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Abstract

The arrival of the European Union in 1957 in Brussels has fundamentally changed the face of the city. The original early 20th century housing stock has almost totally been demolished and because of the absence of authoritative spatial plans or strategies, the European quarter has been subjected to a continuous wave of speculative investment, housing destruction and office construction (Baeten, 2001:121). There are many parties who have an interest in the European quarter, having their own view on the district and its problems. There is a will to change the area but transformation of the neighbourhood is a delicate issue given the interests of all stakeholders, the current planning system and economical, cultural and societal forces. The urgency of the problem asks for spatial design interventions which will contribute to a solution of the problems of the stakeholders, while at the same time designing the process of implementation of these interventions. This thesis aims at delivering those interventions by looking at theory, analysing the situation, formulating a consistent vision and finally creating a development strategy.

Theory

In a literature study an answer was sought to what a successful urban places looks like and how urban areas can be transformed. This has resulted in a framework with guiding principles. It concluded that density, mixed-use, human scale, public space and accessibility are important elements for successful urban places and that they must be seen in the framework of flexibility and security. With respect to urban change management guidelines are formulated on the basis of a literature study without which it is difficult to organise a successful development process. These guidelines emphasise the importance of coalitions, vision, commitment, independent process management, flexibility and financial management.

Analysis

From a broad analysis of the situation, based on the theoretical framework and on interviews with representatives of the main stakeholder groups it is concluded that there are problems on three fields: urban environment, the accommodation of the institutions and the development process.

Several stakeholder groups experience the district as a disconnected, desolated, monofunctional office area with great barriers, poorly integrated buildings of the European institutions and heavily pressurised quality of place. In addition the accommodation of the European Commission is by itself also faced with difficulties. The organisation is spread over many small buildings and the office space used per person is very high and inefficient, resulting in high costs. The accommodation policy does not show a responsible attitude to the city and acts sometimes flatly opposed to the EU policies. Problems in the European quarter are recognized by the main stakeholders who express a wish to transform the area, but the development process is stuck: there is no common vision, little support for existing plans and a very complex political environment, which results in a situation in which everyone is waiting for everyone.

Vision

No single party has full control over the area. This mutual dependency of stakeholders demands an integral approach based on a shared vision that can bring parties closer together. This report proposes a strategy that takes the current growth strategy of the European Union, the Europe 2020 program, and its key concepts - smart, sustainable and inclusive growth – as a starting point for the development of the area. It will increase the utilisation of the position as main seat of the EU. Not by leaving a dominant mark ‘Capital of Europe’ on Brussels by making great interventions in the city and placing grand, bombastic buildings in the European quarter, but by using small-scale actions and progress showing the value of the EU for European society.

The principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth should be translated one by one to the development process, the urban design and accommodation of the European Commission. It is essential that the strategy addresses the three elements collectively because they are closely related. No real change can be made in the current situation when one of these elements is left aside.

Development strategy

Using the theoretical study and the analysis of the area a smart, sustainable and inclusive development process is proposed to transform the area. It entails a process in which all stakeholders are involved and planning is based on their mutual dependency. A flexible planning system that can be adapted over time to a changing context guides the gradual transformation of the neighbourhood by making use of opportunities and steering existing and future investment streams. An independent body will direct the process of development over the whole duration of the transformation.

The proposed instruments set out urban design principles to transform the area into a smart, sustainable and inclusive environment. This implies, based on literature and reference projects, densifying at strategic points with an eye for human scale, introducing housing and amenities in small clusters and decreasing the intensity of traffic. The integration of the neighbourhood in its surroundings is improved by enhancing the north-south connections and creating public space at central points where people can meet.
At the same time the accommodation of the European Commission is made smart, sustainable and inclusive by better gearing the housing to the needs of specific functions. Some functions are outsourced or shared with others to be more efficient and reduce costs and at the same time be more open to the public and stimulate the local economy and liveliness.

The proposed strategy for the development process, urban design and accommodation of the European Commission results in an integral approach to deal with the problems in the area. It combines a gradual transformation process which can change over time with a clear direction - the direction of a smart, sustainable and inclusive neighbourhood which provides an attractive place for residents and workers, offers efficient accommodation and contributes to showing the value of the European Union.
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This master thesis consists of seven parts:

- Part A – Introduction
- Part B – Theory
- Part C – Analysis
- Part D - Reference study
- Part E – Vision
- Part F - Development strategy
- Part G – Reflection

Part A forms the introduction to the thesis. The problem field, the objective, research questions and methodology are explained. Furthermore the context and existing policies and plans are described.

Part B discusses the theoretical of the thesis in the form of a literature study on two subjects: successful urban places and urban change management.

Part C discusses the broad analysis of the problem field, divided in three part: the analysis of the urban environment, analysis of the process and analysis of the accommodation of the European Commission.

Part D shows a comparison between the European quarter and two districts in London and The Hague to see how these cities handle similar problems and to derive lessons from it.

Part E reflects on the state of the district and presents the vision from the author on the future development of the area.

Part F elaborates the vision and presents the development strategy for the district which consists of three parts: development process, urban planning and design and accommodation strategy of the European Commission. It furthermore handles the implementation of the proposed strategy.

Part G reflects on the proposed development strategy. It forms the answer to the main research question and conclusion and recommendations are presented.
Part A - Introduction

1. Research setup
2. Context
3. Existing policies and plans
1. Research setup

This chapter defines the outlines of the thesis. First it handles the problem field, which is summarized in the problem statement. Than it discusses the aim of the study and the main research questions, followed by the societal and scientific relevance. The last part describes the methodology and involved disciplines.

1.1 Problem field

The Leopold Quarter in Brussels

The European institutions have fundamentally changed the face of Brussels over the past fifty years. In 1957, the Treaty of Rome was the start of the European Economic Community, the predecessor of the European Union. The location of its headquarters has always been a delicate political issue. The international role of Brussels therefore was the result of a series of compromises rather than any grand plan (Brussels-Europe liaison office, 2009:1). Brussels became the so-called ‘capital’ of Europe but had to share this title with the city of Luxembourg and Strasbourg. As a consequence, the uncertain balance between the three main candidates for the European functions (Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg) led to ‘lobbying and very discrete diplomacy’ (Lagrou, 2000:102).

In 1997 in Amsterdam, the member states of the European Union decided that the headquarters of the European Commission would be based in Brussels (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:2). This has changed the perspective both for the city of Brussels as for the European Commission from a temporary settlement to a full-fledged residence and indicates the need for a long term planning strategy. With the status of Brussels finally confirmed, a growing number of institutions decided to base themselves in the Leopold Quarter, including advisory bodies, NGOs, lobbying offices and regional offices (Brussels-Europe liaison office, 2009:1).

The European institutions were mainly accommodated near the Belgian central administrative and governmental functions and developed gradually to the approximately 1,800,000 m² (2000) office spaces that are in use today all across the city. The highest concentration of European institutions is situated in the Leopold Quarter, which earned it the nickname of ‘European Quarter’. This district went through a succession of several functions: high class residence (1850–1940), Belgian government institutions (1950–1980), private international companies’ headquarters (from 1970 on) and the European institutions (from 1958 on) (Lagrou, 2000:102).

The Leopold Quarter is a site of approximately 1 km² at the north-eastern edge of the city centre. It is dominated by two major five-lane boulevards – the Rue de la Loi and the Rue Belliard – which cut the area into three sections and absorb most of the traffic. The sections north of the Rue de la Loi and south of the Rue Belliard still contain pockets of housing, but these are threatened by expanding office development. The area between these boulevards is almost completely occupied by offices (Baeten, 2001:121). The Leopold Quarter is separated from the Central Business District in the west by the inner ring road and bordered in the east by the Leopold Park. More detailed information on the spatial and functional structure of the quarter can be found in chapter 6.

Influence of the European institutions on the city of Brussels

The presence of the European institutions had a large influence on the city of Brussels, both on large and small scale. On the large scale the transformation of the Leopold Quarter from residential area to EU district symbolizes the transformation of Brussels from a national capital to Europe’s political capital. The ‘Europeanization’ of Brussels has initiated a great deal of controversy among urban analysts. It is said that the presence of the European Union is polarizing the Leopold Quarter, the city and its suburban settings into, on one hand a wealthy subclass of ‘internationals’, and on the other hand, a domestic workforce whose comfortable place in the city is more and more under siege. In this view, it is said that the rapid post-war internationalization of Brussels is threatening the viability of large inner-city residential areas (Baeten, 2001:118).

Looking at the scale of the Leopold Quarter, the location of the European institutions within an existing urban fabric – unlike in Luxembourg and Strasbourg – gave rise to many conflicts (Lagrou, 2000:102). The constant demand for additional office floor space in places like the Leopold Quarter has legitimized the uncontrolled expansion of offices into adjacent residential areas, leading to the displacement of thousands of inner-city dwellers (Brukselbinnenstebuiten, 1993 cited in (Baeten, 2001:118)). This created a polarization between the local residents and the international institutions (Lagrou, 2000:103).

Beside the need for more space, ‘Europe’ needs a better public image as well (Lagrou, 2000:99). The experience in the past with the building projects for the Commission and the parliament is not very positive. The competition with Luxembourg and Strasbourg has in the past given rise to dubious building processes and hidden agendas regarding the further construction of the necessary space for Europe (Lagrou, 2000:99). An illustrative example is the demand for the building permit for the new European parliament in Brussels in 1989. It was introduced as an application for an ‘International Congress Centre’ although everyone knew it was meant as the new European parliament. The Belgian state elaborated complicated procedural constructions to avoid the participation of foreign architects and constructors in the
building process of the European institutions. Many examples of similar ‘hidden agendas’ both politically and financially made that the Leopold Quarter became gradually a symbol of the failure of urban planning in Brussels (Lagrou, 2000:109).

There is also a lot of criticism on the planning system in Brussels. Baeten (2001) states that there has been an ‘absence of authoritative spatial plans or strategies’ which made that the Leopold Quarter has been subjected to an ‘incessant wave of speculative investment, housing destruction and office construction’ in past years (Baeten, 2001:121). He continues by saying that half a century of ‘virtually uncontrolled office development’ has gradually turned this formerly upper-class residential neighbourhood into an almost monofunctional office zone and a de facto extension of the Central Business District (Baeten, 2001:121). The Brussels-Europe Liaison Office describes a similar process. It states that ‘In a bid to strengthen Brussels, the Belgian government invested heavily in new buildings and infrastructure. These developments initially proceeded without any serious town planning: most of the offices were built by private investors and planning control was divided between local municipalities, the region and the federal government. The quarter was developed without any urban plan, driven for decades by a brutal process of speculation, wilful neglect, intimidation, eviction, demolition, reconstruction and renovation’ (Brussels-Europe liaison office, 2009:1).

Proposals for change

In recent years, the call for change in the Leopold Quarter became louder and louder. In 2008 the Brussels-Capital Region set up a master plan (Richtschema) for the development of the district. Afterwards the Region launched a competition in close cooperation with the European Commission and the City of Brussels aimed at defining a new urban design for the area around the Rue de la Loi. More detailed information on the current policies and plans can be found in chapter 3.

Definition European quarter

This research will be focused on the district in Brussels where most of the European institutions are located. This is for the largest part Leopold quarter, however important locations of the institutions are also outside the Leopold quarter, which must be included in the research. Therefore the research will be focused on the area defined in figure 1.1, which is the area that is used by the Brussels-Capital Region for their statistic information (neighbourhood 35, (BROH, 2010)). From now on this area will be called the European quarter.

1.2 Problem statement

As described in the previous paragraph, the location of the European institutions within the existing urban fabric of Brussels caused many conflicts. The expulsion of residents in order to accommodate offices, the dominance of all kinds of services related to the European presence and the traffic congestion caused by the European institutions are examples of these problems (Lagrou, 2000:103). Furthermore the district is architecturally a rather monotonous complex with a difficult relation with the existing urban fabric, which is partly due to security measures. The uncontrolled way to modernize the city, the division in monofunctional zones and the focus on motorised traffic has greatly contributed to the dismantling of the urban welfare in large parts of the district. There is also a lot of criticism on the planning system in Brussels. Judgements as an ‘absence of authoritative spatial plans or strategies’, ‘virtually uncontrolled office development’ and ‘no serious town planning’ have been used to describe the planning situation in the city.

The different stakeholder groups in the European quarter all have their view on the district, their own problems and interests. Some of these interests and problems are shared by all or a group of stakeholders, others are not shared. However, a clear will to change the European quarter can be seen by several stakeholder groups, which already resulted in a master plan and several design competitions.

Though the proposal and implementation of spatial interventions in the neighbourhood is a delicate issue, considering the interests of all stakeholders, the current planning system and economical, cultural and societal forces. Several proposals foundered because it did not fit in with the interests of certain stakeholder group(s). For example, in the past the official political options for a functional mix failed because of the differential land prices between residential functions and office space and the refusal of the land owning companies to collaborate in the realisation of the functional mix (Lagrou, 2000:109).

Figure 1.1 Border of the European quarter, defined by the Brussels-Capital Region. Source: BROH, 2010 and Google maps, 2010.
1.3 Aim

The aim of the research is twofold. First it tries to gain insight into the problems and interests of the different stakeholder groups in the European quarter in Brussels and, with that as a basis, to develop spatial design interventions which will contribute to a solution of these problems and interests. Simultaneously the possibility to implement the spatial design interventions, considering the different interests of the stakeholders, the current planning system and economical, cultural and societal forces, will be examined.

Second, it aims at contributing to the existing body of knowledge by combining approaches of the scientific field of real estate with urban theories and strategies. Doing so generates knowledge on spatial design interventions for successful urban places and the possibilities and difficulties to implement it in the European quarter in Brussels.

In this research theories and practices from both the fields of Urbanism and Real Estate & Housing are used to study the subject. With this combined background the goal is to approach a complex urban design task from a perspective of implementation and realization. This approach aims at preventing pitfalls in strategy design, i.e. making beautiful design proposals, while not considering social and economic forces, interests and powers of stakeholders, which may not agree with this proposal.

1.4 Research question

The main research question of this graduation project is: What spatial design interventions can contribute to a solution to the problems and interests of the stakeholders in the European quarter in Brussels and how can these interventions be implemented? This question can be divided in three research themes with accompanying sub questions:

Stakeholders and their interests
- Which are the (main) stakeholder groups in the district?
- What are the interests and perceived problems for each stakeholder group and what is their position and influence?

Spatial design interventions
- What is the current spatial and functional quality of the European quarter in Brussels?
- What are criteria for successful urban places?
- What spatial design interventions which contribute to successful urban places can be applied in the European quarter in Brussels?

Implementation
- How is the process of development currently carried out in the district?
- What are guidelines for successful urban change processes?
- How can these guidelines be applied in the European quarter in Brussels to implement the spatial design interventions?
1.5 Societal and scientific relevance

The focus of this graduation project is a proposal for transformation of the European quarter in Brussels. The research has social as well as scientific relevance. It anticipates the current attention on the problems in the district and the proposed solution in the form of the master plan and urban design competition. In broader perspective this project will add to the body of knowledge of spatial design interventions for successful urban places and the possibilities and difficulties to implement it.

**Scientific relevance**

The field of this graduation project is closely related with the colloquium of ‘Corporations and Cities’ which was organised by Delft University of Technology in association with the Berlage institute in May 2008 in Brussels. The main objective of the colloquium was to explore the way large-scale organizations, such as multinationals, governmental institutions and educational facilities, fulfil their accommodation needs as well as how they subsequently influence the structure and liveability of cities. And the other way around: how the vision and policies of urban planners have an impact on large-scale corporations.

This research builds on the topics discussed in the colloquium, focusing on the crossing between the disciplines of Urbanism and Real Estate & Housing. It is embedded in several urban studies that have been done in the past on successful urban places and transformation processes. Though the relation between these two is less discussed in scientific theories. Therefore, this research aims at making a clear link between successful urban places as an urban theory and strategy, and the possibility to implement such transformations from a process and stakeholder perspective, performed as a single case study in the European quarter in Brussels. This combination of theory and practice of Urbanism and Real Estate & Housing will contribute to the current body of knowledge of both fields.

'S...every year by year, the quarter is eating its way further into old Brussels. Streets by street, pretty little residential houses are being torn down and replaced by massive blocks of concrete......The most common complaints Siim Kallas hears is that the EU center is a terrible administrative ghetto.'

- EU special, SPIEGEL, April 2010-

'Lelijkheid troef in Europawijk
Brussel groeide in vijftig jaar uit tot hoofdstad van Europa. Stedenbouwkundig en architectonisch is het een ramp. De Volkskrant, 2009

Kloppend hart EU sluit burgers buiten
De Volkskrant, 2008

Rebuilding the European Quarter
The European Union is planning a major makeover of its headquarters in Brussels. The ambitious design by French architect Christian de Portzamparc aims to transform the European Quarter from a concrete administrative ghetto into a glimmering 'open city to the sky.' Schlamp, 2008

Figure 1.2 Impression of judgements about the European quarter.
1.6 Methodology

This section discusses the methodology of the graduation project. Figure 1.3 gives a schematic overview of this approach and methods. Each phase of the project will be briefly described with its corresponding goals and methods.

Research setup

In the research setup the problem definition is described, together with the main research questions and aim and relevance of the study. It forms the starting point for the research.

Theory

The theoretical study consist of two parts: a study on successful urban places and a study on urban change management. It aims at defining guiding principles for the evaluation of the current situation in the European quarter in Brussels and a proposition for change, based on reviewing historic and recent literature including books, articles and PhD-theses.

Analysis

The analysis consist of three parts: urban analysis, process and stakeholder analysis and analysis of the accommodation of the European Commission. The aim is to evaluate the current state of the district and the development process and define the assignment for future developments. This is done on the basis of the lessons learned from the theoretical study.

Reference study

The reference study makes a comparison between the European quarter and two districts in London and The Hague. The aim is to understand how these cities handle similar problems (as described in the analysis part) and to derive lessons from it, based on a spatial and functional analysis.

Vision

In this part the vision from the author on the future development of the area is presented based on a reflection on the state of the district and lessons learned from theory and practice.

Development strategy

The development strategy details the vision in three parts: the development process, the urban design and the accommodation strategy of the European Commission. It aims at presenting an integral way of dealing with the problems in the area, based on lessons learned from previous elements of the study.

Reflection

This part reflects on the proposed development strategy. It aims at evaluating how the proposed strategy is established, what the strategy will bring to the district and if it does contribute a solution of the problems of the stakeholders.

1.7 Involved disciplines

This graduation project is the final project of the double degree program of Urbanism and Real Estate & Housing. From both fields, two disciplines are involved. For Real Estate & Housing these fields are Urban Area Development and Corporate Real Estate Management, while for Urbanism these disciplines are Spatial Planning & Strategies and Metropolitan & Region Design. The following mentors are involved:

- Prof. ir. H. de Jonge (Urban Area Development, Real Estate and Housing)
- Ir. H.J.M. Vande Putte (Corporate Real Estate Management, Real Estate and Housing)
- Prof. V. Nadin (Spatial Planning & Strategies, Urbanism)
- Ir. D.D. Zandbelt (Metropolitan and Region Design, Urbanism)
Research setup

Theory
- Successful urban places
- Urban change management

Analysis
- Urban analysis
- Stakeholder and process analysis
- Accommodation analysis EC

Reference study

Vision

Development strategy
- Development process
- Urban development
- Accommodation EC

Reflection

Figure 1.3 Schematic overview of methodology.
2. Context

This chapter describes the position of the European quarter in Brussels in broad outlines. Four scale levels will be walked through: Europe and the European Union, Belgium, the Brussels-Capital Region and a already short look at the European quarter itself. A more extensive spatial and functional analysis of the district can be found in chapter 6.

2.1 Europe and the European Union

Brussels is geographically not very centrally located in Europe, but it is well connected to many important (capital) cities, by means of road and air traffic and increasingly by high speed train. When you look at the position of Brussels in the European Union (EU), you can see that it was geographically very centrally located at the foundation of the EU in 1957. Now, after many expansions of the Union over time, a shift of the centre of gravity to the east can be seen. Because of this Brussels lost its geographical central position as capital of Europe. Although this is not by definition a problem, as many capital cities of countries are not centrally located and the position of European capital is perhaps more dependent on political centrality than on geographical centrality, one can learn from this that the position of Brussels as European capital should not totally be taken for granted. Brussels has to be able to compete with other places on the basis of among others its accessibility, living and working conditions and urban quality, to strengthen its position as European capital.

Figure 2.1 Accessibility of Brussels by airplane.

Figure 2.2 Accessibility of Brussels by high speed train.

Figure 2.3 The enlargement of the European Union over time. A shifting centre of gravity to the east.

Figure 2.4 Is Brussels a balanced capital in 2011?
2.2 Belgium

Brussels is central located in Belgium and well connected to other places in Belgium and surrounding countries by car and train. It is the largest city in the country and has a special position as it is the third region besides the regions of Flanders and Wallonia with an own government. It is a bilingual region with Dutch and French as its official languages.

Figure 2.5 Road network in Belgium.

Figure 2.6 Brussels has a special position as one of the three regions in Belgium: Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels.

Figure 2.7 Railway network in Belgium.
2.3 Brussels-Capital Region

The start of the development of the city of Brussels is not so clear. There are different theories on where Brussel was founded, but researchers are pretty sure about the foundation of a castle on an island in the Zenne river (now St. Gorik square) by Karel van Neder-Lotharingen around 977. From here the city developed from a small settlement towards a city. The castle was situated on the cross of the trade route between Brugge-Cologne and the Zenne River and attracted many merchants (Space Syntax, 2007:4).

From the small settlement Brussels grew on to the east side of the Zenne river. Around 1000 the 'Nedermerckt' (the big market square) came into being. Between 1063 and 1100 the first city wall was built in Brussels. In the period afterwards, in the first half of the 14th century the city grew extensively. Between 1356 and 1383 the second city wall was built, surrounded by a moat in the lower parts of the city (Space Syntax, 2007:4).

The third fortifications of Brussels were build in the second half of the 17th century and dismantled in 1782, by order of Joseph II. It materialised the border between the city and the rural areas. The deconstruction of the ramparts, the bastions and the forts was decreed in 1810. The fortifications made place for boulevards which formed a ring around Brussels, which is still a very characteristic element of the city (Space Syntax, 2007:4).
Figure 2.12 Brussels-Capital Region is divided in 19 communes (municipalities).

Figure 2.13 Road network.
The Brussels-Capital Region is one of the three regions of Belgium. It has more than one million inhabitants. The region is divided into 19 communes (municipalities). The borders of the municipalities run all across the city, not always on logical places. Because the power is split between the regional authority and the local authority, this can cause difficult planning and governing situations, as most of the urban projects are crossing municipal borders. The European quarter is positioned in three communes: Brussels, Etterbeek and Ixelles.

The city of Brussels is built in the valley of a river and has a characteristic topographical structure. The south eastern part is the highest, with altitudes up to 100m, whereas the western part is quite low. The city is has an extensive road network with three ring roads and connections to all important cities in Belgium. The external ring, the R0 has no connection south of the city. The ring does close, but much further south. The roads are heavily used, which causes a high pressure on the network and often traffic jams.

The rail network in the city is extensive, but complex with many different stations. There are three main stations: North, Central and South and several smaller ones in the different communes. The metro system is good, with lines to many parts of the city. However, it is very pressured.
2.4 History European quarter

The Leopold quarter was the first extension area outside the walls. It was a very successful extension, due to the fact that aristocrats wanted to leave the historic inner city. It was realised on initiative of La Société Civile pour l’Agrandissement et l’Embellissement de Bruxelles. The plan, elaborated by architect Francois Tilman Suys in 1838, was designed as an extension of the checkerboard pattern of the Park neighbourhood. The new residential quarter was designed around two new squares: la place de l’Industrie (today square de Meeus) and la place de la Société Civile (today square Frère Orban) (Space Syntax, 2007:6).

This first urbanization was the starting point for further expansion of the Leopold district more to the east, realised between 1840 and 1870, which demanded the dewatering of many ponds and marshland on the path of Maelbeek. An extension of the Rue de la Loi was proposed in 1845. At its end, a roundabout enunciated two new axes, Avenue Cortenberg and Avenue d’Auderghem, embracing the new Champ de Manoeuvres in 1850 (nowadays part of the Cinquantenaire parc). In 1855, the railway line linking Brussels to Luxembourg was implanted and the Luxembourg station was built by Gustave Saintenoy between the Leopold district and the zoological gardens (Space Syntax, 2007:6).

The structure of the quarter has changed dramatically over the years. The changes become clear in figure 2.20, which shows the district in 1953 and 2004.
Figure 2.20 Areal photo of European quarter in 1953 and 2004. Source: Declerck, 2009
3. Existing policies and plans

This chapter discusses the policies and plans that are in force in the European quarter. It first handles the legal structure of policy instruments in Brussels after which it is projected on the European quarter. Than it examines the mobility issue further, as this is one of the main issues in the district. It concludes with the competition that is held for the area around the Rue de la Loi and the competition that will be held for the Schuman roundabout.

3.1 Legal policy instruments

The Brussels Town Planning Code (Le Code Bruxellois de l’Aménagement du Territoire (COBAT), Brussels Wetboek van Ruimtelijke Ordening (BWRO)) provides the legal basis for planning policy, town planning and heritage (BCR, 2008:13). The scheme below (figure 3.1) shows the policy instruments that are part of the COBAT. There are instruments on the regional (Brussels-Capital Region) and municipal level, and on both levels indicative and prescriptive instruments. The four instruments are described in more detail below.

