Raise awareness

- Show possible research method

- Show possible altering of planning process

- Inspire urban designers on how to include mutual, local benefits
Future research

- Interview persons with most influence
- Several case studies
- Comparing planning processes
Recap...

How the strategic plan and urban design can create mutual, local benefits between the residential neighbourhood Van der Pekbuurt and the contemporary flagship area Overhoeks Amsterdam, in socioeconomic and spatial terms.
Thank you!

Questions?

Presentation and thesis available online:
www.slideshare.net/RobinBoelsums
In between...

Vacant land

Plans postponed for several years
## Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhoeks</td>
<td>BOELSUMS, A.</td>
<td>Communication advisor, Shell</td>
<td>01-05-2012</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DE REUS, A.</td>
<td>Developer, Ymere</td>
<td>30-01-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETERS, J.</td>
<td>Site manager STCA, Shell</td>
<td>01-03-2012</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCHAAP, T.</td>
<td>Urban designer, DRO Amsterdam</td>
<td>09-03-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCHUURMAN, G.</td>
<td>Developer, Vesteda</td>
<td>31-01-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMILDE, R.</td>
<td>Communications, Ymere</td>
<td>02-05-2012</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAN DER VELDE, P.</td>
<td>Developer, Noordwaarts</td>
<td>31-01-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERMIJS, M.</td>
<td>Chairman residents’ association Gelria, Overhoeks</td>
<td>28-02-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Pekbuurt</td>
<td>DE VRIES, M.</td>
<td>Developer, Ymere</td>
<td>30-01-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUART, B.</td>
<td>Chairman tenants association Van der Pek</td>
<td>28-02-2012</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts on flagship</td>
<td>BOUTE, J.</td>
<td>Communications, department of Town Planning and Urban Development (ds+v)</td>
<td>03-02-2012</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>DOUCET, B.</td>
<td>Lecturer in urban geography, University of Utrecht</td>
<td>16-12-2012</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic plan

**Mission:**
Create mutual, local benefits between the flagship development Overhoeks and its adjacent residential neighbourhood Van der Pekbuurt, Amsterdam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Goal 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reposition aims</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inform local community</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local community participation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integration plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put mutual, local benefits on the agenda</td>
<td>Create enthusiasm amongst local communities</td>
<td>Frame the preferences and needs of local residents</td>
<td>Make mutual, local benefits possible to employ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create enthusiasm amongst local community</td>
<td>Increase viability of Overhoeks</td>
<td>Create enthusiasm amongst local communities</td>
<td>Decrease fragmentation and social polarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public approval and enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overhoeks attractive for broader audience</td>
<td>Make Overhoeks attractive for broader audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residents trust expenses of government</td>
<td>Increase viability of Overhoeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>