**Regional Development Plan**
(Plan Régional de Développement (PRD), Gewestelijk ontwikkelingsplan (GewOP))
The Regional Development Plan establishes the overall planning strategy for the sustainable development of the regional territory. Adopted by the Regional Government in 2002, the PRD will remain in force until it is next revised. It sets out the overall basis for all regional planning policy, as the other plans (the PRAS, PCD and PPAS) cannot deviate from it without expressly setting out the reasons why (BCR, 2008:15).

**Local Development Plans**
(Plans Communaux de Développement (PCD, Gemeentelijke ontwikkelingsplannen (GemOP’s))
The Local Development Plan is an overall planning tool for sustainable municipal development. It follows the guidelines of the PRD and respects the PRAS. Currently 7 of the 19 municipalities in the Brussels region have a PCD (BCR, 2008:16).

**Regional Land Use Plan**
(Plan Régional d’Affectation du Sol (PRAS), Gewestelijk bestemmingsplan (GBP))
The Regional Land Use Plan was adopted by the government in 2001. It will remain in force until it is amended, either as a whole or in part. It has legal value and all its provisions are compulsory. It may entail restrictions on the use of property, including the prohibition of building. This important tool for spatial planning follows the guidelines of the PRD and may indicate amendments to be made to the Local Development Plans (PCD) and the Local Land Use Plans (PPAS). It determines the general use of the various zones within the region, and the provisions which apply to them. It also determines the planning measures applying to the main infrastructure network (BCR, 2008:18).

**Local Land Use Plans**
(Plans Particuliers d’Affectation du Sol (PPAS), Bijzondere bestemmingsplannen (BBP’s))
The Local Land Use Plans determine precisely how land should be administered at neighbourhood level. It refines both the Regional Land use plan (PRAS) and the Local Development Plan (PCD). In principle, they are drafted at the initiative of the municipality and approved by the government of the Region. Like the PRAS, a PPAS has legal value and is compulsory, and it determines whether or not a planning permit will be issued. The PPAS can be accompanied by any necessary compulsory acquisition plans and town planning charges. It may entail restrictions on the use of property including the prohibition of building. Some 460 PPAS are currently in force in Brussels (BCR, 2008:19).

**Hierarchy**
The Brussels Town Planning Code sets down the hierarchy between the various land-use plans, which in general can be summarized as follows:
- The Regional plans have precedence over Municipal plans
- The Land Use Plans (PRAS, PPAS) must fit in with the direction of the Development plans (PRD, PCD); if motivated, they can nevertheless deviate from this (Haumont et al., 2007:6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operational use (indicative)</th>
<th>Passive use (prescriptive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional level</strong></td>
<td>Regional Development Plan</td>
<td>Regional Land Use Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(PRD, GewOP)</td>
<td>(PRAS, GBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/09/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal level</strong></td>
<td>Local Development Plans</td>
<td>Local Land Use Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(PCD, GemOP)</td>
<td>(PPAS, BBP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 Policy instruments, based on Haumont et al., 2007:4.
3.2 Non-legal policy instruments

Besides the legal planning instruments there are also some non-legal plans that set a direction for the development of the city and the European quarter.

**International Development Plan**  
(Plan de Développement International (PDI, Plan voor Internationale Ontwikkeling (PIO))

The Brussels International Development Plan was adopted by the Regional Government in 2007. It is not a plan in the same sense as the PRD. It is an evolving programme creating the necessary dynamic to promote the international character of Brussels and to maintain its competitive position among European cities. It takes its place among regional policies and has no legal force.

The PDI has five main aims:
1. the introduction of a marketing campaign for the city, reflecting the multiple identities of Brussels;
2. the establishment of ten development areas based on facilities of an international scale;
3. the improvement of the quality of life in Brussels, and the growth of facilities for comfort;
4. the organisation of more effective governance;
5. support for sustainable economic development (BCR, 2008:17).

The European quarter is one of the ten development areas.

**Master Plan**  
(Schéma directeur, Richtschema)

Within the framework of the PRD a new type of area under the name ‘strategic development zone’ (Zone-levier, Hefboomgebied) has been defined. The concept of strategic development zones refers to large urban spaces which either offers a major opportunity for the development of the Region or which present some particular problems. The PRD defines 14 strategic development zones, including the European quarter. The policy tool used in these zones is the master plan (Haumont et al., 2007:10).

The master plan establishes the outlines for the development or redevelopment of strategic development zones. It has no legal force and is thus no substitute for the other existing tools, such as the PPAS. It provides a vision prior to other development plans and establishes an operational framework for action (the main options for intervention and the resources required).

3.3 Policy instruments in the European quarter

For the European quarter all four legal instruments are in force. The implications of these instruments will be described below. Even more important is the master plan for the district from 2008. All though this is not a legal instrument, it sets out the development direction of the district, where other documents are less clear about this.

**Regional Development Plan**

The PRD currently in force comprises an urban project that is built around twelve priorities and eight transversal conditions. The twelve priorities include among others: strengthening the residential attractiveness, creating a vital economy, guarantee access to decent housing, enhance the commercial attractiveness and valorise intercultural and international character of Brussels (Haumont et al., 2007:9).

The eight transversal conditions are the following:
1. location-bounded priority initiatives;
2. a strong consensus that calls on all actors of urban development;
3. coherence between the operations of different authorities;
4. to international collaboration;
5. partnerships between the public and private sector;
6. coherence between policies in the Region and in the suburbs;
7. improving administrative reception functions;
8. developing instruments for follow-up of regional policies (Haumont et al., 2007:9).

The priorities and conditions are very rough guidelines, which do not play a direct role in the development of the European quarter, but must be seen as a policy framework which must be taken into account.

**Regional Land Use Plan (PRAS, GBP)**

The Regional Land Use Plan describes the designated land uses in the European Quarter. The map below shows these land uses (figure 3.2). The administrative areas are mainly intended for offices, but also can get another land use(residential, hotel, manufacturing, activities, etc.). The areas of collective interests and public services are intended for this purpose. Dwellings and small businesses which form a logical addition and fit into the plan are also allowed.

The residential and mixed areas are primarily intended for dwellings. Other uses are accepted under certain conditions. Businesses, for example, are limited to 150 m² per project in a residential area. In green areas cannot not be built (Haumont et al., 2007:12).
Existing policies and plans

**Local development plan (PCD, GemOP)**
The local development plan of the municipality of Brussels has been approved in December 2004. The most important aims for the North-East quarter, which contains the European quarter are the following:
- Revival of the living environment;
- Reclassification and development of a new strong residential axis along the Etterbeeksesteenweg;
- Put a stop to the development of offices;
- Measures relating to the facilities and the development of cultural activities;
- Renewal of the parks.

The municipality of Etterbeek has approved its PCD in June 2006. It requires special attention to the blocks between Place Jourdan and Rue Béliard. The municipality of Ixelles has not yet approved a PCD (Haumont et al., 2007:13).

**Local Land Use Plans (PPAS, BBP)**
The map in figure 3.3 with respect to the existing state of legislation shows that a large part of the European quarter is covered by various local land use plans.
- For the municipality of Brussels: 10 PPAS are effective
- For the municipality of Etterbeek: 3 PPAS are effective
- For the Municipality of Ixelles: 4 PPAS are effective

A difficulty with these PPAS is that they are on some places inconsistent with the master plan. There will be new PPAS for several locations in the European quarter following the new master plan to deal with the above mentioned problem. The first new PPAS will be made for the area around the Rue de la Loi (Project Urban Loi, PUL) of which the procedure will start this year.

---

**Figure 3.2 Regional land use plan (PRAS) of the European quarter. Source: Haumont et al., 2007**

**Figure 3.3 Local land use plan (PPAS) of the European quarter. Source: Haumont et al., 2007**
Master plan
The master plan for the European quarter was adopted by the Brussels-Capital Region government on 24 April 2008, after wide consultations. The master plan aims to transform the European district into a pilot European eco-district and a neighbourhood presenting a mix of functions. The ambition is to make the district:

• the main centre of European and international employment in the Region;
• an area of diversified housing;
• a cultural and recreational centre accessible to all (BIP, 2010).

The challenge formulated in the master plan is to restore livability in the heart the European district. Therefore the master sets out measures to improve the quality and accessibility of public spaces, to conserve and find new uses for the architectural heritage, and to raise the architectural quality and environmental performance of the new buildings (BIP, 2010).

The master plan focuses on the following themes:

1. Three main axis that structures the European quarter:
   • the north-south axes: the Etterbeeksesteenweg, the connections with Elsene and Sint-Joost;
   • the parks axis: the connection between the Jubelpark, the Europeanpark and the Park of Brussels;
   • the connecting axis between the European institutions.

2. European eco-district
3. Mobility
4. Restore mixed character of functions
5. Restore urban character of the European quarter
6. The cultural and tourist appeal of the European Quarter

The themes are further worked out in 12 urban and architectural programs which are shown in figure 3.4. The largest project is Project Urban Loi (PUL), the redesign of the area along the Rue de la Loi (see section 3.5). The master plan includes also several current projects in the European district concerning mobility. This will be elaborated on in section 3.4.

Value of the master plan
The master plan is not part of the Brussels Town Planning Code. It therefore has no binding force and regulatory value. It is strictly indicative. This means that the municipal or regional authorities are not bound by the master plan, not in working the plans out and not in the context of issuing permits (Haumont et al., 2007:16).

Though deviating from the master plan can be criticized as the principles of good governance state that the administrative authorities should respect the course of action that they have set out. So when the authorities deviate from the plan, they must give a reasoned justification why they do not want to follow the course of action they have set out (Haumont et al., 2007:16).

Figure 3.4 12 urban and architectural programs of the master plan. Source: BIP, 2010
3.4 Mobility

Mobility is a major issue in the European quarter. There are several proposed interventions, both on road traffic, public transport, cycling and pedestrian movement.

General policy

The Brussels-Capital Region have stated in the mobility plan IRIS 2 that they want to rationalize the road capacity to give priority to the other modes of transport, in particular to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport. Besides the development of public transport and active modes of transport, they want to rationalize the use of the private car. In accordance with the principles of the PRD, and to cope with the environmental challenges, the Region will take measures to reduce traffic congestion with 6 to 10% by 2014 by 20% by 2018 (IRIS 2, 2010).

Master plan

In the master plan for the European quarter nine interventions are discussed to improve the mobility in the district (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:9):

1. Increasing rail use
   To increase the rail use three different projects are launched:
   - Regional Express Network (Réseau Express Régional, RER) - a project for the realization of a suburban network of train lines around Brussels. The aim is to realize a faster and more frequent rail network in a radius of about 30 km around Brussels.
   - Schuman-Josaphat tunnel - a major new rail link in the RER network. This tunnel will provide a 15-minute connection to the international airport Zaventem.
   - Schuman multimodal station - the existing station Brussels-Schuman will be renovated. The existing subway station, the old and the new railway station will be merged into a large, multimodal station (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:9).

2. Extending the service of public transport on the east-west axis
   To cope with the capacity problems on metro line 1 and 5, the capacity will be extended by automation of the metro, to be able to absorb the growing number of passengers till 2025. A second project is to split the lines 1 and 5 by constructing a new tunnel between Merode and Naamsepoort from the Gare du Luxembourg (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:10).

3. Strengthening public transport on the north-south axis
   The north-south links will be enhanced, initially by bus, possibly later by a tram line. Another possible intervention is the construction of a new metro line Art-Loi/Place de Luxembourg/Ukkel (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:10).

4. Improving the service to the European Parliament and the Gare du Luxembourg
   The metro stations closest to the European Parliament and the Brussels-Luxembourg station are Maalbeek (line 1) and Troon (line 2), but the distance from there on foot to those destinations remains large. In the long term this problem can be solved by constructing a new metro line Merode/Porte de Namur, which runs along the Place du Luxembourg. On the short and middle term one must think about solutions with busses or making use of the new RER line (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:11).

5. Reduction of transit traffic on the Schuman roundabout
   The Schuman roundabout will be closed off for transit traffic to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians, with preservation of local traffic. This will be further worked out in the traffic plan and design competition (see next paragraph) (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:11).

6. Reconstruction of Rue Belliard
   The Rue Belliard must retain its function as transit axis, which is essential for traffic that leaves Brussels. On the other hand it should also be a pedestrian walkway that guarantees the connection between the EU institutions and the Parc du Cinquantenaire. A suggestion for the reconstruction is to displace the tunnel entrance to the Rue de la Science (or even a direct connection with the Inner Ring). This must be further elaborated in the traffic plan (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:12).

7. Reconstruction of the Rue de la Loi
   In the master plan two options are considered for the reconstruction of the Rue de la Loi:
   - minimize the impact of the crossroads of the Rue de la Loi and with that remove one or more tracks to give more space to pedestrians and cyclists.
   - redevelopment of the Rue de la Loi to a local road, in which the transit traffic is diverted underground by adjusting the volume of the underground car parks to the new circumstances.
   The preliminary results of studying this option shows that this second option is hardly feasible in practice, given the high cost and major technical problems of implementation (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:12).
8. **Development of a parking policy**
An inventory will be made of all available above- and underground parking places in the European quarter and solutions will be searched for to solve the parking problems for employees and residents (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:12).

9. **Priority for pedestrians and cyclists**
Pedestrians and cyclists will have automatic priority in all the new infrastructural proposals (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:13).

All in all these are many proposed interventions to improve the accessibility of the area. Unfortunately these plans are part of the master plan of the area, which has no legal force. This means that many of the projects are still in the study phase and it is uncertain if these plans will be executed.
3.5 Competitions

As a result of the master plan three international architecture- and urban design competitions are organized. The first one, Project Urban Loi, is launched in 2008 and is about the area adjacent to Rue de la Loi. The second one is about the Schuman roundabout, which asks for proposals to improve public space sharing and transit of the Schuman submissions. In the third case, proposals will be collected for a road link for pedestrians between the northern tip of the esplanade of the parliament and the other side of the Rue Belliard. This last competition is not launched yet and therefore not described more in detail.

**Project Urban Loi (PUL)**

April 2008 a competition has been launched aimed at defining a new urban design for the area adjacent to Rue de la Loi, between Maelbeek and Arts-Loi. The goal of the competition was to define an urban design with a ‘strong symbolic identity, featuring convivial public spaces, giving priority to non-motorised mobility and public transport, and providing buildings of high environmental quality and architectural value’ (Europa.eu, 2008, p. 1).

The competition is in keeping with the objectives defined by the Master Plan for the European Quarter. It aims to transform the zone into an ‘eco-district’ combining the first European and international administrative site in the Region, diversified housing as well as cultural and leisure spaces. In addition, it responds to the desire, as expressed jointly by the regional authorities and the European Commission, to reorganize the locations of the Commission on both sides of the Rue de la Loi ‘while encouraging significant functional and social diversity’ (BELO, 2009, p. 1). The Region is the contracting authority for the project. As such it is responsible for organising the competition, taking decisions (after consulting an advisory committee), monitoring progress and ensuring completion of the project.

The winner of the urban planning competition for remodelling the main axis of the European quarter – the Rue de la Loi – is the French architect Christian de Portzamparc. The ambitious design aims to transform the European Quarter from a concrete administrative ghetto into a glimmering ‘open city to the sky’. It will add a tram link through the street and 390,000 m² of floor space including 110,000 m² of accommodation, 240,000 m² of EC department space and 40,000 m² of retail (BIP, 2010:25). Figure 3.9 shows an impression of the design of de Portzamparc. The project will be translated into a PPAS. The time line of the project can be seen on the next page (figure 3.10).

![Figure 3.9 The urban design of de Portzamparc. Source: BIP, 2010.](image)
Figure 3.10 Time line of the Project Urban Loi (PUL). Source: BIP, 2010.
One Schuman

Beliris organises a design competition that has to provide a study for the redesign of the Schuman square and its surroundings (figure 3.11). Beliris is the name of the cooperation agreement between the federal state, Belgium, and the Metropolitan District of Brussels. Beliris manages, coordinates, and initiates projects in order to improve the aura and view of Brussels (OneSchuman, 2010:1).

The project concerning the new Schuman square should take one very important change into consideration: the roundabout will almost entirely be accessible for pedestrians only. Through traffic will be redirected according to the recommendations of a running mobility study freeing Schuman square for other activities. Cyclists and pedestrians, but demonstrators too, will be the main users of the roundabout in the future. Special attention should be paid to the protection of the surrounding residential areas. The study explicitly requests that the inhabitants of the area are shielded as much as possible from any inconvenience (OneSchuman, 2010:1).

3.6 Remarks

There is a lot going on in the European quarter and there are several policy plans and documents about the development of the district. Though there is a lack of coherence between the plans. The plans are fragmented due to the fact that the decision making power concerning urban planning is shared by the Region and the municipalities. This implies a difficult planning situation and a multi layered policy structure. Furthermore there are often several projects formulated in one policy plan. For example in the master plan 12 different projects are defined which are independent and do not have coherence. Also for the mobility problem are also many spate projects.

The master plan is the most important and recent plan for the European quarter. It sets out the direction in which the district must be developed, although it must be worked out in more detail. The other plans are either on a very abstract level or outdated when it is on a lower scale level. However, the execution of the master plan is entirely dependent on the elaboration in legal structures. This is still a difficult step to take.

For example the master plan aims to make the European district a mixed and lively area. Several measures are intended to encourage the mix of functions in the European district. However, the large-scale return to housing, facilities and local shops will require the use of a regulatory planning tool:
- either a change in the administrative zone provisions of the PRAS;
- or the amendment of the PRAS land use map;
- or the drafting of one or more PPAS for the zones returned to housing.

The master plan is thus very dependent on other legal plans for its execution.
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4. Successful urban places

This chapter handles the theoretical background of successful urban places and how several authors have commented on their development and structure. It first discusses different traditions of thought within the practice of urbanism during the years. Next, it elaborates on three elements that have been investigated by several authors that contribute to successful urban places: activity, image and form. Paragraph 3.2 examines this last element (urban) form and distinguishes common directions. The last paragraph presents critiques on the established opinions goes into the critique that is present on what is described in this chapter.

4.1 Traditions of thought

The observations of – the development of – a city can be roughly separated in four traditions of thought (Carmona et al., 2010:6-8): the visual-artistic tradition, social-usage tradition, place-making tradition and the emerging tradition of sustainable urbanism.

**Visual-artistic tradition**
The visual-artistic tradition has an architectural and narrow focus. It is mostly product orientated and puts emphasis on visual qualities and aesthetic experience of the public realm. It also state that cultural, social, economic, political, and spatial factors and processes are not large contributions to successful urban places. Supporters of this tradition of thought are Cullen (Cullen, 1961), Site (City Planning According to Artistic Principles, 1889) and Le Corbusier (although as an ‘aesthetic antithesis’ of Site) (Carmona et al., 2010:6-8).

**Social-usage tradition**
The social-usage tradition puts emphasis on the way people use space and encompasses issues of perceptions and sense-of-place. It focuses on the appreciation of the urban environment, examining people’s perceptions and metal images. Example of followers of this tradition are Lynch (The Image of the City, 1961), Gehl (Life Between Buildings, 1971) and Whyte (The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces, 1980) (Carmona et al., 2010:6-8).

**Place-making tradition**
A synthesis of the two earlier traditions is the so called place-making tradition. It is simultaneously concerned with the design of urban places as physical and aesthetic composition as well as behavioural settings. Emphasis is laid both on the ‘hard’ city of buildings and the ‘soft’ city of people and activities (Carmona et al., 2010:6-8).

**Sustainable urbanism**
The last tradition of thought is an emerging tradition: sustainable urbanism. The last decades there is a quest for sustainable development. Four convergent lines of thinking can be identified since the year 2000. The first is originating from Richard Florida, with his publications on the creative class. He states that vibrant, walkable neighbourhoods attract this creative class. Second a transformation of America’s downtowns can be seen, with a growing demand for urban living. A third influential development is growing obesitas, linked to car dependent urbanism. The last line of thinking is the ambition to the reduce carbon footprint. The thirst three developments reinforce the place making tradition, whilst the final trend suggests new thinking may be required (Carmona et al., 2010:6-8).

Besides the traditions of thought one can distinguish another classification within the different points of view on the debate about successful urban places from the mid-20th century. It partly overlaps with the traditions of thoughts, but puts a different emphasis. In this classification there are the authors that stress the importance of the physical setting, those that consider activity on the streets to be the key to successful urban places and the ones emphasizing the sensory experience of people when moving through public space.

Gordon Cullen can be placed in the first group. He places the greatest emphasis on physicality, which can be seen as the rational objective classical view of urban design. In his book The Concise Townscape (Cullen, 1961) Cullen shows in a series of photographs and sketches how amongst others design styles, ornamentation, gateways, vistas, landmarks and the way buildings open out into spaces contribute to the quality of public space (figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1 Images of The Concise Townscape, Cullen. Source: Cullen, 1961
Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 1961) was the first to explore urban quality from the premise that activity both produces and mirrors quality in the built environment. She argued that the vitality of city neighbourhoods depends on the overlapping and interweaving of activities, and that understanding cities requires dealing with mixtures of uses as the ‘essential phenomena’. She outlined four conditions indispensable to generating ‘exuberant diversity’ in city’s streets and districts (Jacobs, 1961:162-163):

1. The district must serve more than one primary function; preferably more than two.
2. Most blocks must be short; that is, streets and opportunities to turn corners must be frequent.
3. The district must mingle buildings that vary in age and condition.
4. There must be a sufficiently dense concentration of people, for whatever purposes they may be there.

Lynch (Lynch, 1960) represents the third group by stressing the psychology of place, bound up in the notion of ‘mental maps’ which people use as internal guides to urban places. In doing so, they rely on their senses to tell them whether a place feels safe, comfortable, vibrant, quiet or threatening. This is the romantic subjective view of urban design (Montgomery, 1998:95-96).

4.2 Activity, image and form

In 1998 academic John Montgomery summarizes these three points of view in a conceptual framework in his article Making a city: Urbanity, vitality and urban design. Based on a scheme developed by Punter in 1991 (Punter, 1991 cited in Montgomery, 1998:97) Montgomery argues that three elements - activity, form and image - together form successful urban places (figure 4.2-3).

Activity

The first element - activity - can be seen as the product of two separate but related concepts: vitality and diversity. Montgomery (1998) states that vitality is what distinguishes successful urban areas from the others. It refers to the numbers of people in and around the street (pedestrian flows) across different times of day and night, the uptake of facilities, the number of cultural events and celebrations over the year, the presence of an active street life, and generally the extent to which a place feels alive or lively (Montgomery, 1998:97-98).

However he states that in the long term urban vitality can only be achieved where there is a complex diversity of primary land uses and (largely economic) activity. Combinations of mixtures of activities, not separate uses, are the key to successful urban places (Montgomery, 1998, Jacobs, 1961). The most lively and interesting urban areas tend to be places of complex variety, with a large representation of small-scale business activity. Urban vitality focuses on creating the possibilities for transactions to take place in longer and more extended segments of time, to develop a pattern of increasing complexity (Montgomery, 1998:98).

Image

According to Montgomery (1998:100) the second element of successful urban places is image. He states that every place has both an identity and an image. These expressions are not the same. Whilst ‘identity’ is an objective thing (what a place is actually like), image is a combination of this identity with how a place is perceived. To individuals, the image of a place is therefore their set of feelings and impressions about that place (Montgomery, 1998:100). In close connection to this, Lynch (1960, 1981, cited in Montgomery, 1998:100) states that an individual’s knowledge of a city is a function of the imageability of the urban environment: that is, the extent to which the components of the environment make

![Figure 4.2: Components of a sense of place. Source: Punter, 1991 cited in Montgomery, 1998.](image)

![Figure 4.3: Policy directions to foster an urban sense of place (or place making) Source: Montgomery, 1998.](image)
a strong impression on the individual. In turn he argues that imageability is influenced by a city's legibility: the degree to which the different elements of the city (defined as paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks) are organized into a coherent and recognizable pattern (Lynch, 1960, 1981, cited in Montgomery, 1998:100).

**Form**

The third element of successful urban places is form (Montgomery, 1998). Kevin Lynch wrote In a theory of good city form (1981, cited in Montgomery 1998:102) about the qualities which urban design should seek to achieve, and so how to create a sense of place. He puts forward five basic dimensions of city performance: vitality, sense, fit, access and control. Lynch's fifth criterion ‘fit’ seeks to demonstrate how activity and image interrelate with form to generate a sense of place. Or, in other words: how city form can be designed as to stimulate activity, a positive image and therefore a strong sense of place. He states that a city with good fit provides the buildings, spaces and networks required for its residents to pursue their projects successfully. In a very real sense, this ‘fit’ will be governed by the type of place and the range and intensity of activity desired (Montgomery, 1998:102). That said, one can create a picture of the fit necessary to achieve a successful urban place. Form can in that sense be seen as the ‘fit’ or precondition for activity and image (Lynch, 1981; Montgomery, 1998). The elements activity, image and form and their corresponding principles are summarized in a table (figure 4.4)

Brouwer (2010) has reconsidered the table of elements with their corresponding principles formulated by Montgomery in her master thesis. She states that as form can be seen as the ‘fit’ for activity and image, several cross relationships can be noticed. For instance principle 15 (zoning for mixed use) has a diversity of primary and secondary uses (principle 3) as a result. In this way several cross relationships can be made (adjustments in figure 4.4). This said one can say that form is the basis or precondition of activity and image and how these two result in successful urban places (figure 4.5). The scheme can also be turned around; when the quality of a place is low, it will have a bad image and there will be less activity. Eventually this may lead to an alteration of the form.

The next paragraph describes form directions formulated by several authors that represent this form as the basis of activity, image and eventually the quality urban places.

![Figure 4.4 Principles for achieving urbanity, form as precondition for activity and image. Source: Brouwer (2010).](image)

![Figure 4.5 Form as precondition for activity and image and eventually the quality of urban places. Source: Adjusted from Brouwer (2010).](image)
4.3 Form directions to successful urban places

To come to the form ‘directions’ to successful urban places several authors have been studied: Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 1961) The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Jacobs & Appleyard (1987) Toward an urban design manifesto, Montgomery (1998) Making a city: Urbanity, vitality and urban design and Jabareen (2006) Sustainable Urban Forms, Their Typologies, Models, and Concepts. These authors are chosen because they can be seen as key representatives of the place-making tradition of thought (Jacobs, Jacobs & Appleyard and Montgomery), which combines the visual-artistic and social-usage tradition and the sustainable urbanism tradition (Jabareen).

From these publications similarities and dissimilarities regarding ‘directions’ to successful urban places have been derived. Five themes returned by all four authors: density, mixed-use & diversity, human scale, public space and accessibility, and therefore can be seen as guiding principles for successful urban places. These principles are summarized in table 4.1 and described more in detail below.

Density
According to Montgomery relatively high densities are essential for generating enough diversity and with that achieving urbanity. Being concentrated is what produces urbanity and convenience. On the other hand, density in itself will not necessarily produce urbanity: density is a necessity rather than a sufficient condition for urbanity (Montgomery, 1998:103). According to Jacobs, there must be a sufficiently dense concentration of people, for whatever purposes they may be there (Jacobs, 1961), to generate diversity in city’s streets and districts. Jacobs & Appleyard (1987) put emphasis on the fact that there must be some minimum density of residential development as well as intensity of land use.

Jabareen (2006) talks about compactness and density as two different elements of sustainable urban form. He states that high density and integrated land use not only conserve resources but provide compactness that encourages social interaction. Furthermore he argues that compactness of the built environment is a widely acceptable strategy through which more sustainable urban forms might be achieved, because it can minimize transport of energy, water, materials, products, and people. Compactness goes hand in hand with the goal of liveability, and prevents commuting (Jabareen, 2006:39-40).

Mixed-use and diversity
According to Montgomery and Jacobs vital urban areas and as many of their constituent parts as possible, must serve more than one primary purpose, preferably more than two (Jacobs, 1961, Montgomery, 1998). These primary purposes, and the ‘secondary’ activities they attract, must ensure the presence of people on the streets, public spaces and in buildings across different times of the day. According to Jacobs there are two types of mixed-use diversity: primary uses which bring people to specific places and therefore act as ‘people attractors’: offices, residences, some shops and places of education, recreation and entertainment. Secondary diversity refers to the enterprises and services which grow in response to primary uses, to serve the people which the primary uses attract (Jacobs, 1961:161-164).

Montgomery states that for mixed use to operate successfully, three conditions must be met: people must use the same streets and spaces, people must use at least some of the same facilities, and activity must not be concentrated into a particular time of the day. Thus it is important for mixture to occur not only within a city block or on a development site but also within building blocks both horizontally and vertically (Montgomery, 1998:105).

According to Jabareen there is a general consensus among planners that mixed land use has an important role in achieving sustainable urban form. He states that mixed-use or heterogeneous zoning allows compatible land uses in close proximity to one another, and thereby decrease the travel distances between activities. Mixing uses ensures that many services are within a reasonable distance, thus encouraging cycling or walking. In addition, he says, mixed-use of space can renew life in many parts of the city and in turn enhance security in public spaces. For a sustainable urban form, mixed-uses should be encouraged in cities, and zoning discouraged (Jabareen, 2006:41).

Also diversity is vital. Without it, state Jacobs (1961) and Jabareen (2006), the urban system declines as a living place and a place to live. There are some similarities between diversity and mixed land uses. However, diversity can be seen as ‘a multidimensional phenomenon’ that promotes greater variety of housing types, building densities, household sizes, ages, cultures, and incomes. Diversity represents the social and cultural context of the urban form (Jabareen, 2006:42).

Human scale
According to Montgomery most successful urban places operate at several scale levels, but importantly are more rather than less intricate, are capable of being walked, and have a large number of intersections. These are all statements about the human scale of developments. He further states
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td>‘There must be a sufficiently dense concentration of people, for whatever purposes they may be there’</td>
<td>‘Some minimum density of residential development as well as intensity of land use’</td>
<td>‘Development intensity’</td>
<td>‘Compactness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Density’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed-use and diversity</strong></td>
<td>‘More than one primary function’</td>
<td>‘An integration of activities – living, working, shopping – in some reasonable proximity to each other’</td>
<td>‘Mixed use’</td>
<td>‘Mixed land uses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Mingle buildings that vary in age and condition’</td>
<td>‘Fine grain economy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Diversity’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human scale</strong></td>
<td>‘Most blocks must be short, streets and opportunities to turn corners must be frequent’</td>
<td>‘Many separate, distinct buildings with complex arrangements and relationships as opposed to a few, large buildings’</td>
<td>‘Human Scale’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘A manmade environment, particular buildings, that defines public space as oppose to buildings sitting in space’</td>
<td>‘City blocks and permeability’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Streets: contact, visibility and horizontal grain’</td>
<td>‘Greening’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Public realm’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Green space and water space’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Movement’</td>
<td>‘Sustainable transport’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 ‘Directions’ to successful urban places.
that the most beneficial combination of building heights, street widths, intersections and blocks is likely to fall in the range of 250 intersections and 250 blocks per square mile (Montgomery, 1998:107).

Jacobs and Appleyard argue that for a good human scale there must be many separate, distinct buildings with complex arrangements and relationships, as opposed to a few number of large buildings. In relations to this stands permeability and size of building blocks. Jacobs (1961) states that to generate diversity most blocks must be short and opportunities to turn corner must be frequent. City districts which have more shorter blocks tend also to generate more street life. Thereby it is important that block are just blocks, rather than building plots sitting in space (Montgomery, 1998:108, Jacobs and Appleyard, 1987).

Public space
Montgomery argues that streets are the most important elements in a city’s public realm (Montgomery, 1998:109). The public realm in a city performs many functions, not only by providing meeting places but also in helping to define the built environment, offering spaces for local traditions and customs such as festivals and carnivals, and representing meaning and identity (Gehl, 1995 cited in Montgomery, 1998:109). Good urban places are judged by their street life. Successful streets have users on it fairly continuously, watching and being watched. To stimulate more activity and natural surveillance, an element of horizontal zoning of street frontages would be applied so that there will be a procession of active frontages (Montgomery, 1998:109).

Furthermore public green space and water areas are also important to city life (Montgomery, 1998:111). Greening of the city also appears to be an important design concept for the sustainable urban form (Jabareen, 2006:42-43). It fulfils several functions, among others:
- recreation;
- health, filtering the noise, light and air of the city;
- setting and understanding, by framing development sites, providing views and landscape image (Montgomery, 1998:111).

Accessibility
One can judge the accessibility of a place by its connections to its surroundings, both visual and physical. A successful public space is easy to get to and get through; it is visible both from a distance and up close (PPS, 2009). Successful people places may be destinations (go-to-places) in their own right but, more likely, they are also places on the way to many other places (i.e. go-through-places). The reality is that very few successful people places work solely as destinations in their own right. Almost all are places with favourable locations within the wider strategic movement network and they have benefit of centrality within those networks (Carmona et al., 2010:202).

Jabareen (2006) states that sustainable urban form must be a form and scale appropriate to walking, cycling, and efficient public transport. Policies for sustainable urban development should include measures to reduce the need for movement and to provide favourable conditions for energy-efficient and environmentally friendly forms of transport. Land use planning has a key role to play in the realization of these objectives. It is assumed that when the physical separation of activities is smaller, travel needs are likely to be lower and easily met by walking, cycling, and environmentally friendly transport.

Other
There are a few other conditions concerning successful urban places mentioned by one or more authors. This comprises landmarks, visual stimulation and attention to detail that can contribute to a greater sense of place and the use of architectural style as image mentioned by Montgomery. These conditions are not mentioned by the other authors and are therefore not included into the five main directions to successful urban places.

Flexibility and adaptability
By observing above mentioned conditions as informing principles, it is possible to derive a ‘fit’ for a good urban place. Though, paradoxically, this fit cannot be too precise, for it must allow flexibility for the city to grow organically. Rather than visual order and certainty, places which work well also allow for a degree of uncertainty, disorder and chaos (Montgomery, 1998:103). That said, it is also very important that urban forms are highly adaptable. Places which continue to succeed despite changes in economic conditions, technology and culture do so because their built form is itself mixed and/or highly adaptable. By extension, the successful urban area is one which offers in-built adaptability rather than in-built obsolescence (Montgomery, 1998:106).

The above mentioned form directions to successful urban places can be seen as the common wisdom in current urbanism. There is also critique on this approach to successful urbanism. One of the main representatives of this critique is Dutch practising architect Rem Koolhaas. He has also published some book, of which in Delirious New York and S, M, L, XL he elaborates his vision on urbanism and the contemporary city.
4.4 The generic city

In Delirious New York (1994) Koolhaas illustrates Manhattan as a set of ‘cities within cities’ that thrive on what he called a ‘culture of congestion’, made possible through the cumulation of different activities in a confined space. He states that Manhattan was the unlikely marriage between appearance and performance where architecture was not a matter of mere aesthetics but had succeeded in providing the basis for a unique metropolitan form of life (Hajer, 1999:137). Koolhaas analysed the way in which the two characteristic features of the urban structure on the island, the grid/block structure and the skyscraper, made congestion into a recognized social and cultural quality. Hence he resisted the trend to see congestion as a problem for modern society (Hajer, 1999:138). Koolhaas has encountered a lot of resistance. He is not a mainstream thinker. For example, in this time in which the automobile is frequently taken to be the symbol of the defunct ‘first modernity’ causing environmental decline and traffic jams, cars play a generally positive role in his projects. For Koolhaas there is nothing as detestable as a pedestrianized inner city (Hajer, 1999:138).

In S, M, L, XL and in particularly in the essays What happened to Urbanism? and The generic City Koolhaas goes a step further in his reflection on city. He repositions the challenge of urbanism into how to handle the rapid process of urbanization in the world. In face with this development, which is driven by both demography and economic growth, urban theory is constantly outpaced by the sheer growth of numbers. He criticizes the professional disciplines of urban planning and architecture for focusing their deliberations on what he now sees as a ‘classical model’ of the city and for failing to come up with a new approach to understand and deal with the contemporary process of urbanization (Hajer, 1999:140). Here he claims that the traditional approaches to urban planning do not face up their task:

‘If there is to be a “new urbanism” it will not be based on the twin fantasies of order and omnipotence; it will be the staging of uncertainty; it will no longer be concerned with the arrangement of more or less permanent objects but with the irrigation of territories with potential; it will no longer aim for stable configurations but for the creation of enabling fields that accommodate processes that refuse to be crystallised into definitive form … it will no longer be obsessed with the city but with the manipulation of infrastructure for endless intensifications and diversifications, shortcuts and redistributions – the reinvention of psychological space …’ (Koolhaas et al., 1995:969).

Koolhaas points at a paradox in contemporary urban thinking. The commitment to the historical concentric form of the (European) city leads to the search to both preserve the authentic-city of the historical inner cities and the drive to constantly modernize them to make sure they also keep their role as centres of society. In answer to this Koolhaas adds a new urban form which he labels the ‘generic city’. The generic city stand for sprawl, sameness, repetition. It is literally a city without history created on a plane, a surface. Koolhaas thematizes the phenomenon of urban sprawl as an essential characteristic of the future in which density is artificially created in the form of urban ‘simulacra’: shopping malls, theme parks and museum environments. Being dominated by highways connecting sites of ‘inexplicable isolated density’, the new landscape is very different from the Manhattan grid (Hajer, 1999:140).

The generic city points out the overpowering importance of infrastructure for urban life in the coming decades. He states that not proximity but connectivity, not history but adaptation are the key variables. Koolhaas relates these elements of a new urban sociology to an attack on the Western ‘obsession’ with history as a source of social identity (Hajer, 1999:141).
4.5 Successful urban places and fear of terrorism

Besides the critical notes that can be placed at the guiding principles for successful urban places, there is in the past years a tendency going on caused by the threat of terrorism: urban resilience. This urban resilience seems to go against these principles. This section handles this relatively new concept of urban resilience and its consequences for successful urban places.

Resilience against a range of traditional and unconventional terrorist threats is increasingly important in the way towns and cities are designed and managed (Coaffee et al., 2008:103). For many years urban commentators have discussed the costs and benefits of urban authorities adopting counter-terrorism measures in the face of real or perceived terrorist threats. Some of the most historically explicit examples of such measures were seen in Northern Ireland in the early 1970s and 1980s where 'fortress architecture' and principles of 'defensible space' were used to territorially control designated areas (Coaffee, 2004:201). The concept of resilience is increasingly used to describe how cities and regions are attempting to embed security and risk management features into their built environment as part of a broader drive towards 'safer' and sustainable communities (Coaffee and Bosher, 2008 cited in Coaffee, 2008:4633).

September 11th

Since September 11th 2001, with the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in the United States of America, new forms of mega-terrorism have led to new levels of perceived urban vulnerability. Hence, new forms of protective security are developed, in attempts to counter the threat in 'targeted' urban centres (Coaffee, 2005:449). It became apparent that iconic structures—symbols of the cultures that support them—will continue to be likely targets of terrorism (Rypkema 2003 cited in (Little, 2004:53)) and that cities, more than ever before, are the key strategic sites where terrorism occurs and geopolitical conflicts are played out (Coaffee, 2005:449).

The events of September 11th have influenced the technological and physical infrastructure of targeted cities to the extent that 'urban flows can be scrutinized through military perspectives so that the inevitable fragilities and vulnerabilities they produce can be significantly reduced' (Graham, 2002: 589 cited in (Coaffee, 2004:202)). However, in many urban areas under perceived threat, such counter-terrorist responses amount to little more than extrapolations of ongoing trends which were already employed to reduce the occurrence and perception of crime (Coaffee, 2004:202). It stressed and clarified a number of pre-existing trends that had been developing unnoticed. Furthermore it provided an opportunity to give already existing ideas, policies and technologies a boost (Coaffee, 2005:450).

Responses to terrorist threats in urban planning and design

A way to understand how risks of urban attacks can be reduced is to consider risk as the product of vulnerability (how susceptible a place or system is to attack), threat (how likely is the occurrence of an attack, how motivated people are to attack) and criticality (how serious the consequences are). Effectively, if the consequences of an attack are small, conducting the attack may become less attractive, and the risk could thereby be reduced (Coaffee et al., 2008:105).

Several responses to the hazards of attacks have been discussed by urban commentators. Pawley (1998: 148 cited in (Coaffee, 2004:208)) argued that as a result of surge in urban terrorism, especially against 'the highly serviced and vulnerable built environment of the modern world', the new wave of signature buildings could be replaced by an 'architecture of terror' in response to security needs. This, he argued, could well have the function of making the buildings 'anonymous', and thus, he concluded, a less attractive terrorist target. Many commentators also predicted the demise of the skyscraper and the changing functionality of urban centres. Others highlighted the potential for terrorism to lead to a new counter-urbanization trend amongst business and wealthier citizens in search of 'space and security', or for the increased fragmentation of urban space to continue through 'concentrated decentralization' (Coaffee, 2004:208). The concern is that anti-terrorist defences could mean the virtual death of the urban areas as functioning entities. Therefore urban planners and designers have to think carefully when balancing security with mobility and risk with recklessness (Coaffee, 2004:208).

One security approach is to attempt to 'design out' or mitigate the effects of terrorism by creating an environment that is inherently less likely to suffer attack or can minimise consequences and impact. From an engineering design perspective, the use of 'hardened' or enhanced-performance materials (e.g. those offering blast or fragmentation resistance) has been increasing. From an urban design perspective, the construction of spaces that allow for clear sightlines for camera surveillance, greater 'standoff' distances around buildings or controlled access in certain areas has been encouraged (Coaffee et al., 2008:106).
Spatial design, material choices, aesthetics and many other ‘design’ factors can influence a location vulnerability to attack. It is not suggested that design is a primary defence against a terror attack, but it does form one part of a multi-layered system of security. Current research has identified that key stakeholders recognise that resilient design will become central to planning, construction guidelines and legislation in the near future (Coaffee et al., 2008:107).

At an intra-urban level, the post September 11th city has also seen an inevitable growth in the popularity of physical or symbolic notions of boundaries and territorial closures — for example, enclosed defensive enclaves around residential gated communities, airports, civic buildings or major financial districts, into which access and egress is restricted (Coaffee, 2005:449).

Are fear and urbanism at war?

Over the last decade metaphors of urban renaissance have become increasingly influential in processes of urban policymaking, emphasizing inclusivity, liveability and accessibility (Coaffee, 2005:453). Attempts are made to construct new sustainable and safe urban realms, founded upon the principles of social mixing, sustainability, connectivity, higher densities, walkability and high-quality streetscapes (Coaffee, 2005:448). However, these ‘quality-of-life issues’ sit uneasily beside issues of safety and security, which can easily morph into physical, technological and legislative strategies of urban revanchism and resilience (Coaffee, 2005:453). Furthermore the need to reduce risk, vulnerability and danger abounds in urban policy circles in stark conflict with the needs of cities to attract inward investment, tourists and consumers, and to encourage city living (Coaffee, 2005:448).

Recent studies in humanities, urbanism and architecture have highlighted the risks that counter-terrorism measures pose for the functional integrity of urban space in terms of their potential to contribute to an atmosphere of fear, a culture of surveillance, consequences for social control and freedom of movement, and a reduction in democratic involvement in urban planning and construction often leading to an increased militarisation of urban design (Coaffee et al., 2008:108).

This is the delicate balance that the managers of many cities are now facing as the threat from terrorism continues to cast a shadow over urban life. The response of urban authorities and public and private security agencies to this threat poses serious consequences for urbanity and the civic realm, and in particular for social control and freedom of movement.

4.6 Discussion

This chapter presented an overview of how different authors have looked at the development and structure of cities and what they see as essential aspects of successful urban places. In this discussion several traditions of thought and views have been distinguished. The elements (urban) form, activity and image are named by many authors, at first separately, but later, initiated by Montgomery as a combination of each other. The model of Montgomery can be seen as common wisdom in current urban planning and design practice. Looking at elements of form that are described by several authors, five main aspects of successful urban places come forward: density, mixed-use & diversity, human scale, public space and accessibility. These elements are named by almost all authors, although their emphasis is sometimes different.

These elements can therefore be seen as guiding principles to successful urban places. Though, it must not be seen as real criteria on which a city can be tested, or that when all criteria are fulfilled a city can be assumed to be a good urban place. A better interpretation is to see them as guidelines on which a city can be analysed and compared with other places, serving as a basis to propose interventions on.

Looking at the publications of Koolhaas one can see that in Delirious New York there is an important focus on density and mixed use. Its ‘culture of congestion’ is about the cumulation of different activities in a confined space. He does not put attention on the human scale of developments and public spaces.

Figure 4.6 An example of urban fortification: the American embassy in The Hague. Source: Google images, 2011.
In his later work S, M, L, XL he disclaims the desire for a ‘culture of congestion’ and focuses on how to handle the rapid process of urbanization in the world. He criticizes the focus on a ‘classical model’ of the city and for failing to come up with a new approach to understand and deal with the contemporary process of urbanization (Hajer, 1999:140). This is a useful comment because it points out the need to translate the lessons from Jacobs, Montgomery and others to current practice. With that it is important not to be blindly supporter of the classical model of the city, but to apply the guiding principles for successful urban places on the contemporary city.

It is furthermore of concern to include the element of flexibility and adaptability to the framework of guidelines to successful urban places. As stated before the urban form must allow flexibility for the city to grow organically. Places which work well allow for a degree of uncertainty, disorder and chaos (Montgomery, 1998:103). It is also very important that urban forms are highly adaptable to be able to react on changes in economic conditions, technology and culture (Montgomery, 1998:106). Also Koolhaas emphasises the importance of flexibility. If there is to be a “new urbanism” he states, it will be the staging of uncertainty (Koolhaas et al., 1995:969).

Flexibility should not be seen as the sixth element for successful urban places next to the elements of density, mixed-use & diversity, human scale, public space and accessibility. This because flexibility cannot be seen as an urban quality in itself, but as mean for the urban environment to react on changes in the context. Therefore the five elements must be seen in the framework of flexibility. The urban fabric as a whole, and thus also the five elements for successful urban places must be able to react on future changes.

The section on fear of terrorism shows an essential debate in current urban design practice. On the one hand there is a call for inclusivity, liveability and accessibility in the urban environment, which can be translated into the guiding principles for successful urban form. One the other hand the increasing request for safety and security measure in the urban territory is often dominating and results in ‘fortress architecture’ closing areas off for the public. There is a great challenge for the current urban design practice to bring these two elements together, i.e. both having an attractive, lively and open city and at the same time having a secured environment answering to the security requirements. The request for secured areas will probably not disappear and therefore it should be imbedded in urban form without harming the viability too much. That is way the element of security must be included in the framework. Like flexibility not next to the five elements for successful urban places, but as an embracing framework. Summarizing this will result in a system of five guiding principles for successful urban places placed in a framework of flexibility and security (figure 4.7).
5. Urban change management

Since the 1990s social and cultural aspects of city development have become gradually more important. The recent climate and financial crises have given rise to sustainability and financial engineering as additional aspects of city development, making urban management, the development and improvement of urban areas and regions, increasingly complex (van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:53). Urban management is by definition multidimensional: several stakeholder groups from the public and private sectors are involved and it can be applied to different scales or levels (urban or metropolitan scale, district or neighbourhood level and project level) (van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:54).

It is very difficult, or even not possible, to find a guiding framework for a ‘successful’ process of urban management. The process is too complex and unpredictable for that and to a very large extent dependent on local circumstances. However, many authors have identified the success factors and pitfalls in the process. This chapter will discuss a number of these concepts, which are important in urban area management, although they will not guarantee success. This chapter is not aiming at giving a complete overview, however it points out what are essential elements in the process of urban management as seen by current practice.

5.1 Governance and coalitions

The more traditional approach of developing cities through top-down blueprint town planning has gradually been shifting to the more entrepreneurial approach of strategic management of both public and private initiatives in the urban environment (van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:53). In the Western world, governments generally do not have a monopoly on power, nor control over all resources, and are thus dependent on the power and resources of other actors. This more distributed structure of government adds to the complexity and challenge of place-making and especially to the delivery and maintenance of good places (Carmona et al., 2010:64). The term ‘governance’ has come into use to refer to all ‘collective action promoted as for public purposes, wider than the purposes of individual agents (Healey, 2007:17). Governments, citizens and development parties are witnessing an increasing array of problems and questions regarding urban area development – issues that are deemed to be the responsibility of the government. Yet these issues need to be addressed in terms of governance since there can be no single party who can operate all the instruments, drive a unilateral vision or offer an all-encompassing solution (Franzen et al., 2011:11). Although it might be argued that the influence of government is diminishing, it still plays a essential role as regulator and driver for change.

Due to the growing complexity of urban management, cooperation and coalitions between stakeholder groups have become more significant. According to Barton (2010) the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods depends on the active commitment of local stakeholders. Public, private and community sectors needs to pursue common purposes. This cooperative principle is not about “romantic community idealism” he states; “it is about coordination”. It may mean working in partnerships with other bodies, sharing ownership of a neighbourhood project, or it may simply mean open/efective information exchange and consultation (Barton et al., 2010:43). Van Hoek and Wigmans (2011:60) call this strategic networks: patterns of interaction between mutually dependent actors that evolve in response to policy problems or projects. Figure 5.1 shows the differences between adversarial, consultative and inclusive processes and the solution it will bring. Only an inclusive process, Barton (Barton et al., 2010) states, will bring consensus and a win-win solution. The underlying rationale for cooperation between the participating actors is the recognition of their mutual dependence. The intensity of cooperation within the strategic network is therefore determined by the actors’ recognition that they both need each other to achieve their own individual objectives, and so eventually they will tow the same line (van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:71).
There are significant differences in interest and power between different actor groups. Power is the stakeholder’s ability to influence objectives (how much they can), while interest is the stakeholder’s willingness (how much they care). The level of power and influence together form the level of influence a stakeholders has on a certain process. Although it is a useful basic framework for understanding which stakeholders are likely to be the most influential, it is very hard to find ways of effectively measuring each stakeholder’s power and interest. Furthermore it can be very important that those with the weakest voice – i.e. with little power, but maybe high interest - are heard. It is often the role of the planning authority to ensure that these interests are considered in the planning process. A way to deal with differences in power and interests is, as Barton (2010:53-4) does, to distinguishes in the process of participation three levels of potential involvement:

- Partners – who share the decision-making and accept responsibility for making things happen. Partnerships may involve formal contractual agreements and the dovetailing of investment programmes.
- Participants – who actively participate in the decision-making process, but are not prime movers. Participants are likely to be involved in consensus-building processes in the context of stakeholders forums, focus groups, citizens’ juries, etc.
- Consultees – who are formally asked for their views about current problems and possible solutions but do not engage in the collaborative forums (Barton et al., 2010:53-4).

In practice however, Van Hoek and Wigmans state, the creation of cooperation between actors or partnership is not always uncomplicated. Even though actors may realise that cooperation in light of such opportunities and threats is a prerequisite for favourable urban development and economic growth, this is no guarantee that such cooperation will always be clear-cut (van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:71). There will always be private interests and goals of stakeholders, besides joint and mutual interests. These interests are very important and can hamper the process of cooperation. In the development process it is crucial to show that also these private interests can be met, although maybe in a different way than initially thought. It is furthermore questionable if stakeholder groups will see by themselves the mutual dependency and interests and with that the reasons to form coalitions. If this is not the case, and formation of coalitions is desirable, one of the stakeholders or an external party should take the initiative, which is not necessarily obvious.

5.2 Vision

Defining a shared vision is stated to be the first step in collaborative urban planning (Barton et al., 2010:47). A sound vision of the development of an urban region as well as plans to solve urban problems should be convincing enough to gain broad support. In other words: potential partners must be willing to ‘buy into’ it (Barton et al., 2010:47). To that end, such a vision will have to be sufficient realistic and focus on the opportunities and problems of the urban region. Also, it must do justice to the interests and goals of all stakeholders in a balanced way. A sound vision forms the basis for formulating objectives and strategies. The vision can, once accepted as the common framework for decision-making, help to guide the relevant actors in their behaviour (van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:60).

A potential threat in urban management is that the shared vision is of little substance or too general, due to the need for compromises. This makes a vision less useful. It is important that a vision is seductive and that parties want to go along with it, but at the same time it must give a clear sketch of the aims, scope and hoped-for outcome, as well as the way the project will be managed and the collaborative and consultative process (Barton et al., 2010:47), so that the vision actually implies something. It is also essential to realise that a shared vision is far from being the only requirement for a streamlined process. Further steps regarding commitment, process management and a sound development approach, are equally important.

5.3 Commitment and support

Besides coalitions between stakeholders and a shared vision, Barton argues that explicit (political) commitment at the highest level to the principles and strategies of a project is essential. Effective collaboration depends on shared ownership and consistency of purpose (Barton et al., 2010:57). Leadership is closely related to this issue. Van den Berg states: “every party, programme and project needs a leading actor to initiate, continue and complete it”. The assumption is that the leadership of key actors contributes substantially to the successful design, development and implementation of projects. “Leadership is a necessity, be it by way of specific competencies (the position in the administrative hierarchy, financial capabilities, specific know-how or other powers) or the charisma of public or private individuals who successfully drive the project forward” (Van den Berg et al. cited in van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:60).
Van den Berg states that furthermore political support is a prerequisite for successful urban management, since political relations and financial pre-conditions are decisive for the initiation and implementation of new policies (Van den Berg et al. cited in van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:60). Societal support is also essential. Lack of support from those directly affected (local population, business society, interest groups) may limit the chances of successful implementation (Van den Berg et al. cited in van Hoek and Wigmans, 2011:60).

Barton (2010:65) states that the real problem is not necessarily finding win-win-win policies, as in implementing them with sufficient coherence and dynamism to make them work. That coherence and dynamism will only happen if a common philosophy is accepted by the key interests involved: i.e., explicit political commitment at the highest level to the principles and strategies of the project (Barton et al., 2010:57) and willingness to work together to achieve them (Barton et al., 2010:65). Urban area development needs a commitment from the main stakeholders for a long period of time. This can be difficult due to personal and political changes in the organisations. Essential for the success of a development is stated commitment for the period of the project.

5.4 Process management

The complex and uncertain character of urban area development, which involves many different actors and disciplines calls for direction at different levels, from strategic to operational. Process management can be a valuable methodology for this. The art of process management is making a conscious effort to balance the context, to take action and where relevant to connect and integrate the three different tracks: process (decision-making and procedures), content (programme, concept and costs and benefits) and communication (support, trust, transparency). The task of a process manager in the urban area development is to organise, connect and direct these tracks and make a link between the strategic level of decision-making and the level of detailed implementation (figure 5.2). It seeks to provide a conceptual framework for tackling issues that are difficult to direct. This means dealing with uncertainty (Franzen, 2011:128-9).

The establishment of a new organisational structure to manage change in the form of formal partnerships or a community development trust can help break down barriers (Barton et al., 2010:57). This entity must be a professional project organisation, independent from the separate stakeholders involved, with enough mandate to act adequately. It can bring the different stakeholder groups together, help to form a common vision and guide and facilitate the development process.

This process organisation can take different shapes as public-private co-operation projects pass through various stages in the development process: the initiatory, feasibility, realisation and exploitation and management phase. The model of cooperation is dependent on the land position and desired risk distribution between parties. Three main types of cooperation models can be distinguished:

- The public land development: the traditional or building claim model.
- The public-private land development: the joint venture under legal entity or agreement.
- The private land development: the concession or the development agreement (Wolting, 2006).
In a situation where only a few players have relatively large properties, the traditional model fits. Market parties sell their land and buildings to the municipality on condition that they are entitled to develop a portion of the development volume (building claim). Under these agreements, the municipality takes over land and buildings. It develops the land and sells plots back to the developers, who will build within the framework of the urban plan. In urban renewal, this form is not infrequently used, because land possession is often fragmented.

In complex urban transformation projects, the local authority and private parties agree to perform a joint land development. All parties contribute to the risk in a joint venture. Examples of such joint ventures are a joint exploitation company, urban development corporations and local development companies.

Land development agreement is the simplest form of cooperation. Especially in small scale projects it can be very suitable. In this model market players develop within the existing property boundaries. In the development agreement the municipality and the developer(s) make agreements on the coverage of costs that the municipality has to make to adjust the public space to the new situation.

It is also possible that the cooperating parties choose for a PPP concession model. In that case a private party takes care for the integral development of a plan. The municipality shifts the risks to the private party and shall therefore also not gain any profits. After completion, the municipality buys the new public space again. The municipality has in this situation little or no control during the development.

5.5 Development approach

Besides creating coalitions between stakeholders, defining a shared vision and setting up a process management framework, an approach to the development process must be defined. This implies setting out the framework of how problems and interests in the area will be tackled. Three different approaches in seeking to influence the design and implementation of the development are described by Carmona (Carmona et al., 2010:298): the process of ‘guidance’, ‘incentive’ and ‘control’.

Guidance equates to the ‘positive’ encouraging of appropriate development by producing a range of plans and guides. These will have more or less authority depending on the statutory powers under which they are prepared. They range from simple ‘information’ tools to ‘establishment, allocation and enforcement’ devices guiding the distribution and redistribution of land uses. Ultimately, however, it will typically be for landowners to determine whether they wish to develop or not. The power to make positive proposals is thus limited by it typically being the private sector that has access to resources (Carmona et al., 2010:298).

Incentives processes, by contrast, equate to more proactive processes of enabling development that is in the public interest, through actively contributing public sector land or resources to the development process, or otherwise making the prospect of development more attractive to landowners, perhaps by providing public amenities or development bonuses, altering land allocations or providing a high-quality public realm (Carmona et al., 2010:298).

Control processes give public authorities the power over the development process through the ‘negative’ ability to refuse development. If guidance and incentive fail, then control offers the ultimate sanction for local government to ensure the public interest is being met via a series of overlapping regulatory regimes (Carmona et al., 2010:298).

Punter (cited in Carmona et al., 2010:298) argues that the traditional view of design has been a static one of an ‘end-product’ – a particular piece of built urban form – rather than a dynamic one of a process – a creative problem solving process – through which development is produced. The first view on planning is mostly translated in ‘blueprint’ master planning, whereas the latter, the dynamic process can be translated into design strategies and frameworks.

Design strategies generally provide a spatial design vision for a large area such as a town or city centre. They are conceptual and flexible in nature and focus on establishing
and coordinating the potential of key sites and infrastructure projects within an area to realise a wider design-based vision. Design frameworks are used to guide developments on large sites, by coordinating key design features and by setting out a spatial framework for infrastructure, urban structure, development parcels, landscape and the distribution of land uses. They are often used instead of a masterplan where greater flexibility is required for sites that will be built-out over considerable periods of time (Carmona et al., 2010:314). It indicates strategic lay-out principles of a scheme prior to the detailed design of buildings and spaces (Barton et al., 2010:70). While a blueprint masterplan specifies a single intended outcome, framework masterplans generally set out broad urban design aspirations and principles, providing scope for interpretation and development within the framework’s parameters and being flexible in design solutions, to be able to respond to changes. The final outcome is typically multi-authored (figure x.3) (Carmona et al., 2010:315). It furthermore does provide (degrees of) certainty for all parties (investors, developers, occupiers and the local communities) and co-ordination to ensure that the component parts contribute to a greater whole (Carmona et al., 2010:316).

### 5.6 Financial management

A precondition for the realisation of an area development project is that the project has to be viable, i.e. whether the project can be met at a desired rate of profit. For private sector developments, assessment of project viability includes analysis for the market for the proposed development and the potential returns in relation to development costs and risk. In the public sector, it assesses whether appropriate forms of cost recovery are available, whether the development constitutes an appropriate use for public money and whether it provides value for money (Carmona et al., 2010:273).

Several methods of development appraisal exists, but in simple terms, appraisals consider four related factors:

- Development revenues, i.e. end or expected value of development
- Land acquisition costs
- Production costs, e.g. building costs, fees, costs for borrowing, funds and contingencies
- Developer’s profit or required level of profit (Carmona et al., 2010:273).

The latter is important because, if the developer cannot achieve the desired level of profit, other sites and developments may be more attractive or the developer may pursue alternative investment opportunities (Carmona et al., 2010:273). Particularly in the complex environment of urban management where the government often does not have the power neither the resources to act on its own, private parties and with that market forces are essential to follow in the development approach. For a development to be viable, its expected value must be greater (at least, to the extent of the developer’s required profit) than the production and land acquisition costs, with adequate safeguards against risks (Hummels and de Clerck, 2011, Carmona et al., 2010).

Viability studies may highlight the need for design modifications to, for example, increase the land uses likely to produce most revenue (Carmona et al., 2010:273). There are several ways to influence the viability of a project, amongst others:

- Programmatically: by modifying the programme, for example by altering the balance between rental or social sector homes, or by changing the balance between commercial real estate and housing.
- Cost-quality ratio: it is important that the level of quality sought (and therefore the potential for income) is compatible with the costs.
- Timetable and phasing: by structuring the timetabling and phasing in such a way that the income is generated as early as possible in the process and cost deferred for as long in the process, it is possible to positively influence the viability during the planning period and make it easier to assess the risk profile (Hummels and de Clerck, 2011:188).

A continuous tuning between the urban design and viability study is necessary to guarantee a viable project with urban design quality. Besides that the timing of starting the discussion about viability between the different stakeholders is crucial. Commencing too early with observations about the financial viability of a project can be disastrous for coalitions forming and vision building, whereas commencing too late can result in a beautiful urban design over which all parties agree which has no realism concerning the viability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blueprint</th>
<th>Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A complete or total design</td>
<td>Codes/rules/principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterministic</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design everything</td>
<td>Design enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– ‘the city to the spoon’</td>
<td>– ‘what matters’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single outcome</td>
<td>Range of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single author</td>
<td>Multiple authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single built (to completion)</td>
<td>Continuous build-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct design/</td>
<td>Indirect design/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first-order design</td>
<td>second-order design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial diversity</td>
<td>Authentic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted dialogue</td>
<td>Open conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Blueprint and frameworks. Source: Carmona et al., 2010.
5.7 Guiding principles

This chapter shows that urban management processes are complex and involve many different stakeholders, disciplines and scale levels. It is difficult to give clear guidelines of how to design a successful urban development process. However, several authors stress the importance of the same elements which will not immediately guarantee success if implemented, but without which it is certainly difficult to organise a successful development process. It concerns the following elements:

- **Coalitions** – No single party has the power nor the resources to drive sustainable development. Mutual dependence makes the formation of coalitions between stakeholders necessary.
- **Vision** – A sound shared vision can gain broad support and forms the basis of collaborative urban planning.
- **Commitment** – Explicit (political) and long-term commitment and leadership at the highest level to the principles and strategies of a project is essential.
- **Independent process management** – An independent organisation sufficient mandate can break down barriers and guide the process of development.
- **Flexibility** – The development approach must be flexible to be able to respond to changes.
- **Feasible business case** – The development must be in line with market forces and make a feasible business case.
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6. Urban analysis

In this chapter the functional and spatial structure of the European quarter is studied to get an impression of the current situation regarding the urban environment. This is done on the basis of the five elements defined in the theoretical study that contributes to successful urban places: density, mixed-use, human scale, public space and accessibility. These elements serve as guiding principles for the analysis and makes it possible to compare the existing situation in the European quarter with theoretical principles of successful urban places and to define the qualities and shortcomings of the district. The elements are examined one by one, after which will be concluded in the end of the chapter with an assignment: the tasks to fulfil to improve the urban quality of the area.

6.1 Density
As described in the theoretical study in chapter 4, according to Montgomery and Jacobs relatively high densities of people are essential for generating enough diversity and with that achieving urbanity (Montgomery, 1998:103, Jacobs, 1961). One can see that in the European quarter there is a high floors space index (FSI), high average height of building in comparison to the average in Brussels (figure 6.1). Though this density is almost only build up from office space, as 94% of the floor area in the quarter is not used for accommodation and there is the highest office density (2.5 million m²/km²) of Brussels, 25 times as much as the average (figure 6.2-6.3). The population density is only 1840 inhabitants per km², whereas the average in Brussels lays on 8460 inhabitants per km² (figure 6.5).

The European quarter has a high density in sense of m²/km² and FSI, but a very low density when it comes to population and other functions than offices. During office hours there are many people in the district, outside offices hours there are almost none.
6.2 Mixed-use and diversity

According to Montgomery and Jacobs vital urban areas must serve more than one primary purpose, preferably more than two (Jacobs, 1961; Montgomery 1998). Looking at the distribution of functions in the European quarter, one can see that there are almost only offices (figure 6.6-6.11). At a very few points there are public amenities such as museums, religious buildings and schools. Also on very few locations there is a shop or restaurant at the ground floor, most of the time the buildings are totally occupied with offices. Dwellings can be found at the borders of the district, where also more other functions are located (figure 6.12).

Result of this distribution of functions is that there is hardly any activity outside office hours. Even the few shops and restaurants are only open during office hours, which results in a desolated district after 6 pm and in weekends.

Extremely one-sided distribution of functions (offices, offices, offices) which results in a desolated district after 6pm and in weekends.
Figure 6.12 Overview of functions in the European quarter.
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6.3 Human scale

Jacobs and Appleyard argue that for a good human scale there must be many separate, distinct buildings with complex arrangements and relationships, as opposed to a few, large buildings (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987). Looking at the morphological structure of the European quarter one can clearly recognize the grid structure which dates from the foundation of the district in 1830 (figure 6.13-6.14). Though what is even more notable are the three main offices from the European Commission, Council and Parliament. These buildings are a rough interruption in the grid and have a total different scale and typology. It is further remarkable that in the grid structure many axis do not run through, but end in a building. One can see that clearly in the Rue de la Loi, where many side streets end. This negatively influences the permeability in the district (figure 6.15).

The size of the blocks in the grid structure in the district is varying from 60 by 60 meters at the smallest to 170 by 240 at largest. This corresponds to average blocks sizes in Brussels, from example north of the European quarter (figure 6.16). However, the filling-in of the blocks is very different. In the European quarter the blocks contain on average 10-15 buildings, whereas the blocks north of the district contain 30-60 buildings (figure 6.17). This makes a big difference in the experience of the sizes of the blocks. Small, many separate buildings give more a feeling of a human scale. Besides that, the contrasts in the neighbourhood are sometimes enormous, especially between the large buildings of the European institutions and adjoining residential blocks (figure 6.28-29). The dimensions of the main buildings of the European institutions is way larger than the adjacent buildings. Especially the head quarters of the European Commission, the Council and the Parliament are enormous blocks. Furthermore these blocks are closed off for the public to guarantee safety for the people who work in the buildings. This fortification of buildings has been disastrous for its surroundings, as it prevents interaction from the people on the street and the building and large parts of the district are inaccessible for the inhabitants and visitors.

Montgomery states that the successful street will have users on it fairly continuously, watching and being watched. To stimulate more activity and natural surveillance, active frontages must be present (Montgomery, 1998:109). In the European quarter this is the total other way around. At most ground floors there is no activity, except for an entrance to an office building. With that facades are very often closed off by advertisements (often in buildings of the European institutions) or mirrored glazing. This makes the facades double dead.
Morphological characteristics

Figure 6.14 Grid structure in the European quarter as opposed to more organical structures in the surrounding neighbourhoods.

Figure 6.15 Permeability.

Figure 6.16 Block size in the European quarter and north of the district.

Figure 6.17 Filling-in of blocks in the European quarter and north of the district.

Figure 6.18 Fine grain structure north of European quarter and coarse grain structure in European quarter.
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Figure 6.19-21 European Council (Justus Lipsius building).

Figure 6.22-24 European Commission (Berlaymont building).

Figure 6.25-27 European Parliament.

Strong contrasts

Figure 6.28 Strong contrasts.

Figure 6.29 Strong contrasts.
Double dead facades

The three main buildings of the European institutions are aliens in open space in great contrasts to its surroundings. The fortification of these buildings is disastrous for public live in its surroundings. The block size in the rest of the quarter is not too large, but the filling-in is large scale. Many facades in the quarter double dead: no function and closed off.
6.4 Public space

The public realm in a city performs many functions, not only by providing meeting places but also in helping to define the built environment, offering spaces for local traditions and representing meaning and identity (Gehl, 1995 cited in Montgomery, 1998: 109). Roughly there can be two levels of public space distinguished, the street level and the level of squares and green spaces. Figure 6.36 is a Nolli map of the European quarter, showing all space accessible to the public both outside as inside buildings. A church for example is a building that is accessible for all and therefore it is coloured white in a Nolli map.

From the Nolli map and the map below showing all public spaces (figure 6.38), one can see that there are some large green spaces at the borders of the district. In the quarter itself there are not so much public spaces, but more important the public space is often not well used because there are not so much public facilities around it, only offices (see examples on the next page).

At street level one can conclude that there is not so much public space, as the sidewalks are very small and must be shared by pedestrians and cyclists. Most of the buildings and facades are closed off for the public, which explains the black areas in the map. A mid-scale public space is lacking, especially along the main axis, where people can meet and interact.
Below a few examples of public space in the neighbourhood and their characteristics are discussed: square Frere Orban, Jardin de la Vallee and the public space in front of European Parliament.

**Square Frere Orban**
- Central located public space
- One public function on the square, rest is offices
- Well arranged with many seats
- Is well used on nice working days during lunch, but rarely outside office hours.

**Jardin de la Vallee**
- Central located public space
- Not easy accessible, closed off by a fence
- Surrounded by offices and roads
- Is not well used, not even during working hours. It is sometimes entirely closed.

**European Parliament**
- Very large public space
- Public space runs from nowhere to nowhere
- Ends in a very busy road
- No public functions, only offices
- Only one entrance to the building
- Hardly used during working hours, not in evenings and weekends

There are some beautiful public spaces at the borders of the European quarter, but in the district itself there is a lack of public space at street level and mid-scale public space. The existing public spaces are not well used, because there are no functions located and the spaces are not well connected to the surroundings. The many closed off buildings to the public do not contribute either to vibrant public spaces.
6.5 Accessibility

The European quarter has a strategic location in Brussels just outside the city centre on important infrastructural axes. The Rue de la Loi is a main axis city inwards, the Rue Belliard out of the city, connecting the inner and outer ring. These two axis, four to six lanes wide, are very pressured and perceived as an urban barrier. In rush hour, they process high traffic volumes. Between 3000 and 4000 private vehicles per hour run through these quite narrow streets, of which 70% is transit traffic. This causes a lot of inconvenience. The European Quarter is the most polluted area of the Brussels-Capital Region, both in terms of noise nuisance as well as air pollution (figure 6.49).

There run two main public transport systems through the area. There is a train connection with a station at Place Luxembourg (next to the European Parliament) and at Schuman, connecting to the north station. There is currently a new line under construction which connect Schuman to the international airport Zaventem. The metro network concentrates at the northern part of the district and runs along the Rue de la Loi.

Large parts of the European quarter are very unpleasant for pedestrians and cyclists. The Rue de la Loi and the Rue Belliard form enormous barriers, with their four to six always busy traffic lanes. The public space for pedestrians is negligible and must even be shared with cyclists on the Rue de la Loi (figure 6.60). On the Rue Belliard there is no possibility to cycle (figure 6.61).

Figure 6.56 gives a schematic overview of the flows of people in the area. The main points of origin are public transport stops, the parking garage under the Rue de la Loi and the parking garages in the office building. The main destinations in the area are the buildings of the European institutions and the other offices. These origins and destinations result in little flows of people. People coming from the parking garages do not even have to cross the street, as the often can go directly into their office building. Only the people coming from the public transport are moving through the streets. This distance is often short, which causes minimal flows of people and with that minimal life on the streets.
Road structure

Figure 6.52 The main road structure.

Figure 6.53 Proportion transit and local traffic.

Public transport

Figure 6.54 Train line and stations, and new train line and stations under construction.

Figure 6.55 Metro line and stations, and potential new metro lines.

Flows of people

Figure 6.56 Schematic overview of main points of origin and main destinations and the flows of people in between.

Figure 6.57 Section of the Rue de la Loi with underground parking and metro with direct connection to the buildings.
Barriers

The two main infrastructural axes are very pressured and put a high demand, inconvenience and pollution on the area. The public transport is concentrated on one axis not centrally in the district and is also very pressured. The accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists is bad: there are huge barriers and there is no decent place for the soft modes of transport in the public realm. The flows of people in the area is limited, because a large part of this movement takes place underground.
6.6 Assignment

Summarizing, the urban analysis shows the following largest issues in the area:

**Desolated**
The very low population density and extremely one-sided distribution of functions result in a desolated district after 6 pm and in weekends.

**Disconnected**
The accessibility is bad, roads are stuck, public transport is pressured and there are huge barriers and no decent place for the soft modes of transport in the public realm. Besides the district forms a disconnected island in its surroundings.

**Quality of place?**
The two main infrastructural axes are very pressured and put a high demand, inconvenience and pollution on the area. There is a lack of public space at street level and mid-scale public space and existing public spaces are not well used.

**Integration?**
The three main buildings of the European institutions are aliens in open space in great contrasts to its surroundings. This fortification is disastrous for public live in its surroundings.
7. Stakeholder analysis

7.1 Introduction

Different parties have interests in and influence on the European quarter in Brussels. The main stakeholders can roughly be separated in four groups:

1. the authorities of the Brussels-Capital Region and municipalities;
2. the citizens of Brussels;
3. the owner-users, such as the European institutions;
4. the private parties, such as real estate owners, developers and investors.

A fifth group can be defined as the remaining stakeholders. There are many other (smaller) parties involved, amongst which are businesses and organisations in the European quarter, research institutes and pressure and lobby groups, but also tourists and European citizens. The stakeholder groups perceive specific problems in the neighbourhood and have their own interests in the development process. They all have - each group in a different way - influence via their (spatial) demand on the spatial structure of the district. Vice versa there is an influence of the spatial structure on these stakeholder groups (figure 7.1).

The stakeholder groups can be subdivided in several sub-stakeholder groups. The European institutions can for example be split in the European Commission, the European Parliament, the European Council and the citizens in the neighbourhood committees of the European quarter and other citizens of Brussels (figure 7.2). The stakeholder groups can furthermore be divided in much more and specific groups, for example by dividing the (sub) stakeholder groups in different segments, such as policy makers, controllers, technical managers and users, focusing respectively on strategy, financial, technical and functional matters. However, this study will look at the stakeholder (sub)groups as a whole as it will give a rough, but good overview of the interests and power division in the district and a feeling for the situation.

The stakeholder groups and the process is studied in two different ways, by a document study and interviews. In this chapter first the stakeholder groups will be introduced after which the document study is discussed. Subsequently the set-up and results of the interviews will be handled. The chapter will conclude with a reflection on those two studies and an overview of the results and conclusion.
7.2 Stakeholder groups

This section gives an overview of the stakeholder groups that are studied in the document study and interviews.

Authorities

- Brussels-Capital Region
  The Brussels-Capital Region is one of the three regions of Belgium, alongside the Flemish Region and the Walloon Region. The Brussels-Capital Region has jurisdiction over the territory made up of the 19 communes of Brussels totalling more than one million inhabitants. It is run by two authorities: the Parliament and the Government of the Brussels-Capital Region. These authorities are responsible for defining the policies to be adopted in the context of the Region’s areas of competence, including town and country planning (planning, urban planning, urban renovation, land use policy, protection of monuments and sites).

- Municipality of Brussels
  The municipality of Brussels is one of the nineteen communes and has almost 150,000 inhabitants. It is governed by a mayor and ten alderman. The municipality of Brussels has also some competences on the field of town planning, among which formulating the Local Development Plans (PCD, GemOP) and Local Land Use Plans.

European institutions

The European Union (EU) is an economic and political union of 27 member states in Europe. Within the European Union there are three main organisations:

- Council of Ministers of the European Union
- European Parliament
- European Commission

The Council is the EU’s main decision-making body. It represents the member states, and its meetings are attended by one minister from each of the EU’s national governments. The European Council defines the general political directions and priorities of the European Union (European Union, 2007).

The European Parliament (EP) is elected by the citizens of the European Union to represent their interest and shares legislative and budgetary power with the Council of the European Union. It has three places of work: Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg (France). Luxembourg is home to the administrative offices (the ‘General Secretariat’), while meetings of the whole Parliament, known as ‘plenary sessions’, take place in Strasbourg and sometimes in Brussels (European Union, 2007).

The European Commission is independent of national governments. Its job is to represent and uphold the interests of the EU as a whole. It drafts proposals for new European laws, which it presents to the European Parliament (EP) and the Council. It is also the EU’s executive arm and with that responsible for implementing the decisions of Parliament and the Council. The seat of the Commission is in Brussels, but it also has offices in Luxembourg, representations in all EU countries and delegations in many capital cities around the world (European Union, 2007).

These three organizations within the EU have their own needs and interests concerning their real estate and physical environment. They therefore all have their own mission and real estate strategy. Only the European Commission has published this strategy.

Citizens

- Neighbourhood committees
  The citizens in the European quarter are organized in two neighbourhood committees, the neighbourhood committee of the Northeast quarter, GAQ (“groupe d’animation du Quartier Nord-Est”) and The Leopold quarter Association (L’Association du Quartier Leopold, AQL). The GAQ is a group of volunteers with no political affiliation, but who are involved and concerned residents of the quarter. They have no fixed office and are financed solely through contributions from residents (Group d’Animation du Quartier européen de la ville Bruxelles, 2010:1). They are involved in the whole area east of the historical centre (Group d’Animation du Quartier européen de la ville Bruxelles, 2010:1). The AQL aims at defending the interests of residents and businesses in the European quarter. They especially want to promote the quality of urban life, the renovation of housing and mixed blocks, development of urban services and public facilities (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1). The GAQ and AQL bring together residents - ‘convinced Europeans’- to fight the degradation of their environment, and to promote the quality of the heritage, environment and life in general in the European quarter (Quartier Européen, 2010b:1).

- Other citizens
  The interests of citizens who do not live in The European quarter are not organized as a stakeholder group. One could say that their interests are looked after by the authorities, although there could also be contradictory interests. There are no documents studied from ‘general’ citizens, however some interests groups are interviewed (section 7.5).
Private parties
The group of private parties consists of roughly three subgroups: investors, developers and agencies. They are not untied at the level of the European quarter or on the city as a whole. They neither have published their opinion or interest about the European quarter, so this group is not included in the document study. In the interviews the private parties get largely the chance to find out their interests and position in the process.

7.3 Document study
This section discusses the problems and interests of the stakeholders which are published in public documents, such as policy documents, ambition statements, websites etc. For three (parts) of the main stakeholders groups this information is available: the authorities (the Brussels-Capital Region), the European institutions (mainly the European Commission) and the citizens (neighbourhood committees). For the fourth stakeholder group - the real estate owners, developers and investors in the area - no specific public documents about their perceived problems and interests is found, as stated earlier.

In the following sections the problems and interests for each stakeholder group that are published will be discussed. Furthermore the studied documents are described, including their authors and purposes, so that their use and influence are recognizable.

Each section is composed of a short introduction to the stakeholder group, the studied documents, their main interests, perceived problems and the ambitions that this stakeholder has concerning the development of the European quarter. The described problems and interests are deducted from the policy documents. The problems and ambitions are not listed in order of priority, because in the documents no distinction in priority was given. Afterwards the perceived problems and ambitions are compared in a diagram to draw certain conclusions. There the authors interpretation comes into play again. It concludes with remarks concerning the value of this information. The overall section finishes some concluding remarks on the findings of the document study.

7.3.1 Authorities - Brussels-Capital Region
Policy documents
The Brussels-Capital Region and other local authorities have published two important documents on the European quarter. The first document is an agreement between the Federal State, the Brussels-Capital Region, the city of Brussels and the municipalities of Elsene and Etterbeek, concerning the Leopold-Schuman quarter made in 2006. This agreement aimed at coordinating the actions of public authorities in the Leopold-Schuman quarter for a harmonious development of the quarter (Federale Overheidsdienst, 2006). It commits the different parties within their respective powers to realize the measures which anticipates the development of the quarter (Federale Overheidsdienst, 2006).

The second document is the master plan for the European quarter (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008). This plan has been coordinated by the Brussels-Capital Region. It shows a vision on the development of the European quarter, both for the near future as for the middle and long term. The master plan connects to the of the agreement introduced before. The government of the Brussels-Capital Region has ratified the master plan on 24 April 2008 (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:2).

Besides these two policy documents a third document is studied. This is a communication document published March 2010 which is called ‘Urban project Loi, An urban design for the rue de la Loi and its surroundings’. It is written for the people of Brussels, Europeans, local residents and those who work in the Leopold district by Marie-Laure Roggemans, representative of the Brussels-Capital Region for the development of the Leopold quarter (Brussels Info Place, 2010).

Interest
For the local authorities the Leopold quarter plays an essential role in the international and capital position of Brussels (Federale Overheidsdienst, 2006). They state the district offers a number of distinct collective urban benefits related to the presence of the European institutions, making the district a privileged place for international actors to establish themselves. They therefore stress the continued importance of agglomeration of related economic systems, and particularly that of the European quarter (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:2).
Perceived problems
The Brussels-Capital Region does not provide a general overview of what they perceive as problems in the Leopold quarter in their policy documents, though one can read clear stated problems between the lines. These described problems can be divided in three main themes:

- Liveability
The Brussels-Capital Regions states that the liveability must be restored to the heart the European district (Brussels Info Place, 2010:12), i.e. there is now a lack of liveability.

- Monofunctional and deteriorated office area
‘The time has come to take a completely new look at a mono-functional and much deteriorated office area which is dominated by road traffic’ (Brussels Info Place, 2010:24).

- Pollution and dominance of road traffic
‘Today, the European quarter is the most polluted area of the Brussels-Capital Region, both in terms of noise nuisance from the busy transit traffic through the neighbourhood, as well as air pollution (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:8).

Ambition
The ambition for the development of the Leopold quarter is stated much clearer in the policy documents. One can divide these objectives in overall ambitions for the quarter and specific ambitions.

The overall ambition of the Brussels-Capital Region is to embed the international actors spatially in the urban fabric of Brussels, to protect and increase the attractiveness and the image of the Leopold quarter and to improve the everyday living comfort (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:2). They state that the Rue de la Loi must be a showcase of the presence and integration of the European institutions in Brussels, but also of a sustainable city of the twenty-first century (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:8).

More specific, the ambition is to make the district:

- A mixed and lively area
The neighbourhood must present a mix of functions (Brussels Info Place, 2010:12) to be created between the offices connected to the European and international institutions, which predominate today. The residential functions should reclaim its position and the cultural and recreational function should be accessible for all (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:2). Furthermore the Region states that the district must be a rapidly growing residential pole (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:2).

- An eco-district
The master plan made by the Region aims to transform the European district into a pilot European eco-district (Brussels Info Place, 2010:12). The needs of the environment will be served by efforts to create a ‘zero carbon’ European district. A zero carbon district is one which minimises its energy consumption by applying the ‘passive standard’ criterion using renewable energy to meet its remaining energy requirements (Brussels Info Place, 2010:20). To achieve this the Region has stated that motorized traffic must be reduced (Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, 2008:8) and the environmental performance of the new buildings must be raised (Brussels Info Place, 2010:12).

- A district with sustainable transportation
The Region states that they want to improve the accessibility by managing (motorized) mobility and improving the efficiency of public transport (Federale Overheidsdienst, 2006). To achieve this, motorized traffic should be lowered while simultaneously traffic speeds by means of specialization of the main urban roads. Main public spaces must be redeveloped, designed to improve pedestrian and cyclist flows (Federale Overheidsdienst, 2006).

- Improve the urban character
The Region states that they want to improve the urban character and urbanity of the district. Therefore they aim at identifying a project uniting high density, urban composition, integration in the neighbouring districts, high environmental quality and user-friendly public spaces (Brussels Info Place, 2010:24). This should be achieved by:
- recognition of the urban fabric of the traditional city and its public spaces;
- improving the quality and accessibility of public spaces;
- conserving and finding new uses for the architectural heritage;
- raising the architectural quality of the new buildings (Brussels Info Place, 2010:12).
• A cultural and recreational centre appealing and accessible to all

According to the Region the cultural and tourist appeal of the European quarter must be improved and the symbolic European buildings must have better accessibility for visitors to the area (Federale Overheidsdienst, 2006).

Concluding remarks
By comparing the perceived problems of the Brussels-Capital Region with the ambitions, one can see that all ambitions correspond to one or more of the problems, except for one (figure 7.3). This is the ambition to make the European quarter the main centre of European and international employment in the Region. This is an independent ambition and can be a potential discrepancy with the others.

This section presented an overview of the problems and interests of the Brussels-Capital Region as one of the local authorities. No documents of other authorities are studied, as they were not available, except for the agreement between the Federal State, the Brussels-Capital Region, the city of Brussels and the municipalities of Elsene and Etterbeek. In the interviews section the position of the municipalities is examined further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Ambitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The main center of European and international employment in the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monofunctional and deteriorated office area</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution and dominance of road traffic</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.3 Diagram comparing problems and ambitions of the Brussels-Capital Region.
7.3.2 European institutions

Policy documents
The policy documents concerning building policy in the European quarter as written by the European institutions are all originating from the European Commission. From the three institutions, this is also the largest occupier of real estate in Brussels (European Commission 800,000m², Council of the European Union 220,000m² and European Parliament 320,000m² (Brussels Info Place, 2010:13)).

Four official policy documents have been studied originating from the period 2003-2009. Two of them are a communication from the Commission on policy for the accommodation of commission services in Brussels (and Luxembourg), written in 2003 and 2007. These are succeeding documents, with only few changes. The third one is also an official communication from the Commission, though this time a guide to the Commission’s architectural policy written in 2009. The last document is a memo from the Commission on its buildings policy in Brussels from 2009. This can be seen as an addition to the policy documents from 2003 and 2007.

Interest and strategy
The Commission highlights the three following overall objectives concerning their accommodation strategy:
• the rational installation of services and better working conditions for staff (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:2);
• the intensification of acquisition policy (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:3).
• reflecting the impact of the Commission’s buildings policy on the urban environment of Brussels, through the intensification of the dialogue with the Belgian authorities (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:2).

Furthermore the Commission has stated that they want to maintain a strong symbolic presence in the European quarter, while at the same time decentralising some departments to sites outside the traditional hub by developing a single pole of between 100,000 and 250,000 square metres or, alternatively, up to three poles of at least 100,000 square metres each (Commission of the European Communities, 2009:2). Whilst they state that this approach has some drawbacks (additional travelling between sites, geographical dispersal of staff and additional costs caused by the need to foresee social infrastructure), it will also give significant advantages: it will bring diversification which is needed in order to reduce upward pressure on the property market in the European quarter, by introducing a strong element of competition. Furthermore the host country authorities would welcome the ability to increase mixed land use in the European quarter (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:10-11).

Perceived problems
In their policy documents, the European institutions do not give a overview of what they perceive as problems in the Leopold quarter, though it is possible to read problems between the lines. These described problems can be divided in five main themes:

• Pressure on property prices
The Commission experiences that the concentration of buildings of the institutions within the restricted area of the European Quarter has a direct impact on rents and purchase prices. Several economic indicators point to rising pressure on prices in the European Quarter (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:4).

• Efficiency of buildings
The Commission states that the efficiency of buildings (notably in terms of the ratio of useable net space to overall m²) varies widely and is greatly limited by their small size in many cases. Directorate Generals (DG’s) are dispersed in several buildings and there can be a more efficient use of shared facilities (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:6).

• Poorly functioning town planning
As regard town planning, the Commission states that the architecture in the European quarter is of varying quality. The area is an enclave, which creates traffic problems. The monopoly of administrative and service activities has created an imbalance (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:3).

• Traffic problems
The Commission declares that it experiences deterioration of transport conditions in the Brussels area, of which the immediate effects are an increase in traffic congestion and pollution (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:8).

• Security and safety
The Commission declares that it experiences recurrent problems such as insecurity in streets that are deserted at certain times and a lack of access to local services (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:7).
**Ambition**

The ambition of the European Commission for the accommodation of their services and with that for the development of the European quarter is stated explicitly in the policy documents. These ambitions have been categorized per theme and are described below.

Overall the Commission states that it is in a unique position to create a significant and lasting improvement in the area of buildings policy to the benefit of the institution, its staff and the host countries (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:3).

More specifically, the ambitions are focused on:

- **Cost reduction**
  The Commission states their key objective is to ensure high value for money for its real estate portfolio (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:12). Two measures must be taken to achieve this. At first a limitation of buildings in the Leopold quarter, avoiding upward pressure on cost (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:5). Second, the quality of the buildings must be improved, hence increasing the value of its assets by selecting only buildings of high quality and high efficiency in strategic locations and in full comply with the budgetary constraints (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:12).

- **Efficiency**
  The ambition of the Commission is to rationalize the existing portfolio significantly by concentration of services into a smaller number of large buildings (in principle at least 50 000 – 100 000m² for each building or complex). The dispersion of DG’s in several buildings should be avoided. This will offer considerable potential for increased efficiency (more efficient use of space, shared facilities) without any negative impact on staff and with the possibility of creating economies of scale (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:6).

- **Comfortable working environment**
  The Commission states that in full compatibility with the budgetary constraints, appropriate consideration must be given to the physical environment in which the staff works by providing a pleasant, healthy and modern working environment that is attractive and motivating (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:13).

- **Integration into the urban environment and diversifying activities**
  The Commission states that its buildings should not be a blot on the landscape, but instead make a positive contribution to city life. They states that, as a key actor in the property market, it will set very high standards for its own development in an effort to improve the quality of the neighbourhood, to convey a positive image of Europe in the eyes of citizens and to ensure a modern and appropriate working environment for staff and visitors (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:12). Buildings should be integrated into the urban environment in which they are situated in a harmonious and coherent way. Particular care must be taken to ensure an appropriate urban mix between office, residential and commercial property, including the possibility of public space which facilitates cultural and social integration (Commission of the European Communities, 2009:4). They argue that developing housing and shops will recreate a sense of community allowing solutions to be found to recurrent problems such as insecurity in streets that are deserted at certain times and a lack of access to local services. The Commission in principle favours housing within the European quarter, on condition that the authorities responsible for granting planning permissions take steps to control property development in the area. As for commercial activities, the Commission encourages areas open to the public, in particular shops, on the ground floor of its buildings (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:5).

- **Image improvement**
  The Commission states that the image of the European quarter must be improved by improving town planning and endeavouring to increase the architectural quality of the buildings occupied by the Commission (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:5). Its aim is to give the European quarter a strong, positive symbolic image as the capital of Europe by making the buildings more beautiful and efficient, by integrating them more into their immediate surroundings in the heart of convivial areas of housing, shops, green spaces, etc. (Commission of the European Communities, 2009:3). The easy access for all members of the public must be ensured by a welcoming, open image of the buildings and by improving signposting in the Leopold quarter (Commission of the European Communities, 2003:7).

- **Security**
  With the significant rise in security incidents and attacks at both European and world level in recent years, the Commission states that it is aware of the need to ensure that its staff and assets are properly protected. To this end, effective, proportionate security measures, reflecting the threat assessments established for buildings and services will continue to be an integral part of the planning and operation of existing and new Commission sites (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:14).
• **Accessibility**
  The Commission states that its buildings must be easy accessible. This means access by modes of transport, either individual or collective, ease of access for all members of the public and access for people with disabilities.

• **Mobility**
  To fit in with the Commission’s mobility policy which is aimed at promoting and encouraging environmentally-friendly modes of transport (walking, cycling and public transport), the Commission state that its buildings must be quickly and easily accessible by public transport. Prospective buildings must be located near the Commission’s central buildings, the other European institutions and social infrastructure, and/or have easy access to them (Commission of the European Communities, 2009:4).

• **Sustainability**
  The Commission states that it wants to further reduce the institution’s carbon footprint by means of its buildings policy strategy: reduced emissions from buildings, the optimization of links with public transport and greater synergies in terms of buildings management. Therefore they declare that it is important that the Commission’s existing buildings continue to reduce their carbon footprint, and that new projects meet the highest environmental standards with the aim of being carbon neutral (Commission of the European Communities, 2007:15).

**Concluding remarks**
By comparing the perceived problems of the European institutions with the ambitions, one can see that they all correspond (figure 7.4). For all problems ambitions are named and vice versa. It becomes clear that the ambitions are better worked out and more into detail than the problems. What comes not forward in this scheme is that there could be some internal conflicts in the ambitions. This will be handle in a further stage.

This section presented an overview of the problems and interests of the European Commission as stated in its policy documents. It does not discuss the perspective of the other two organisations, the European Council and the European Parliament, which also have large amounts of real estate. This is because there are no public documents of these organisations concerning their accommodation strategy. In the section about the interviews (7.5) the position of the Council and Parliament are examined further.

---

**Figure 7.4 Diagram comparing problems and ambitions of the European institutions.**
7.3.3 Citizens

Documents
The citizens as a stakeholder group do not have official policy documents. The two neighbourhood committees have published their opinion on the European quarter on their websites (http://www.gaq.be and http://www.quartier-europeen.eu). This information is used to formulate their perceived problems and ambitions in the quarter.

Interest
For the citizens the main interest is to maintain the elements that improve the quality of life in the European quarter: emphasizing the primacy of housing for families above other uses, respect for zoning and environmental rules and regulations, promoting a sense of security, decentralization of services, management of public space, reduction of traffic speed, and small, local businesses (Group d’Animation du Quartier européen de la ville Bruxelles, 2010:1).

Perceived problems
The neighbourhood committees give a fairly good overview of what they perceive as problems in the Leopold quarter. These problems can be categorized in the following themes:

- Uncontrolled expansion of offices
- Illegal building activity
- Traffic and pollution
- Perception of insecurity
- Degradation of public and green spaces (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1)

Ambition
The ambition of the neighbourhood committees is stated in outlines on their websites. These ambitions have been categorized per theme and are described below:

- Improving the urban environment

The neighbourhood committee states that improving the urban environment is the key factor to increase the quality of life of urban residents, as well as the development strategy of the urban economy. There must be a focus on quality planning, maintenance of existing assets and the creation of interesting architecture (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Ambitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the urban environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the urban economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion rather than demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a truly European quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging soft mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of public and green space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrolled expansion of offices</td>
<td>Ambition corresponds to problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal building activity and parking</td>
<td>Ambition corresponds to problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing traffic volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of insecurity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degradation of public spaces and green spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Development of the urban economy
  There must be a comprehensive approach for the development of the urban economy, covering employment, facilities, urban services, housing, public and cultural sector (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1).

- Conversion rather than demolition
  In a context of sustainable development, buildings must rather be converted than demolished (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1).

- Creating a truly mixed European quarter
  The neighbourhood committee states that the Leopold quarter must consist of a truly mix of functions, satisfying cultural and recreational needs and focusing on the development of new public services at local and district level. It also aims at creating and maintaining a good housing quality with adequate size and affordable prices (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1).

- Encouraging soft mobility
  The neighbourhood committee wants to encourage soft mobility rather than the current omnipresent car use. There must be planning and effective regulation of traffic, focused on the incentive to use public transport (Quartier Européen, 2010a:1).

- Maintenance of public space and green space
  The green and public space in the Leopold quarter must be better maintained, including the courtyards within the blocks.

By comparing the perceived problems of the citizens with the ambitions, one can see that almost all correspond (figure 7.5). Only the ambition to convert rather than demolish is an isolated ambition, which does not answer to a stated problem.

This section gives an overview of the problems and interests perceived by the neighbourhood committees in the European quarter. It does not take into account other opinions of citizens in the quarter nor the opinion of citizens in Brussels who do not live in the Leopold quarter. In the interviews section the position of citizens and interest groups is examined further.
In table 7.6 and 7.7 the problems and ambitions of the different stakeholders are brought together. The filling-in of the diagram has been done based on the information from the policy documents. Some statements had to be estimated. The stakeholder group of the developers/investors is also added to give a more complete overview of the problems and interests in the district. Their statements are all estimations.

The table shows that the Brussels-Capital Region, the European Commission and the neighbourhood committees share some problems and ambitions, although perceived in different weight (see colours). There are three problems/ambitions that clearly stand apart from these shared problems/ambitions, that are only perceived by the European institutions, namely:
- Pressure on property prices
- Efficiency of buildings
- Security of buildings

### Figure 7.6 Perceived problems in the European quarter by different stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Livability</th>
<th>Monofunctional deteriorated office area</th>
<th>Pollution &amp; dominance of road traffic</th>
<th>Pressure on property prices</th>
<th>Efficiency of buildings</th>
<th>Security of buildings</th>
<th>Safety on streets</th>
<th>Degradation of public spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Figure 7.7 Ambitions for the development of the European quarter of different stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambitions</th>
<th>Improve image, increase attractiveness</th>
<th>Main center of European and international institutions</th>
<th>A mixed and lively area, diversifying activities</th>
<th>Eco district</th>
<th>Sustainable transportation</th>
<th>Improve urban character, urbanity</th>
<th>A cultural and social focal point, attractive to all</th>
<th>Efficient buildings</th>
<th>Cost reduction</th>
<th>Integration of offices in urban environment</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Security of buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
This section discusses the interviews with the representative of the stakeholder groups conducted from March till May 2011. It first handles the aim and set-up of the interviews, after which the results are presented in two parts, one part about the views on the urban environment and one part about the views on the process. The next section will reflect upon the interviews and discusses the conclusions.

**Aim**

The document study gives a good first impression of the perceived problems and interests by different stakeholders, however there are great limitations to this study. Only a few stakeholders have public documents on the European quarter, and no information of the private parties is available. Even if the documents are available, there are still many questions left regarding used definitions, priorities and possible opposing opinions within stakeholder groups.

To get answers to these questions and a better understanding of the development process in the European quarter interviews have been executed with representatives of the stakeholder groups. The aim of the interviews is more in detail to get to know the position and interest of the organisation and their view on the current situation in the European quarter, in a way ‘checking’ the statements in their policy documents (if they were available). Besides that the aim is to find out their view on the future situation of the district and on the process of development and transformation and the cooperation between the different parties. The last element is very important as it is hardly, if at all, discussed in the policy documents.

**Interviewees**

The interviews are conducted with several representatives of the stakeholder groups. In total 21 persons are interviewed in 16 sessions. From all stakeholder groups several representatives are approached and discussions have been taken place. Figure 7.8 gives an overview of the interviewed parties and appendix A presents further details on this.

**Structure of interviews**

The structure of the interviews is adjusted to the party that is interviewed, however the rough setup was every time the same. The interviews are composed of four sections:

1. Position of organisation and relation with other stakeholders
2. Interest in the European quarter, perceived problems and ambitions
3. View on future development
4. Process

In the first part the organisations are asked to describe their ‘experience’ with the European quarter, their role in the process and the collaboration between the main organisations/people involved in the project. The second part examines the interest of the party in the district, what they perceive as problems right now and what their ambitions are for the quarter. No questions were asked about the elements that are literally mentioned in the policy documents. It was in the contrary important what the interviewees mentioned themselves, to be able to make afterwards a good comparison with the statements in the policy documents.
The third part goes more into detail in the future development of the district and how the stakeholders groups would like to see the area over a few decades. This is executed by using cards which showed different urban futures, based upon the theoretical study. At first cards with the elements for successful urban places are showed to the interviewees (figure 7.9). They are asked to prioritize these elements on the basis of what they think are very important elements for future development of the quarter and which elements are not (so) important. While the interviewees are doing this, an explanation of the choices is asked for. By having a prioritization or grouping of the elements follow-up questions are asked. For example when an interviewee finds mixed-use development very important for the district, follow-up questions like; what kind of functions must be mixed (offices + housing, offices + shops, ...), at what scale level (neighbourhood, block or building level) and in what time span (office hours, 8.00-22.00 h or 24/7) are raised (figure 7.10). The cards structures the conversation about the future of the area and let people express themselves about their needs and wishes. Appendix A gives an overview of all the cards used for the interviews.

The last part examined the development process and the cooperation between the different parties. Questions were raised like: which developments went well or wrong, why did this went well or wrong and what role did the specific stakeholders played in this. Besides that it focused on the future developments, how the concerned stakeholder would like to see the development process, the actions of other parties in the process and their role, to get a better understanding of the bottlenecks and opportunities in the process. In appendix A the set-up of one of the interviews is presented.
7.5 Outcomes interviews

This section gives a description of the interviews held and their outcomes. It shows what the interviewees have said during the meetings, without reflection from the author. In the next section there will be reflected upon the outcomes of the interviews.

The section is divided into two parts. First, the opinions about the urban environment, the spatial and urban situation are discussed, i.e. how different stakeholder groups look at the quarter, what they perceive as problems and what ambitions they have for the development of the district. Second, there is the question of process: the position, power and responsibilities of the stakeholders, the way they cooperate and how they look at future development of the quarter.

7.5.1 Urban environment

The European quarter is not an attractive neighbourhood according to most of the stakeholders. The problems with mobility, the lack of conviviality and security issues are often expressed by the involved parties. It is said that although there is a great potential created by the presence of the European institutions, the outcome is miserable. However, there are not only negative voices. A private party sees the European quarter as a nice area and says that "it is just like a village " and “the integration of the European institutions in the city is a success” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011) and the real estate manager of the European Parliament observes that “it is an advantage to be in the middle of the city” and “a pleasure to work there for the employees”.

General ambition

The European quarter is of great importance for all stakeholders, although their interests and ambition for the district varies substantially. According to a representation of citizens the challenge is to make the European quarter an attractive district and to combine a metropolitan function with a normal city neighbourhood. Local and global interest must be able to exist next to each other and must be balanced. They argue that the local interests are the weakest link in this case and therefore must be supported (BRAL, 2011).

The Brussels-Capital Region has another view on the future of the area. They state that it is not a problem if the European quarter stays a kind of ‘special’ area with ‘special’ offices and housing, as long as it is a real quarter of the Region and it is open for visitors from all over Brussels (ADT-ATO, 2011). Citizens of Brussels must be attracted to visit the quarter. The cultural and tourist image of the European quarter must therefore be enhanced (ADT-ATO, 2011).

For the European institutions the European quarter is especially important to create a good basis for an efficient home for the institutions. For the European Commission the largest problem is now the efficiency and dispersion of its buildings (OIB-a, 2011) and the ambition is to solve this within and outside the district.

For the private parties the European quarter is of “vital importance” (AG Real estate, 2011), “it is the most important office district of Brussels, where the European institutions are the most important player” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). Therefore they are interested what the future possibilities of development will be and how this will influence the value of their existing property.

Perceived problems

Although the general interest of the stakeholders in the European quarter varies, there is consensus about the two main problems in the area: mobility and lack of conviviality. All stakeholders perceive this, to a greater or lesser extent, as a problem.

There are also great similarities between the different stakeholder groups in the proposed possible solutions. They for example agree upon the fact that the mobility problems must be solved by a greater focus on public transport and that mixed use and public space could be a solution for the lack of liveability. However about the further interpretation of these solutions is a lot of discussion between the different parties, which is described in the following sections.

Accessibility and mobility

Almost all the different stakeholder groups name accessibility and mobility as one of the largest problems in the district. There are both problems with the accessibility, i.e. that the main roads are always blocked and that there is not enough public transport, and with the nuisance of mobility, i.e. the pressure of the car traffic, the nuisance of the ‘autostrada’s’ on the Rue de la Loi and Rue Belliard and the fact that there is no place to walk or bike (BRAL, Cofinimmo, CBRE, OIB, 2011). However, also some parties put the problem in perspective. One party argues that the accessibility is already very good (Touring, 2011), that it is good compared to other parts in the Region (ADT-ATO, 2011) or that only the perception of the public transport is bad (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011).

The solution of the mobility problem lays for all parties in the improvement of the public transport and decrease of car use: “there must be fewer cars in the area. In the future it would be good if there were no cars at all in the European quarter” (CBRE and Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). Car use must
be discouraged (OIB-b, 2011). “Therefore it is good to try for example to avoid car parking on the street. Car parking in the basement of buildings can be decreased, or made more expensive, that will put the car use under pressure (OIB-a and Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). It could also be good to introduce a (congestion) charge to enter the area, just like in London and other big cities” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). To make this decrease in car use possible, parties agree upon that first measures must be taken to improve the public transport. “If the offer of public transport is good, reduction of cars is possible” (DG HR, 2011). “There must be dedicated more effort on the public transport. The existing infrastructure must be better used (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011) and a new metro line between Schuman and South station must be considered (CBRE, 2011). In the future there must also be more focus on pedestrians and cyclists, although most of the interviewees do not believe so much in cycling in Brussels. Or as someone says it: “cycling is a gimmick for the EU people” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011).

Although the stakeholders are clear about the solution direction for the problem of accessibility and mobility, there is no consensus on how the transition must take place from car use to public transport and what will happen to the cars in the area. Or as one of the private parties calls it: “Everyone agrees upon the fact that the value of real estate around the Rue de la Loi will rise if there will be less traffic. But, what are the solutions for people that need to use the car?” (CBRE, 2011). Some say that the transition must slowly and soft and that car use must be reduced little by little (AG Real Estate, 2011). However, there is also no clear view on who must take initiative in this and has to pay for it.

The most parties find that the Region must take a leading position in solving it (DG-HR, OIB-a, Municipality of Brussels, Touring, CBRE, 2011) and the European Commission has already indicated that they probably will not take initiative in this issue (OIB-a, 2011). However the Region states that there is already a good accessibility in the area, compared to other areas in the region and there is no money for new infrastructure (ADT-ATO, 2011) Thereby is the Region dependent on the Federal state for decision about mobility, and this is difficult at the moment because there is no government and they do not have the same objectives regarding mobility.

Taking decisions about the accessibility is however crucial. The European Commission connects clear consequences on the investment on mobility: “the Region must show commitment in solving the mobility issues. They have to invest in it. Only after that the European Commission will start with a building project” (DG HR, 2011). If investments fail to come, possibly other solutions will be found for the European Commission (DG HR, 2011).

Liveability
The second largest problem according to the stakeholders in the area is the lack of liveability or conviviality. This lack is expressed by the ‘dead’ character of the neighbourhood, the mono-functionality, the lack of inhabitants and the feeling of insecurity after 6 pm (OIB, ADT-ATO, 2011).

Consensus about...

Problem

- "the Rue de la Loi is an urban motorway" (OIB-B, 2011)
- an "autostrada" (OIB-a, 2011)
- "the main roads are always blocked" (Cofinimmo, 2011)
- "great nuisance of traffic, no place to walk or bike" (CBRE, 2011)

Proposed solution

- "there must be fewer cars in the area. In the future it would be good if there were no cars at all in the European quarter" (CBRE, 2011)
- "car use must be discouraged" (OIB-b, 2011)
- "there must be dedicated more effort on the public transport" (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011)

NO consensus about...

Execution

- Till what extent will the public transport be improved and who will pay for it?
- ... and what will happen with the cars?
- "there is already a good accessibility in the area, compared to other areas and there is no money for new infrastructure" (ADT-ATO, 2011)
- "They Region must show commitment into solving the mobility issues. They have to invest in it. Only after that the Commission will start with a building project” (DG HR, 2011)
The introduction of a mix of functions and public space are often proposed as a solution for these problems. They Region for example states that “the lack of inhabitants creates security problems and difficulties to integrate the neighbourhood in the surrounding areas. A mixed district will help to integrate the quarter in the area” (ADT-ATO, 2011). Besides that investment in public space is necessary, “especially when people are going to live in the area” (Cofinimmo, 2011). “The public space is in a very bad condition; it is very narrow, you have to share the sidewalks with bicycles and the pavement is bad. There is a need for small scale public space (at street level) and midscale public space in the neighbourhood, especially along the two main axes (source).

Density is seen by all stakeholders as a mean to get mixed use and public space in the area. Density is both “a solution to create public space” as it is only “legitimized where you can create public space around it” (CBRE, 2011). A higher density in the European quarter is considered as inevitable as Brussels will grow the coming years with 200.000 inhabitants (BRAL, 2011), “the only way to resolve the problem” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011) and a mean to get mixed use and public space in the area.

Although almost all stakeholders say that the introduction of mixed use is a good idea for the European quarter, however the considerations behind this differ. The authorities are great supporters of mixed-use development as stated before. Also for the municipality of Brussels the protection and re-establishment of housing is the main starting point of development (Municipality of Brussels, 2011). The European Commission has an ambivalent position regarding mixed-use. On the one hand they propagate that they think that mixed use development is important for the district, though on the other hand, they are very critical of accepting other functions on the ground floor of their buildings (AG Real Estate, 2011). The OIB confirms this image, they state that “the European Commission will not be an active advocate of mixed use development” and that it would be good if the Commission “does not play an active role in avoiding mixed use” (OIB-A, 2011). The mix of functions in the buildings of the European Commission must be acceptable in terms of security (OIB-A, 2011). Private parties are supporters of mixed-use development because there is a great vacancy of office space. “There has always been a market oversupply of office space, though now it is really bad. Therefore it is good to reduce the surface of office space and to create new residential functions, hotels, etc” (Cofinimmo, 2011).

There is also no widespread consensus about what kind of functions must be mixed in the European quarter. The authorities focus mainly on the introduction of housing into the area and facilities to serve the new and existing inhabitants. The European institutions have more attention more for shops and restaurants, which can be a good addition for the employees, although they also recognize that if one wants to create a lively area that all functions are important and that there must be no restrictions to this (OIB-a, 2011).

**Figure 7.12 Schematic overview of outcomes from interviews.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Proposed solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“the neighbourhood is not convivial and that the security after 6 pm is under pressure” (OIB-B, 2011)</td>
<td>Mixed-use Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“there is a lack of conviviality, ‘art of living’” (CBRE, 2011)</td>
<td>Public space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Execution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What must be the scale of mixture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where and how much increase of density?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “a mix of functions in buildings of the EC must be acceptable in terms of security... security weighs always very high” (OIB-A, 2011). |
| “mixing at building level is very difficult because of co-ownership constructions” (Cofinimmo, 2011) |
Private parties are clear about the fact that the area must not aim to be a significant retail area. “That will not work, it is very hard to setup a retail area and it will definitely not work in the European quarter. The focus must be on dwellings, bars and restaurants and some service shops” (CBRE, 2011). BRAL proposes that the European institutions could outsource some of their activities such as audio-visual services, printing, etc. This could break the closed nature of the institutions and could also stimulate local employment (BRAL, 2011).

The Brussels-Capital Region thinks the housing in the European quarter will be for specific groups. These groups can be defined as ‘young urban professionals’. More or less young EU workers who like to live in a cosmopolitan, urban environment. There will not be social housing in the area, because the Region cannot afford this (ADT-ATO, 2011). The European Commission doubts if the Belgium authorities are not too optimistic that people want to live in the area (DG-HR, 2011). Private parties indicate that the transformation of offices into residential buildings will certainly happen very soon but certainly not at a very large scale (Cofinimmo, 2011).

Regarding to the scale of mixture the different parties are almost diametrically opposed to each other. The citizens and authorities want to mix the functions at the lowest scale as possible, preferably on building level. The European institutions and private parties are very sceptic about mixing on building level, because of reasons concerning security and co-ownership. For them mixing at neighbourhood level, or at maximum block level is acceptable.

There is also discussion about where to increase the density in the area. The Brussels-Capital Region aims at a much greater density along the Rue de la Loi in the Project Urban Loi (PUL), because density means for them a chance to get mixed-use and public space. In the area outside the PUL perimeter, there has no decision made yet on the density. They state that “from a political point of view, it is very hard to promote density” (ADT-ATO, 2011). Therefore the Region has chosen to limit the higher density to the PUL area. However, they state “it could possibly be good to create also a higher density in the rest of the area (but lower than in PUL), to create also a mix of functions there, but this has to be decided upon together with the local authorities” (ADT-ATO, 2011). The private parties indicate that if there is a difference in volumes, there is no reason to limit the density. At the Rue Belliard exists the same problem as on the Rue de la Loi. Also this axis must be denser (CBRE, 2011). “There must be an input of the Region on the Rue de Belliard. Guidelines must be defined; otherwise the private sector will define the guidelines. There must be rules for every new development, about public space, etc ”(CBRE, 2011).

Security
Besides the issues about accessibility and liveability, another important element in the discussion about the European quarter is security. There are two types of security issues in the area: security within buildings and security on the streets.

The issue of security within buildings is the most important for the European Council, as the summits with heads of state form a very high security risk. They call the location of the Council in the middle of the city “a nightmare” concerning security (European Council, 2011). It is a handicap to be located in such a dense urban area, especially when European summits take place and the whole area must be strictly protected. In such situations a location like the NATO site, outside the city, is much easier to secure (European Council, 2011). The wish to have an open image is in contradiction with security. According to the European Council one must always look for a compromise between security – openness, but also between security and protocol. “You can go as far as you want with security, but that is sometimes not desirable regarding the interests of openness and protocol” (European Council, 2011). However, security requirements will be a leading principle in future decisions. Also for the European Commission security within the buildings is an important issue, as has been stated before. Especially in discussions about mixed-use in Commission buildings, security plays an important role. “The mix of functions in the buildings of the European Commission must be acceptable in terms of security” (OIB-A, 2011). The second type of security, security on the streets is often mentioned as one of the problems of the European quarter. This issue is seen as closely associated with the lack of liveability in the area: “after 6pm it is desolate in the area and that puts the social safety under pressure” (BRAL, OIB-b, 2011). Also for the possible solutions the same measure as for the lack of liveability are examined.

Human scale and flexibility
It was notable in the interviews that almost none of the stakeholders groups named human scale as a large problem in the area or as an element to focus on in future development. It has been said that the human scale of the area could become under pressure when the density of the area is increased, but no party named it as a important point to focus on. Flexibility is only being named as an important characteristic for buildings by the European Commission and private parties and not so much as an essential quality for an area. Not as something missed in the current situation as a vital element for future development.
7.5.2 Process

This section discusses the position and interests of the different stakeholder groups regarding the European quarter and their view on historic, current and future development of the area. It furthermore handles the interaction and cooperation between the parties and their vision for future development.

The two most influential parties in the development of the European quarter seem to be the Brussels-Capital Region (BCR) and the European Commission. The BCR is from the different authorities the organisation that takes lead in guiding the development of the district and they get more (legal) influence compared to the municipalities. The European Commission is the largest occupier of real estate in the area. Their portfolio is spread over many buildings at several locations in the quarter and is in development. The accommodation strategy of the Commission and the decisions that they take is therefore very important for the development of the European quarter. The other stakeholder groups stay somewhat at the background. Both the BCR as the EC have a difficult position in the development process. Their position and interest are described first below, after which the other stakeholder groups are discussed and the interaction and cooperation between the parties.

Brussels-Capital Region

Complex division of power

In Belgium, in with that also in Brussels, their exist many layers of government with a complex division of powers between them. There is the Federal State of Belgium, the three Regions of Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels and municipalities. The Brussels-Capital Region is caught by the Federal state and the Regions of Flanders and Wallon on the one side and on the other side the 19 municipalities. Legal competences on the field of urban planning are divided between the Region and the municipalities. Concerning for example mobility issues, the Region is directly dependent on the Federal state and indirectly also on the Region of Flanders and Wallonia. Agreements in these fields are difficult, as interests differ widely.

With recent changes in the Brussels Town Planning Code raised friction between the Region and municipalities. The power of the Region concerning urban planning has increased at the expense of the municipalities. They can make now, just like the municipalities, Local land use plans (PPAS, BBP). Especially in the case of the European quarter the municipality of Brussels has a position at the background: “the interests of the region in the European quarter are greater than the interests of the municipality of Brussels” and with that “the municipality has not much to say, most of the decisions are taken by the Region. We can do only small interventions in terms of licensing, pedestrian and cycle paths, etc.” (Municipality of Brussels, 2011). Because of the little influence of the municipality they have withdraw from the planning process: “there is very little margin for the municipality to make PPAS. The Bench of Mayor and Aldermen has therefore indicated that the Region should make the PPAS itself” (Municipality of Brussels, 2011).

The Region on their turn blames the municipality for not having a vision for the European quarter. “It is not clear if they want to keep it as it is right now, or change it. The region has to make the first step (from all authorities), because the local authorities do not” (ADT-ATO, 2011). The Region is on the other hand also accused for having a little structuring vision for the area (BRAL, 2011) and for working at the areas where they have taxpayers and voters (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). They have not many means and power to have an active role in the development of the area.

It is now a complex situation of layers of government that cannot take decisions. There must be negotiations with the Federal state and the three Regions, otherwise it impedes the development of Brussels. There are plenty of solutions, if there is a political will (Touring, 2011).

Presence of the European institutions: chance or problem?

The BCR is captured between two opinions which are present in the city of Brussels: whether to see the European institutions as a chance or a problem for the city. The BCR states that it is their interest to see the presence of the European institutions as a “chance for the city, a great opportunity to develop the city as an international centre of activity”, as they argue that “the EU is the engine of the development of the Region” (ADT-ATO, 2011). However, the position of the EU in Brussels and in the European quarter is in dispute. Numerous citizens and local authorities see it as a great problem, caused by the fact that the EU is positioned “without any vision” in the European quarter, has caused “the demolition of neighbourhoods and expulsion of many inhabitants”. They see it as an “urban disaster” (ADT-ATO, 2011). What also causes friction between the Brussels citizens and the European institutions is that the ‘rich’ EU workers have a lot of purchasing power and with that increase prices. This enhances the negative feeling about the settlements of the EU and it is difficult for them to see the EU as a chance for the city. This perspective is also in the minds of the local authorities (municipalities) (ADT-ATO, 2011). So the Region sees the presence of the EU as an opportunity, which must be kept in the city and must participate in the process of urban development, whereas citizens and local authorities have the attitude “the less EU the better” (ADT–ATO, 2011).
European Commission

Although the European Commission is present since the end of the 50's in Brussels, it has only recently developed an accommodation strategy. The first steps for this were taken at the time of Commissioner Kallas (2004-2010). The two key points from the strategy are: concentrating and densifying real estate in the European quarter (Project Urban Loi, PUL) and in addition to the presence in the European quarter one to three external sites of at least 100,000 m2. Private parties have seen a change in the strategy of the Commission. “The attitude of the European Commission has changed over the past years. They have changed their real estate strategy and express it more” (CBRE, 2011). “The European institutions have become in recent years a much tougher negotiator. They have a clearer vision of what they want to do with their property” (AG Real Estate, 2011). However, there are still many points of critique mentioned on the attitude of the EC with their real estate towards the city, or as one of the parties state “now there must also be a better relation with practice” (AG Real Estate, 2011). This is particularly about the double messages the EC sends, their commitment and contribution.

Double messages

The European institutions sometimes send a double message. They state that they would like to have a mixed neighbourhood, but in practice, for example in the current development of the Capital building, shops at the ground floor level of the offices are not, or very little allowed (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). The European Commission is aware of this double message and give another example: “we state that we want to be integrated in the city, but at the same time we choose external site in Delta, where integration and mixed-use is very difficult” (OIB-a, 2011). Also regarding mobility the Commission has sometimes a double-sided attitude. They state that they want to reduce the car traffic and they also take measure for that, however the number of parking places still remains an important issue. “The administration has personal comfort as a high priority. That is different at the level of political Directorate Generals (Climate, Energy, Environment) within the Commission” (OIB-a, 2011).

Commitment

The European Commission does not necessarily take a clearly readable position regarding the ambitions of the Region to make the European quarter a nicer and better integrated area (OIB-a, 2011). The Commission accepted the Project Urbain Loi (PUL) and declared to be willing to work on it together with the Region. However, the EC states that “the most important incentive to work on this project is to rationalize the portfolio of the European Commission” (DG HR, 2011). For the Brussels Capital Region it is very important that the European Commission launches some signal as soon as possible that the PUL project is a good project. “All actors are wondering if the EU believes in the PUL project. The Commission must commit to it, without them the project is not feasible. They must convince the private owners that they want the project as well” (ADT-ATO, 2011).

Another problem is that the European Commission is not able to give commitment upfront development of buildings. This is very difficult for the private sector (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). There is a discrepancy between the private market and the Commission in what the Commission asks for and what the market can deliver regarding the volume and location of offices without engagement of the Commission. “It is a pity that the Commission is not allowed to take position in advance of a development. It would be much better if they could be a partner of a developer in the construction phase, taking a position before the project is delivered. This will result in better fitting buildings for the Commission, but therefore they should also be ready to take a risk” (CBRE, 2011).

Contribution

Besides the commitment of the European Commission to developments in the quarter there is also a discussion about the contribution they should deliver. The European institutions do not want to pay taxes or so called Charges d’Urbanism. They state that “the city is earning a lot of money by the presence of the institutions” (DG HR, OIB-a, 2011) and therefore they have the feeling that the city must be happy that the institutions are there. “The Commission expects more effort to keep the institutions” (DG HR, OIB-a, 2011). Besides that, the EC states “there is no budget line for financial contributions in the urban environment or infrastructural works. The European Commission does not want to pay the Charges d’Urbanism. The Region must also understand that the budgetary constraints are heavier nowadays in the European Commission than before” (DG HR, 2011).

Other parties are criticizing this attitude of the institutions: “the European institutions are often acting like they are invited in Brussels, but they are now part of it. They have to take their own responsibility, also a financial responsibility. That would create a real partnership between the EC and the Region” (CBRE, 2011). “The EU is not supporting the urban development a lot. They do not pay for common infrastructure. Developers are willing to pay, but is the EU?” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). There must be a balance between what is requested and the money that is available: “it is good to cry, but it is also good to take solutions” (CBRE, 2011).

There are some softer voices on the other hand within the Commission. They state: “it is conceivable that the Commission will directly or indirectly via developers pay for
improvement of the urban environment or infrastructural works. It is certainly possible, but there must be a very clear explanation what will be improved and what the Commission pays for. It must be explained that it will lead to economies of scale and/or cost savings at a certain moment in time for the Commission” (OIB-b, 2011).

**Walk the talk**

There are many voices within and outside the Commission that call for an accommodation which is in line with and a reflection of its policies (Verleysen, 2011) which can serve as an example. So to say: “perform the policy aims in your front yard” (BRAL, 2011). The EU can in that way create a reference framework with their buildings (AG Real Estate). The Commission agrees upon this: “the least the Commission can do is applying its own policies to its buildings (OIB-b, 2011).

“The buildings of the EC should be fully in line with European politics” (Verleysen, 2011). If, for example, the EU states in its own policy that cars are not allowed any more in cities in 2050, then in the European quarter the cars must be eliminated in 2040. It is about the symbolism: “the buildings of the EU must set an example for the EU policy on climate, energy, mobility, etc. The EU must at least meet its own standards” (Verleysen, 2011). Or, as a citizens states it: “there is not a positive image of the European quarter nowadays, which has an effect on the enthusiasm for Europe”. The European institutions should take more responsibility in the development of the European quarter, because it is all about the project Europe. “Acting the right way here gives a positive influence on the image on a higher level” (Marco Schmitt, 2011).

Although this ambition is supported by different stakeholder groups, it is not easy to achieve. As stated before, there is no coherence between the political goals of different Directorate Generals, such as Climate, Energy and Environment and the administration, under which the buildings policy of the Commission falls. There is a clear distinction between the political budget and the administrative budget, which implies that the administrative budget is not meant to achieve political goals. The (strong) working unions of the EU workers are besides that very sceptical about all changes which could possibly decrease the working comfort.

**European Parliament and Council**

The three European institutions, the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Council, all have their own accommodation strategy. “They are not working together on the field of real estate but there is an inter-institutional cooperation. For instance, they exchange information once every two months to coordinate their actions or to launch inter-institutional public procurements” (European Parliament, 2011). Both the European Parliament and the Council have a real estate strategy that is focused on centralizing in one location in the European quarter, near the other EU institutions and having the buildings in ownership. For both organisations this strategy is more or less accomplished: they have almost all the buildings they need on the right location, or it is currently being build or looked for. This results in a background position towards the developments in the European quarter, or as the Council states: “the European Council shall exercise restraint in the development of the European Quarter. The accommodation strategy is nearly done, eventually there will be perhaps a need for a small extension (if new member states join), however more will not happen.

**Citizens**

Citizens do not play an important role in the development of the European quarter. The largest problem for them is the lack of communication they perceive. “As a citizen it is difficult to follow the developments in the European quarter. One is dependent on the communication of the Region and the European institutions and they communicate not so much. There is little transparency on the developments of the Project Urbain Loi and the external site of the Commission. One faces a profusion of nothing; it’s very difficult to find out who is coordinating and who is responsible” (BRAL, 2011). Also private companies in the quarter are not involved in the development process. Touring is anxious and concerned about the current developments in the European quarter, mainly the Project Urbain Loi (Touring, 2011). “Economically” they state, “it is not a sound project and one does not expect a lot from it” (Touring, 2011). Besides that, there has been “absolutely no consultation of the stakeholders in PUL project”. There has not been any contact between the Touring and the government” (Touring, 2011).

In the past there has been a lack of communication as well: “the building of the European Parliament is a good example of bad planning in the European quarter. It has been built by a private party and there was no communication and no public documents at all” (Schmitt, 2011). This resulted in a “very large building which has a great distance to the people, literally and figuratively. There are many barriers and there is no direct contact possible with the parliament” (Schmitt, 2011).

In the future there must be more openness of institutions, both large-scale long-term planning and short-term practical issues, such as those yards. “Better communication can lead to more involvement” (BRAL, 2011).
Private parties
The interest of the private parties is stated clearly: “the European quarter is of vital importance for the real estate sector” (AG Real estate, 2011), “it is the most important office district of Brussels, where the European institutions are the most important player” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011).

The needs of the European institution in the field of real estate become more specific. Because not all of the existing offices meet those needs, there are more and more vacant buildings in the district. This vacancy creates uncertainty for developers to develop at their own risk and puts pressure on the rent level. The opinion of the private parties is therefore slowly shifting from very positive to more uncertain. One is waiting for decisions about urban planning from the Brussels-Capital Region and clarity about the needs and constraints of the European institutions. “It is very important for the private sector to understand what the Commission wants and at what time. Although it is much clearer than in the past, it is never clear enough for the private sector. Detailed information is needed about demand, timing and financial constraints of the Commission” (CBRE, 2011).

Current developments - Project Urban Loi
The current Project Urbain Loi, which focuses on a great increase of density along the Rue de la Loi, together with new public space and the introduction of housing, shows the relations between the stakeholders and the development process. Mainly private parties are very sceptical about the realization of the plan. “The implementation of PUL will be very difficult, because it is not taken into account in which phase of the lifecycle a building is” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). “The building Loi 15 for example must be demolished in the PUL plans, although it is brand new. Also many other buildings are just refurbished. The landlords of these buildings will not come into action to renew or demolish its buildings in the coming decades. It will take 100 years before the project is finalized” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). Also the fragmented ownership in the area can cause problems: “various owners must agree upon the development of a block. Who is allowed to built high and who not? Where should be public space?” (AG Real estate, 2011). Those issues are very hard to decide upon.

Also the European institutions are sceptical: “the Region initiated the PUL project, but now they are making changes in some important starting points of the project. They stated that they wanted to decrease the traffic on the Rue de la Loi a lot, but they have difficulties now to decide upon this, or they are maybe even deciding to increase the traffic. They also stated that they wanted to increase the height of the buildings in the area, but by problems with the

neighbourhood, they are planning to decrease the possible height of the new buildings” (DG HR, 2011). “They Region must show commitment into solving the mobility issues. They have to invest in it. Only after that the European Commission will start with a building project in the PUL area” (DG HR, 2011).

However, there are also some positive notes about the project which praise the initiative: “It is unclear what will come of it but it is certainly a step in the right direction” (AG Real Estate). “The PUL project must be seen as a vision, a target in the future to work to. Though, one must be realistic and everyone knows that this (exact) target will not be reached. That is impossible. Some parts are financially impossible to implement. However, even if nothing happens with PUL, it definitely sets an ambition. Projects that are developed right now are trying to conform to the PUL project” (Cofinimmo, 2011).

View on future developments
There is a great need for a party that takes a leading position in the development. A logical party for this could be the European Commission. “They must build with a vision. There is a great need of political will and courage on the level of the Commissioner” (Verleysen, 2011). The Region will likely be less inclined to take action before the EU has decided what they want. When the EU will not take this pioneering position, they will probably not get the offer from the market at the location they want and in accordance to their wishes. However, the European institutions should also understand that the projects must be realized in a context of Euro-scepticism in several member states and a financial crisis, which will certainly restrict the opportunities (European Council, 2011).

Citizens and private parties look at in a pragmatic way to the quarter. “If one must wait till all decisions are made and all (private) parties have agreed; one can wait forever. It is better to let small projects start, in the PUL area or next to it, which are in line with the vision for the area. In this way the vision will be realised step-by-step by private parties. One must realise that it is a project on a very long period. Therefore it must be phased and one has to look pragmatic to it” (Cofinimmo, 2011). “The development in the European quarter must be small scale, practical and pragmatic. One can work with small pilot projects. The projects that work well can be expanded on a larger scale (Schmitt, 2011).
7.6 Reflection

Document study
The document study gives a good first impression of the problems that are perceived by the different stakeholder groups and their interests in the development of the European quarter. However, it is important to realize the limitations of this study. Only a few stakeholders have public documents on the European quarter, and no information of the private parties is available. Also for the available documents applies that there are still many questions left, regarding definitions, priorities and different opinions within stakeholder groups. To get a better insight into these questions, interviews have been performed. Still the document study is useful to know the ‘official’ opinion of the organisations and to be able to compare it with the interviews.

Interviews
The interviews went well in a generally open, relaxed conversation. Especially the graphic cards, used in the second half of the interview (appendix A), were successful. It worked as a useful tool to form the discussion and to help the interviewees to tell their story and express their needs. The choices for certain cards were argued in the discussion, which gave a good understanding of the particular view of the interviewee.

A difficulty of the interview series is whether the persons interviewed form a good representation of the stakeholder groups. By having interviewed 21 persons in 16 sessions, a considerable amount of actors have been heard. For the greater part these were people responsible for the development of the European quarter in their organisation or closely connected to it. Although this does not give a decisive answer about what other opinions there are, it brings up a considerable reliable picture. It was most difficult to get a reliable picture of the interests of the group of citizens. Finding good representatives of this group was not easy and the discussion were more complicated as the interviewees were not ‘trained’ to express themselves about spatial and process issues, making it hard to understand their interests. Most other interviewees were experienced in the field of real estate or urban planning, which made it easier for them to communicate about their wishes and needs.

Another issue is that it sometimes seemed to be that the interviewees gave ‘desired’ answers and maybe not their ‘true’ opinion. This is mostly seen by topics as mixed-use and public transport. Interviewees named this as solutions for current problems, but by asking further they did not have an answer to further filling in of these solutions or the consequences. This possibly suspects that someone is in fact not sure if it is a good solution, but only states it because it is often mentioned and one presumes that it is desired.

With that, some answers or opinions of stakeholders were rather naive. For example by stating that public transport will solve the mobility problem or that the area must be a ‘rapidly growing residential pole’, stakeholders did not show a very realistic view on the future of the district.

A last important point is that the discussions are influenced by the interviewer. The set-up of the interview, the questions raised and cards used have guided the conversations and therefore the outcomes to a certain direction. This is hard to avoid or even impossible, however it is good to realise that the statements are coloured by the way of interviewing, the interpretation and recording of the interviewer.

All these elements must be taken into consideration by reviewing the opinions of the stakeholders. The statements of the interviewees are not objective and should not be seen and used as such. It only gives an impression of what kind of feelings are present under different groups and short of relations exists between the groups.

7.7 Findings

From the document study and interviews the following conclusions can be drawn, having regard to the limitations described in the last section. The guiding principles of the theoretical study of urban change management are applied to structure the findings and to compare it with theory. Besides that also findings next to the framework are described.

Vision and goals
By comparing the document study with the outcomes of the interviews, one can see that the problems and interest mentioned in the interviews are reduced to the core of the interests. Whereas in the public documents several problems and ambitions are mentioned, in the interviews only a few are named. For example for the European Commission rationalisation of the portfolio and costs reduction is the most important ambition and for the Brussels-Capital Region the introduction of housing and other mixed uses. Where the goals mentioned in the written documents were
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quite close to another – also just because there were a lot of goals mentioned - as shown in the tables in section 7.3, the interviews reflect clear priorities which makes the distance between the stakeholder groups larger. A common vision for the development of the district is currently out of the question.

Coalitions

There is more or less consensus about the two main problems in the area: mobility and lack of conviviality. All stakeholders perceive this, to a greater or lesser extent, as a problem. However the individual interests of stakeholders make it very difficult to solves these issues. That also causes that all parties are waiting for each other. The European institutions are waiting for the authorities to take decisions about the mobility and accessibility issues. The authorities are waiting in their turn for the Commission to show commitment for the proposed developments. The private parties are besides that also waiting for the authorities and the European institutions, both for making clear decisions about the urban development as to get a clear idea of the demands of the institutions. The citizens are waiting for communication and transparency about the plans and are hoping to be involved.

The fact that no party can act on its own, but have to wait for decisions of other stakeholder groups, shows that there is a great interdependency between the actors. However this mutual interdependency is not recognised as such and parties do not allow each other much. The atmosphere is tough, as can be seen from statements such as: “they have no vision on the development of the European quarter” (Brussels-Capital Region about Municipality of Brussels) and “the Region must show commitment in solving the mobility issues. They have to invest in it. Only after that the European Commission will start with a building project” (DG HR, 2011). Firm coalitions do not exist in the European quarter, which results in a process that is stuck for a long period and has slow progress.

Commitment

The relationships that exist between stakeholder groups in the European quarter, for example about the development of Project Urban Loi, great commitment from the parties is hard to find. There is an atmosphere of ‘we will work on it because we have to, but in fact we only want to reach our own goals’ or as the EC states it: “The Commission accepted the Project Urban Loi (PUL) and declared to be willing to work on it together with the Region. However, the most important incentive to work on this project is to rationalize the portfolio of the European Commission” (DG HR, 2011). Furthermore agreements are withdrawn or postponed. The Region is making changes in some important starting points of the project PUL regarding mobility and building heights and the Commission is still refuses to send a clear message to the outside world that they support the project. Next to this there is a problem that the European Commission is not able to give commitment upfront development of buildings, this is very difficult for the private sector as they cannot develop the large buildings the EC request at its own risk.

Another problem is that within the two main stakeholder groups, the Brussels-Capital Region and the European Commission there is a lack of leadership and commitment on the highest political level to the existing strategies and projects. On a lower level within the organisation there is quite some cooperation and agreement, but this is missing on a higher level. The lack of support for the project of a heavyweight in the organisation, makes it very difficult to execute the current project in a good way.

Financial feasibility and flexible planning

A different issue is the scepticism under private parties on the feasibility of the PUL project, or one parties states it: “the implementation of PUL will be very difficult, because it is not taken into account in which phase of the lifecycle a building is” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). Also the fragmentation of ownership in the area can cause problems, as some owners will receive great benefits, where others have to give up a lot. How that must be distributed equally is not worked out upfront. Furthermore the plans of the Project Urban Loi are not flexible to respond to future changes, whereas for the area outside the PUL perimeters there are no development guidelines at all, which result in a lot of uncertainty for the private parties.

There should be an intervention to get the process of development going, which is now totally stuck. The different stakeholder groups must be showed their mutual dependency, to be able to built coalitions with trust and openness between the parties. A common – realistic vision must be formed to form the development process, detailed in a feasible and flexible planning system. A independent process organisation can help to break down existing barriers, bring the stakeholders together and get the development process going.
8. Analysis accommodation European Commission

The European Commission is the largest occupier of real estate in the European quarter. They own and rent a total amount of more than 800,000 m² in the district (OIB, 2010). The decisions the European Commission makes regarding their accommodation are very important for the development of the neighbourhood. It is therefore important to know how the current accommodation looks like, what their future demand will be and how they coop with the urban environment of their buildings. This chapter discusses these themes. It starts with a description and reflection of the current accommodation and the current demand of the EC. Afterwards there is a critical reflection upon this, focussing aspects such as future uncertainties, the position and responsibilities of the EC and the relation to its own policies. The chapter concludes with an assignment, the tasks to fulfil to improve the accommodation of the EC.

8.2 Current situation

The current real estate portfolio of the EC comprises 64 buildings, divided in three poles spread over Brussels. The largest part is accommodated in the European quarter, the two other clusters – Genève and Beaulieu – are much smaller, both in number of buildings as square meters (figure 8.1). A large part of buildings is rather small, 85% of the buildings are smaller than 20,000 m² (table 8.1). This is perceived to be too small, because if an average Directorate General (DG) must be located in one office (500-1000 employees), a building of 17,500 m² – 35,000 m² is required.

Table 8.1 Size of buildings.
Source: OIB, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of buildings</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000 m²</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 20,000 m²</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 – 30,000 m²</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 – 40,000 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 – 50,000 m²</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50,000 m²</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2 Clustering of buildings.
Source: OIB, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clustering (number of buildings of EC within 150 m)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 9</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking at the clustering of buildings, one can see that besides the division over three sites spread over Brussels, the buildings are also spread within the sites, especially the European quarter. 42% of the buildings have 2 or less buildings within 150 meter (table 8.2). DG's are sometimes spread over several buildings, which results in long travel times between buildings and large pressure on the efficiency as sharing of facilities is often not possible because of the distances.

A large part of the portfolio is in ownership, or will be in ownership in the future, as there are many lease contracts with option to buy. The remaining part of the portfolio is leased are rented, or there is a usufruct agreement (figure 8.3 and table 8.3).

The average office space per person (37.7 m²) (OIB, 2010) is very high in comparison to, for example the average in commercial companies in Brussels (19 m²). One cannot compare these numbers one to one, because it is not clear which spaces (such as conference places and supporting functions) are included in both calculations, however it does indicate that the average space use per person is rather high. The high average space use per person is due to the fact that almost every employee of the EC has an individual office. The occupancy costs are also rather high (€ 251/m² per year, OIB, 2010). This is mainly caused by the fact that only 16% of the building portfolio is owned by the EC. The high space use and costs indicates that the portfolio is not efficient at the moment.

The largest part of employees of the EC live in the Brussels-Capital Region (67%). There is a large concentration of employees in the districts in the east and southeast of the city, whereas the western and northern parts of the city are not so popular for the civil servants of the EC. The European schools and creches are spread over the city and not related to the office sites. Half of the employees travel by public transport to work, compared to 29% by car. This is a large increase in the past decade (table 8.4).
The physical appearance of a large part of the real estate portfolio is poor. Buildings are not well integrated in the urban tissue, have a poor architectural quality and are sometimes even badly maintained (figure...). They furthermore suffer from their surroundings with large scale grey office blocks, nuisance from traffic and lack of high quality public spaces and amenities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.4 Source: OIB, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition in mobility of employees of the European Commission (1998-2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal car:</strong> 50% → 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transport:</strong> 32% → 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soft modes:</strong> 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other: Car pooling,...</strong> 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.6-8.9 Impression of physical appearance of real estate portfolio of the European Commission.
8.2 Current demand of European Commission

To cope with the issues of among others high costs and inefficiency as described in the previous section, the EC has formulated an accommodation strategy. The three following overall objectives are leading in this accommodation strategy, as also described in the previous chapter (chapter 7):

- the rational installation of services and better working conditions for staff (Commission of the European Communities, 2007: 2);
- the intensification of acquisition policy (Commission of the European Communities, 2007: 3).
- reflecting the impact of the Commission’s buildings policy on the urban environment of Brussels, through the intensification of the dialogue with the Belgian authorities (Commission of the European Communities, 2007: 2).

The Commission has stated furthermore that they want to maintain a strong symbolic presence in the European quarter, while at the same time decentralising some departments to sites outside the traditional hub. This could be done by developing a single pole of between 100,000 and 250,000 m² or, alternatively, up to three poles of at least 100,000 m² each (European Commission, 2009: 2). This to bring diversification in the portfolio which is needed in order to reduce upward pressure on the property market in the European quarter, although there will be some drawbacks regarding travelling between sites, geographical dispersal of staff and additional costs caused by the need to foresee social infrastructure.

In practice this accommodation strategy means a focus on two actions – the development of an external site and the rationalisation of the portfolio. That there is now a choice made. Recently a provisional decision has been made to develop a single external pole of up to 200,000 m² at Delta, a location in the South-East of the city (figure 8.10). Besides that the rationalise portfolio expresses itself the ambition to have fewer, but larger buildings (figure 8.11).
8.3 Critical reflection

One can cast doubts on the suitability of the current real estate portfolio of the EC, their accommodation strategy and the decision they take now and will take in the future. The following sections reflect critically upon this accommodation policy of the EC and the effects it may have for the organisation and the city. It starts with the planning for future uncertainties, followed by a reflection on the position of the EC and the relation to its own policies.

8.3.1 Future demand

The EC looks, in determining their future demand, only at the space that is necessary to replace buildings with ending contracts or renovation needs. The European Commission presumes that the demand for office space will stay the same in the future, around 1,000,000 m² (figure). The fact that the demand in the future could possibly change is not at all taken into account. There is no planning for uncertainties in the future demand, either growth or decline.

However, one can say that the future demand is quite uncertain. The demand for real estate is dependent on the organisational needs of the EC, which is in its turn dependent on the organisation of the European Union and with that on the European Union as institute. The future of the European Union is moreover subject to decisions of individual member states, economic, financial and social developments, and so forth. The future of the European Union cannot be predicted. Will there be new member states in the future and how many? What will be the power of the EU, will it grow or shrink? And what will be the impact of the current economic crisis on the EU? These questions do not only have an effect on the quantitative demand of real estate of the EC in the future, but also on a qualitative level. How will one look in the future against the importance of physical image? Or at the importance of sustainable development?

All these uncertainties result in the end in the question will there be a decline or growth in the demand for office space? Because there is no certain answer to this question, it is of vital importance that the real estate portfolio of the EC can cope with uncertainties and can flexibly respond to changing demand. Therefore flexibility is needed on portfolio level on among others type of ownership, type, size and quality of buildings and location.

Figure 8.12 Need and available space. The need is said to be the same up till 2026.

The future demand based on ending contracts and renovations is:
- 2013: ± 70,000 m²
- 2017: ± 50,000 m²
- 2021: ± 220,000 m²
- 2025: ± 100,000 m²

Source: OIB, 2010

Source: OIB, 2010
8.3.2 Critical reflection - position European Commission

Some critical reflections can be made upon position that the European Commission takes in defining and communicating their accommodation strategy. This became particularly clear during the interviews with various stakeholder groups, as described in the previous chapter (chapter 7). Most of the critique is about the double message the Commission sends, the lack of commitment and the refusal to contribute to the urban development of the city.

Double messages

The European institutions sometimes send a double message, as becomes clear from the following quotes from the interviews: “They would like to have a mixed neighbourhood, but in practice, for example in the current development of the Capital building, shops at the ground floor level of the offices are not, or very little allowed” (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). They state that they want to reduce the car traffic and they also take measure for that, however the number of parking places still remains an important issue. The Commission recognizes this double attitude, as they state themselves: “The European Commission state that they want to be integrated in the city, but at the same time they choose external site in Delta, where integration and mixed-use is very difficult” (OIB-a, 2011). “The administration has personal comfort as a high priority. That is different at the level of political Directorate Generals (Climate, Energy, Environment) within the Commission” (OIB-a, 2011). This double attitude and messages creates uncertainty by the stakeholders that work together with the institutions and it makes them an unreliable and dishonest party.

Commitment

There is a lack of commitment from the European Commission to the developments in the European quarter, or as they state it themselves: “The European Commission does not necessarily take a clearly readable position regarding the ambitions of the Region to make the European quarter a nicer and better integrated area (OIB-a, 2011). However, for the Brussels Capital Region it is very important that the European Commission launches some signal as soon as possible that the PUL project is a great project. “The Commission must commit to it, without them the project is not feasible” (ADT-ATO, 2011). Here too, the Commission cannot be seen as a reliable partner as it remains very unclear about their commitment to initiatives of the Region and other parties.

Contribution

Besides the lack commitment of the European Commission to developments in the quarter there is also a discussion about the contribution they should deliver. The European institutions do not want to pay taxes or so called ‘Charges d’Urbanism’. They state that “the city is earning a lot of money by the presence of the institutions; they must be happy that the institutions are there and therefore it would be good if they show effort to keep us” (DG HR, OIB-a, 2011). Other parties are criticizing this attitude of the institutions: “the European institutions are often acting like they are invited in Brussels, but they are now part of it. They have to take their own responsibility, also a financial responsibility” (CBRE, 2011). “The EU is not supporting the urban development a lot. They do not pay for common infrastructure. Developers are willing to pay, but is the EU? “ (Jones Lang Lasalle, 2011). There is some discussion within the EC about this issue and there are some softer voices who state: “it is conceivable that the Commission will directly or indirectly via developers pay for improvement of the urban environment or infrastructural works.” (OIB-b, 2011).

8.3.3 Critical reflection - walk the talk

There are many voices within and outside the Commission that call for an accommodation which is in line with and a reflection of its policies (Verleysen, 2011) which can serve as an example. So to say: “perform the policy aims in your front yard” (BRAL, 2011). The EU can in that way create a reference framework with their buildings (AG Real Estate). Some voices within the Commission agree upon this: “the least the Commission can do is applying its own policies to its buildings (OIB-b, 2011).”

However, at this moment, the current real estate portfolio and future accommodation strategy is not in line with the general policies of the European Union, represented by the several Directorate Generals. Sometimes it is even flatly opposed to the policies and ideas of the political level, as the examples below show.
The 2007-2013 Operational Programme ‘Brussels Capital Region’ aims to:
- achieve balanced territorial development of the Brussels Capital region;
- reduce economic, social and environmental disparities in an area containing several rundown districts;
- boost the economy and employment in this area;
- make the area more attractive and improve the quality of life for its inhabitants, businesses and associations. (Regional Policy, 2011)

However: the provisional decision of the Commission to develop an external pole at Delta, a location in the south-east of the city, is flatly opposed to the policy to achieve balanced territorial development, as the south-eastern part of the city is already very wealthy and it will increase the economic, social and environmental disparities instead of reducing it.

Directive 2008/50/EC requires Member States to ensure by 2005 that certain limit values for PM10 are met. The limits impose both an annual concentration value (40 μg/m3), and a daily concentration value (50 μg/m3) which must not be exceeded more than 35 times per calendar year (RAPID, 2011).

However: the place of residence of the European institutions, the European quarter is the most polluted place of Brussels and Belgium is criticized by the European Commission that they not fulfil these requirements.

The 2011 White Paper on transport aims to:
- halve the use of ‘conventionally fuelled’ cars in urban transport by 2030;
- phase them out in cities by 2050;
- achieve essentially CO2-free city logistics in major urban centres by 2030 (European Commission, 2011)

However: the European quarter is still full of cars and up till now no measures are taken to strongly reduce it.

8.4 Assignment

Summarizing, the analysis shows the following largest issues concerning the accommodation of the European Commission:

**Not efficient and high costs**
The organization of the European Commission is spread over many small buildings in and outside the European quarter and the office space used per person is very high, which results in high costs.

**Poor physical image**
Is this the image the EU wants to present itself with? Many of the buildings of the European Union are not well integrated, closed off as fortifications, not transparent and with that forming barriers in the urban environment.

**Not planning for future uncertainties**
The European Commission does not take future uncertainties in the demand into consideration in their accommodation strategy.

**Not responsible**
The European Commission is sending double messages to the public and gives little to no commitment and contribution to developments in the neighbourhood and city.

**Against own EU policy**
The accommodation strategy of the European Commission acts sometimes flatly opposed to the EU policies.

![Figure 8.14 Relationship between accommodation strategy of the European Commission and policy of the European Union](image)
Part D - Reference study
9. Reference study

The difficulties in the spatial and functional structure that are found in the European quarter, as described in the urban analysis (chapter 6), are not exclusively present in Brussels. Also other urban centres with a high density of offices are struggling with the same issues to combine a great workforce with the ambition to be have an attractive, sustainable and liveable city and neighbourhood. This chapter studies two central urban areas, the eastern cluster of the City of London (United Kingdom) and the Wijnhavenkwartier in the centre of The Hague (The Netherlands), that houses many offices like the European quarter. It makes a comparison between the three areas, in which an issue or problem that is present in Brussels will be the central point. The situation concerning this issue in the other two neighbourhoods is examined, to see how these cities handle similar problems and to derive possible lessons from it. The issues are grouped by the elements for successful urban places, as described in chapter 4, by which also the urban analysis of the European quarter has been carried out.

The chapter starts with a description of the two studied neighbourhoods in London and The Hague. Subsequently the themes of density, mixed-use, human scale, public space, accessibility and security are discussed successively, each concluded by a small summary.

9.1 City of London, Eastern cluster

The City of London is a small area within Greater London region. It is the historic core of London around which the modern conurbation grew. It is only little more than one square mile (1.12 sq mi/2.90 km2) in size, though it is densely developed and is one of the world’s leading international financial, business and maritime centre. It provides employment for over 370,000 people and offices make up over 70% of all buildings and many of them are occupied by financial and business services (City of London Corporation, 2010:12).

Alongside its primary business function, the City has many other roles. It is at the hub of an extensive regional public transport network and a centre of learning with over 29,000 students. It houses arts and cultural facilities and is a visitor destination with many touristic attractions. Though there live only around 9,000 residents in the area, concentrated in a few spots (City of London Corporation, 2010:12).

Due to the economic dynamism there is a high rate of change and development, putting particular pressure on the transport and utility infrastructure. There are significant competing demands between the need to accommodate new office development alongside the need for new housing, social and community facilities and improved transport infrastructure (City of London Corporation, 2010:12).
The authorities of the City of London (City of London Corporation) state that the central challenge facing the City is the delivery of sustainable long-term economic growth to support the London and national economies, whilst at the same time providing for population growth and protecting and improving the environment and quality of life (City of London Corporation, 2010:12). This growth will in turn lead to further pressure for new offices, shops, homes and leisure facilities, and the services necessary to support them. The authorities state that a balance is needed between providing for this new development and retaining and improving the best of the current building stock (City of London Corporation, 2010:13).

The reference study is focussing on the eastern cluster of the city of London. The east of the City has the highest density of business activity in the City and contains a cluster of tall buildings. New tall buildings are expected to be clustered in this area. The resulting significant increase in numbers of people either working in or commuting to this small area will put more pressure on public transport, streets, open spaces and services.

Although the whole City of London is much bigger and houses a lot greater work force than the European quarter in Brussels, it is an interesting reference project to look at to see how the city handles the integration of businesses alongside other functions and how they organise infrastructure and public space. Especially the eastern cluster, with its high rise developments and ambition to have attractive, sustainably designed tall buildings with a focus on high quality street scene and environment is interesting to study.

9.2 The Hague, Wijnhavenkwartier

The Wijnhavenkwartier is centrally located in The Hague in between the central train station and the old city centre. It houses many governmental institutions, among others five Ministries. The area has not always been a natural part of the city centre. It has long been an unattractive, bleak area which lacked the desired urban character and missed a good integration in the city. Since the 1990s thing are changing. With the construction of the city hall and the mixed-use project the ‘Resident’ the area gets a new impetus. Both central government as the municipality in close cooperation with private parties are investing in the area. At the moment two new ministries together with housing and amenities are built to work further on the process of changing the closed, unattractive office and residential area into an open, lively and attractive living, working, shopping and entertainment district.

The Wijnhavenkwartier in The Hague is an interesting reference project to compare with the European quarter in Brussels for several reasons. It is an area with many offices, which houses mainly governmental organisations. Therefore issues with respect to accessibility and integration of these buildings versus the security requirements are also here of topical interest. Furthermore there is a great ambition for already a longer period to change the area from a closed off, unattractive office area, into a well integrated mixed part of the city. The first results of these project can already be seen in The Hague and therefore it is an interesting case to look how questions about density, mixed uses, human scale, etc are handled.
9.3 Density

The European quarter has at the moment a quite high density, especially compared to other areas in Brussels. Most of the buildings are 33 meter high, as the current height limit prescribes, which results in a rather massive impression of the density, as the streets are rather small in the area. The Brussels-Capital Region struggles with the question how to regulate the building heights and density in the area to provide enough space for development and trying to make it a pleasant pace at the same time. The cities of London and The Hague have specific ways of dealing with this issue.

The City of London is densely developed, especially the eastern part. The location of tall buildings is based on view lines from strategic points of the city to significant buildings and heritage sites. The aim is to protect and enhance significant views of important buildings (St. Paul's Cathedral and the Tower of London), townscape and skylines, making a substantial contribution to protecting the overall heritage of the City's landmarks. This is done by implementing regulation, for example the Mayor's London View Management Framework.

High rise buildings in The Hague are concentrated around public transport nodes. The area around Central station is such a node, and that makes the Wijnhavenkwartier a dense development.

![Figure 9.6 Building heights city centre The Hague.](image)

Clearly focused high rise policy, for example based on sight lines and protecting heritage or concentration around public transport nodes.

9.4 Mixed-use

In the European quarter an extremely one-sided distribution of functions can be found. There are almost only offices in the central located areas, which results in a desolated district after 6pm. The City of London and the Wijnhavenkwartier in The Hague are also dominated by offices, however other functions can be found there. The type of functions, the scale of mixture and the effects on the liveliness and conviviality are discussed below.

In the City of London 70 % of the surface area is occupied with offices. The density of working people is very high, every day there are coming 373.000 people to work in the area. The density of inhabitants is however very low, only 9.700. Besides that there are some important shopping areas, many cultural and touristic attractions and nightlife. The City of London does not focus in its policies on (a lot more) residential areas, but it does puts emphasis on new shopping areas or intensification of existing shopping areas.
Almost all offices in the city of London are mixed with shops, cafes and restaurants on the ground floor. These facilities are adapted to the large working population in the city. You can find many shops for working cloths, dry cleaners, hair dressers and quick coffee and lunch cafés. In some parts of the city these facilities are only open during weekdays. This results in a huge contrast in liveliness and attractiveness between weekdays, when it is very busy on the streets and the facilities are well used, and weekends, when there is now working population, shops are closed and streets are almost empty, except for a few tourists around the tourist attractions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employment projections</th>
<th>Population projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>423,000</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>428,000</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.10 Employment and population projections City of London. Source: City of London (2010)
The centre of The Hague has specific areas with different atmospheres and a cluster of similar functions. There is the shopping, cultural and touristic area and an area with mostly offices and residential functions. The different atmospheres are close to another. Cultural and administrative functions are for example directly connected on the axis from Central Station to the New Church. There is a reasonable supply of housing in the area. There are now 565 apartments and 365 are furthermore planned.

At a lower scale level functions tend to be more mixed, mostly in a combination of a main function (offices, residential) with another function (shops, cafes and restaurants) at ground level.

The Resident is a good example of such a development. It is a highly mixed development with offices (115,000 m²), apartments (315), shops (4,500 m²) and 800 parking spaces. It forms a bridge between the low-rise buildings of the old city centre and the large-scale office buildings within the vicinity of The Hague’s Central Station. Shops and apartments are mixed in one building and also shops and offices, but there are no mixed buildings with offices and housing together. The offices and apartments are located in two different areas within the block.

A greater mix of functions results in general in more liveliness on the streets. In London offices area almost always mixed with shops, cafes and restaurants on the ground floor. In the Hague you can see that similar functions are grouped together in smaller or larger area, clusters. The presence of a reasonable supply of housing provides a minimal level of activity during the whole week, in contrast to the city of London where almost no resident live, which results in dead streets on weekends. In both cities you can see that on building level there is only a mix with shop, cafés and restaurants at the ground floor. Housing and offices are rarely mixed in one building.
9.5 Human scale

There has been a great increase in scale in the European quarter in the past decades. The block size has remained stable, but the filling-in of the blocks is large scale. The three main buildings of the European institutions are entirely disproportionate, so to say ‘aliens in open space’: very large buildings, closed off to the public and not well integrated in its surroundings which puts the human scale of the area heavily under pressure. In London and The Hague there is also a demand for new developments which can put the human scale of the districts under pressure. How do these cities cope with the integration of (large scale) new developments?

The structure and street pattern of the City of London dates from the Middle Ages and still exists. Only the filling in of the blocks has changed over the years, although the scale remains relatively small. There are many conservation areas and listed buildings in the city, which protect the heritage and prevent large scale development. However, there are also many new developments in the area, especially in the eastern cluster. They respect the regulations concerning heritage and views, but are not always subtle integrated on a lower scale level and create great contrasts with the preserved buildings. Streets are pleasant by the differentiation in height and building fronts.

There is a great difference in scale and typology between the Wijnhavenkwartier and the rest of the centre of The Hague. There is a clear contrast between the old and the new centre, between the two clusters, as a contrast to London where the contrast are between buildings at block level. The size of blocks in the Wijnhavenkwartier is not so large compared to other parts of the city, though the filling in of the blocks is much larger, with often only one building in a block. The Resident is a transition area between large scale and small (historic centre) areas, with preservation of old buildings within the development and differentiated filling in of blocks. It is a good example of integrating new large scale developments in an old structure while retaining a human scale for the users.
9.6 Public space

There are some beautiful public spaces at the borders of the European quarter, but in the district itself there is a lack of public space at street level and mid-scale public space. The existing public spaces are not well used, it because there are no functions located and the spaces are not well connected to the surroundings. It is interesting to compare the provision of public space in London and The Hague with the Brussels case to see where these places are, of what scale and with what function.

There are no large open or green spaces in the city of London, but there is a well distributed system of small scale public spaces. The city applies a quota of minimal public space per 1000 week day day-time population (0.062 ha). Many of the small scale public spaces, pocket parks, are off the main routes, in between buildings and sometimes even a bit hidden. They are often part of a private development. The Pater Noster square is a good example of new developed public space, off the main routes, surrounded by offices and with shops and restaurants at the ground floor which brings liveliness.

In the centre of The Hague there is one large scale open space (Malieveld) which is used for festivals and demonstrations. There are only a few smaller scale public spaces. However, a large part of the centre is a car-free zone thanks to a recent implemented traffic circulation plan. That gives a lot of comfortable space to pedestrians and cyclists, making the main routes important public spaces. Next to the pedestrian zones with functions as a network of public space, there are some important squares in and around the area. These squares all have their own identity based on either culture, cafés and restaurants, political centre or housing, which gives it a clear defined use.
9.7 Accessibility

The two main infrastructural axes that are run through the European quarter are very pressured and put a high demand, inconvenience and pollution on the area. The public transport is concentrated on one axis not centrally in the district and is also very pressured. The accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists is bad: there are huge barriers and there is no decent place for the soft modes of transport in the public realm. This critical situation in the European quarter raises the question how other central business areas handle accessibility issues.

The whole City of London is very good accessible by public transport. Each spot in the city is within 500 meters from a metro and/or train station. The lines are pressured, but give access to all parts of the city and its surroundings. There are also some main roads going through the eastern cluster of the city. They are extensively used, but the traffic is strongly regulated by the congestion charging system. The streets are furthermore generally broad, have two-way traffic and there is rarely parking on the streets. This makes the impact of the traffic on the city acceptable.

A well distributed system of public spaces with clear defined uses and not too much nuisance from traffic create pleasant places for people to meet.
The accessibility of the Wijnhavenkwartier is very good, both by private and public transport. The district is close to the highway that is entering The Hague (A12). Although cars are not allowed in a large part of the centre, there is a good network of parking garages in and around the district. The many car free zones make the accessibility for pedestrians and cyclist very pleasant. The whole district is within 600 meter from Central Station and many tram lines are crossing and surrounding the area. Public transport is literally integrated in the built up area of the Wijnhavenkwartier as trams go through several buildings.

Greatly regulate private transportation by means of for example restricted accessibility and congestion charging. Integrate the remaining traffic well in the urban environment. Provide besides that a well integrated public transport system.
9.8 Security

The main headquarters of the European institutions are fortifications, closed off from the public due to the security measures. This is disastrous for public life in its surroundings. How do the other cities deal with security measures and does it influence the public life?

The security concerns in the City of London are high, there has long been and still is a terrorist threat. However, the security concerns in the City of London do not result in a closed off city for the users and a mix of functions is guaranteed in most of the areas in the city. On some places you do see safety measures in the form of piles, to prevent attacks, for example in front of the gherkin. The mix of functions on building level is also for current and future governmental buildings in The Hague not a problem concerning security. In several buildings of ministries there are shops on the ground floor, the safety zone starts behind the shops or at the first floor.

Security requirements do not necessarily have to cause a separation of functions or closed off areas for the public, but safety zones must be clearly defined.
Part E - Vision
10. Vision

As described in the analysis chapter (chapter 6, 7 and 8) there are many problems in the European quarter in Brussels both in the field of urban environment, the accommodation of the European Commission and the development process. After describing several possible futures for the district, showing a band width of solutions according to the opinions of the stakeholders, this chapter presents the vision of the author. It examines how to break through the vicious circles in the development process and how to solve the before mentioned problems.

10.1 Assignment

On different scale levels the urban environment is alarming. In the city as a whole there are large contrasts in economic and social position of districts and there is little balanced development. At the level of the European quarter one finds a disconnected, desolated, monofunctional office area with great barriers, poorly integrated buildings of the European institutions and heavily pressurised quality of place.

Besides the state if the urban environment, the accommodation of the European Commission is by itself also problematic. The organisation is spread over many small buildings and the office space used per person is very high, inefficient and results in high costs. Possible future uncertainties in the demand are not taken into account. The accommodation policy is furthermore not responsible to the city and acts sometimes flatly opposed to the EU policies.

Problems in the European quarter are recognized by the main stakeholders and there is a wish to transform the area, but the development process is stuck. There is no common vision, little commitment for existing plans and strategies to improve the neighbourhood and a very complex political environment, which results in a situation in which everyone is waiting for everyone.

10.2 Possible futures

The assignment of the European quarter, the accommodation of the European Commission and the development process can be seen from different perspectives. Various stakeholder groups project diverse futures on the development of the district. What will happen if the European Commission would have free play on the development of the neighbourhood? Or if the citizens are in total control?

For the Brussels-Capital Region, the most important goal in the development of the European quarter is twofold: on the one hand they want it to be the main centre of European and international employment and on the other hand the neighbourhood must be a mixed and lively area by reintroducing housing. If the Region would be in control, these two main functions would go hand in hand and would be mixed everywhere in the neighbourhood up till the building level. In that way the European institutions will be completely integrated in the district (figure 10.1).

When the citizens would be in control of the development of the district, they would try to limit the presence of the European institutions to a minimum. The ‘unchecked spread’ of the institutions must be prevented by greatly restraining new developments of the institutions and related organisations. The area should be slowly transformed to how it used to be: down with the wealthy, privileged ‘eurocrats’ and more space for the ‘real’ people of Brussels (figure 10.2).

By letting the European Commission free play, they would start several large scale developments in the area to provide their organisation with large and efficient buildings. They would not have to consider their integration in and effects on the city, as long as their buildings are efficient, secured, low priced and well accessible. This will create bombastic buildings and EU ‘ghettos’: an ideal place to work in with all necessary amenities within reach (figure 10.3).

If the private parties would be in control, they would continue the way they are acting in the past decades: seize all opportunities for development by order of for example the European Commission or other organisations (figure 10.4).

However, no single party has the full control over the area. In the current process of development in the European quarter all parties are waiting for each other before acting. This indicates that there is a mutual dependency between the stakeholder groups: the separate parties cannot act on their own in the development of the neighbourhood due to the great complexity. If the Brussels-Capital Region for example wants to stimulate the introduction of housing
and other functions in the area, they can use their power to a certain level impose this, or to refuse building permits for large scale offices projects. However, it will be limited to several unconnected projects, which will not structurally contribute to the achievement of their vision to have a truly mixed neighbourhood. When the Brussels-Capital Region has no feeling for the interests and demands of the European institutions and private parties and how to coop with that – they can only initiate small scale ad hoc projects, instead of large scale changes.

The interdependency of stakeholders makes it of crucial importance that the parties create a shared vision on the development for the district to get the process going. Otherwise the process remains to be stuck and that is harmful for all parties involved. Below the vision of the author is presented, which is used as a connecting thread for the development strategy for the European quarter. It can serve as an inspiration to think in another direction than which is customary. This vision must be seen as an example of how a vision can be built that connects various stakeholders, shows mutual gains and directs the development.

10.3 Vision

Although there are several problems in the European quarter, the area is by no means prospectless. There are many opportunities - which you will not find at other places - but they are hardly used. All ingredients are available to make it a great place: a central location in Brussels, presence of European and related institutions, a great cultural diversity, many people using the area and a stream of investments. It is the ‘heart’ of Europe.

The position as main seat of the European Union and all mentioned opportunities can be utilised much better. This should not be done by leaving a dominant mark ‘The capital of Europe’ on Brussels by making great interventions in the city and placing grand, bombastic buildings in the European quarter: that approach will not meet approval today. The primary cause for this is that one of the key values of the European Union, unity in diversity, does not lend itself for one specific image or ‘brand’ of the EU. Besides that the euro scepticism that is felt by many European citizens makes a bombastic capital inappropriate. Furthermore, the current financial (euro) crisis makes that all member states, and so the European Union, must make drastic cutbacks. The time of great gestures and investments is over and will not be accepted by the member states and European citizens.
10.4 Coalitions

There are many problems to be solved in the area and it is too complex to intervene independently, as shown in the analysis of the process. This vision can connect the different parties and form strong coalitions between them, so that they can work collectively on the district’s future (figure 10.5). A coalition of joined forces with a common vision will bring the European quarter much further than one party can do alone. It will bring a sustainable, integrated, liveable place, which shows the benefits of EU policy with efficient and flexible accommodation for the institutions.

This vision aims by no means at imposing the opinion of the European institutions on the development of the European quarter. On the contrary - it is a way to call for responsibility of the European institutions, which now act flatly opposed to some of their own policies. It fits closely to the interests of the Brussels-Capital Region and the citizens and forms a way to create coherence between the several actors and interests.

How should the position as main seat of the European Union then be utilized? By focusing the attention to the essence, the core values of the European Union, one shows what the EU and European policy can mean for the development of cities and regions and notably the people who live there. Instead of presenting the EU by great symbolic buildings and interventions, one should use small-scale actions and progress showing the value of the EU for European society. This can be done by looking at the current policy of the European Union, the Europe 2020 program and its key concepts: smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Why shouldn’t one project the principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth on the accommodation of the European institutions and the developments in the European quarter, as it is the guiding principle for all European action? The principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth should be translated one by one to the practice of urban development, so that the European quarter can be transformed into a sustainable, lively and attractive place where people like to work, live and leisure with efficient and flexible accommodation for the institutions.

These guiding principles should be translated to all components of the approach, so that in the end there will be:

- Smart, sustainable and inclusive development process.
- Smart, sustainable and inclusive urban development on city, neighbourhood and block level.
- Smart, sustainable and inclusive accommodation for the European institutions.

Figure 10.5 The vision to transform the European quarter according to the principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive development can bring the stakeholders closer together and is a call for responsibility for the European Commission.
Besides mutual gains, this vision will also bring to the individual stakeholders groups. Chapter 17 will examine this closely, but roughly one can say that for the European Commission the efficiency and flexibility of its accommodation will be improved, while reducing costs and creating a responsible attitude and better physical image. For the authorities it will bring a better balanced development to the city, an integrated European quarter, improved accessibility and stimulation of local economy and new housing. The citizens will also profit from a better integrated and accessible European quarter, more openness of the institutions, new local facilities and housing and better inclusion in the development process. Private parties in their turn will have more certainty about future developments in the whole district, clear development guidelines with flexibility and space for own initiative, many development possibilities and also better inclusion in the development process.

This concept will be further examined in chapters 11 to 16, which describes extensively what a smart, sustainable and inclusive development process, urban development on city, neighbourhood and block level and accommodation for the European Commission will look like. Chapter 17 reflects upon this vision and strategy and studies the effects on the current problems in the area and the consequences for the different stakeholder groups.

Europe 2020 program

Europe 2020 is the EU’s growth strategy for the coming decade. Europe faces a moment of transformation. The crisis has wiped out years of economic and social progress and exposed structural weaknesses in Europe’s economy. In the meantime, the world is moving fast and long-term challenges – globalisation, pressure on resources, ageing – intensify. The EU must now take charge of its future.

Europe can succeed if it acts collectively, as a Union. We need a strategy to help us come out stronger from the crisis and turn the EU into a smart, sustainable and inclusive economy delivering high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion. Europe 2020 sets out a vision of Europe’s social market economy for the 21st century.

Europe 2020 puts forward three mutually reinforcing priorities:

- Smart growth: developing an economy based on knowledge and innovation.
- Sustainable growth: promoting a more resource efficient, greener and more competitive economy.
- Inclusive growth: fostering a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion.

Figure 10.6 Description of the Europe 2020 program of the European Union. Source: European Commission, 2010.
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11. Development process

This chapter describes a possible development strategy for the European quarter. The proposal opens up the vicious circles in the process, to improve the urban environment and at the same time to accommodate the European Commission. It translates the concept of a smart, sustainable and inclusive process into guidelines for how to design the development procedure. Based upon lessons learned from theory and current practice, it examines the formation of coalitions and commitment in the European quarter, the development approach and financial and process management. The development approach will be described in more detail in chapter 13.

11.1 A smart, sustainable and inclusive development process

The current development process in the European quarter is characterized by a lack of shared vision and goals for the development of the district, poor commitment and leadership of the main stakeholders and as a result a situation in which all parties are waiting for each other. Designing the process according to the principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive planning can break through the current vicious circles in the process and will mean the following:

- Smart – No grand master planning or a tabula rasa approach, but a gradual, step-by-step transformation of the neighbourhood by making use of opportunities and steering existing and future (private) investment streams (see financial management and development approach).
- Sustainable – No blueprint design, but a framework adaptable to changes over time with an independent body to guide decision-making consistently regardless of political changes (see development approach and process management).
- Inclusive – Involvement of parties concerned in the process, creating coalitions and building a common vision which all parties can commit to (see coalitions, commitment and vision).

11.2 Coalitions

In the current process of development in the European quarter all parties are waiting for each other before acting. This indicates that there is a mutual dependency between the stakeholder groups, i.e. the separate parties cannot act on their own in the development of the neighbourhood due to the great complexity. However this mutual dependency is not recognized as such and therefore not used to create coalitions. Though the creation of coalitions is crucial because due to the growing complexity of urban management and the fact that no single party can operate all the instruments, drive a unilateral vision or offer an all-encompassing solution (Franzen et al., 2011:11, see chapter 5).

Therefore one must demonstrate that mutual gains can be created and that the actors need each other to achieve their own individual objectives. This interdependency in the neighbourhood is shown highly schematically in figure 11.1. It gives an impression about where these dependencies exist. Furthermore it can be beneficial to take advantage of existing competencies and expertise found at the different levels of parties involved by working in coalitions.

The Brussels-Capital Region - as the main authority with responsibility for urban planning and the main local party - and the European Commission – as largest owner and occupier of real estate in the area with great interest in the development - are the key parties that can lead a process out of this vicious circle and take the initiative to the formation of coalitions. They are strongly dependent on each other and therefore should express the ambition that they want to join their forces to improve the European quarter, in close cooperation with other stakeholders involved. This can serve as an example for the other stakeholders and can work as a catalyst.

The organisation of coalitions and partnerships in the European quarter can be dynamic. It may vary over time and scale in terms of parties involved, in the form of cooperation, and in the means and time period. However a few starting points must be laid down and serve as guiding principles for the cooperation. First there will be coalitions at two scale levels: one large coalition at the neighbourhood level and several smaller coalitions at the block level (see process management section). Second for each coalition a distinction must be made between partners – stakeholders who share the decision-making and accept responsibility for making things happen, participants – stakeholders who actively participate in the decision-making process, but are not prime movers and consultees - stakeholders who are formally asked for their views but do not engage in the collaborative process. This creates a clear framework for all parties concerned, laying down their position and interest.

At neighbourhood level, the coalition framework will roughly look like this:

- Partners: Brussels Capital Region, (representation of) owners/occupiers of real estate (e.g. European Commission), representation of landowners
- Participants: Municipalities of Brussels, Etterbeek and Elsene, citizens, interest groups
- Consultees: Experts, Region of Flanders and Wallonia, ...
At block level, the coalition framework will roughly look like this:
- **Partners**: Brussels Capital Region, owners/occupiers of real estate, landowners
- **Participants**: Relevant municipality, representation of citizens and interest groups
- **Consultees**: Experts

Section 11.7 examines the structure of coalitions and the process organisation in more detail.

### 11.3 Vision

At this moment there is no shared vision between the main stakeholders on the development of the whole European quarter. There is a master plan (Richtschema) for the district set up by the Brussels-Capital Region in 2008. Although there has been consultation in the preparation phase of the plan, it is a rather broad and sometimes vague vision, which is not widely supported by other stakeholder groups. Besides the master plan there has been an urban design competition for the area along the Rue de la Loi. This was initiated by the Brussels-Capital Region in coordination with the European Commission. However there was no clear underlying vision to the competition, it takes up only a relatively small part of the neighbourhood and other stakeholders (landowners, citizens) were not informed or consulted on it.

It is very important to build a shared vision, as this is the first step in collaborative urban planning. It should be convincing enough to gain broad support and to that end it must be sufficient realistic and focus on the opportunities and problems of the urban region and it must do justice to the interests and goals of all stakeholders in a balanced way.

In this report a possible vision is described, which is used as a connecting thread for the development strategy for the European quarter. It can serve as an inspiration to think in another direction than which is customary. It takes the key elements of European policy; smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, as a guiding principle for the development of the district to create an example of European policy in making an attractive and sustainable city, as described in the previous chapter.

This vision must be seen as an example of how a vision can be built that connects various stakeholders, shows mutual gains and directs the development. However it is crucial that if the involved stakeholders want to change the area, they must build a clear vision together from the beginning which they strongly support and not just taking a vision from someone else.

---

**Figure 11.1 Schematic overview of interdependency of main stakeholders groups.**
11.4 Commitment and support

Currently there is a great lack of commitment of the main parties involved to the development of the European quarter, as showed in chapter 7. Besides that there is a lack of strong political support at the various governmental levels (Federal state, Regions of Flanders and Wallonia and municipalities) and societal support from citizens and interest groups is.

It is essential for the success of the developments in the district that there is, after forming the necessary coalitions and shared vision, explicit commitment at the highest political level to the principles and strategies of the project. This involves formal commitment in the form of agreements as well as informal commitment – openness and trust between the various parties. Every involved party needs furthermore a leading person who can take full responsibility for the project and who has power (the position in the administrative hierarchy, financial capabilities, specific know-how or other powers) and charisma to successfully drive the project forward. Agreement can be found at the lower levels in the organisation, but not (always) at the highest levels. It is crucial that this changes and that there is commitment and leadership at the highest level of all involved organisations. This can be realised by recognition at the top of the organisation that there is a mutual dependency between the parties and that the current vicious circle is harmful for all parties concerned. Only this top of the organisations can break open the process.

Furthermore broad political and societal support, although difficult in the Belgium situation with many layers of government, must be built by the involvement of the relevant stakeholders and interest groups (coalitions) and open communication in the process.

11.5 Development approach

Current development practice in Brussels and the European quarter is focused on control, on guiding development through regulations laid down in land development plans on various scale levels. This way of planning gives little freedom, or sometimes on the contrary a lot of freedom to (private) parties for development. This system is not very well suited for developments in such complex situations of high density mixed uses of such prominence and besides that it is not providing a clearly guiding to a certain vision or goal. The urban design of de Portzamparc is an example of this. It sketches an image for the future development of the area, which must be detailed by architectural competitions, but it does not offer sufficient freedom to respond to possible future changes and opportunities, indeed it constrains options with no guarantee of delivering the type of quarter that all stakeholders want to see. It therefore it raises resistance of various parties.

For the European quarter it is crucial to have a flexible planning system, a dynamic process of development that can be adapted over time to a changing context. This because the transformation of the area is complex and will last for several decades as it will be a step-by-step gradual transformation. In that time the demand can have changed considerably. Also the fact that many different parties are involved and that the position of the government is not so strong, make it necessary to guide private initiative, instead of making a blueprint master plan which does not fit up with demands of the parties that have to execute it. The flexible planning system must set out broad urban design aspirations and principles, providing scope for interpretation and development within defined parameters and being flexible in design solutions, to be able to respond to changes. Crucial is that it provides (degrees of) certainty for all parties and co-ordination to ensure that the component parts contribute to a greater whole, as defined in the vision.

However, it may be also necessary to lay down a few fixed rules or principles which are non-negotiable to ensure critical urban elements and interests. The planning system must therefore be build up from three layers of planning instruments:

- **Control instruments** – powerful regulatory regimes with the ability to refuse development
- **Guiding instruments** – a range of plans and guides providing ‘positive’ encouraging of appropriate development.
- **Incentive instruments** – ‘bonus rules’ making the prospect of development more attractive enabling development that is in the public interest.

Figure 11.2 The European Commission and the Brussels-Capital Region are in need of commitment and leadership at the highest (political) level.
The framework can protect and promote the interests of local stakeholders and ensure that basic development principles important are followed, whilst at the same time offering flexibility to the market to take up opportunities (in partnership) as and when they arise.

Each instrument works on a specific level of detail, with particular power and techniques adjusted to the desirable outcome. All instruments together form a kind of ‘toolbox’ with different tools serving different means. The instruments are linked so that they complement and reinforce each other. These instruments are brought into action on two scale levels:

**Neighbourhood level - development strategy**
Translates the vision into a spatial concept for the area to guide the development, defines its position in the city and identifies interventions at neighbourhood level.

**Block level - urban design framework**
Sets out urban design aspirations and principles, standards and expectations of qualities, provide coordination and ensure that components parts contribute to a greater whole.

- **Control** - clear defined fixed rules that cannot be flexible, formulated at block level.
- **Guiding** - guidelines that set out minimum and/or maximum values or qualitative criteria within which can be developed.
- **Incentive** – ‘bonus’ rules which create an incentive to contribute extra to the general interest.

This planning system and its instruments will be further elaborated and explained in text and figures in chapter 14.

### 11.6 Financial management

At present the development plans in the European quarter, for example the urban design of de Portzamparc for the area along the Rue de la Loi, are not well enough adapted to the financial structures in the area. Proposals do not match the real estate cycle of the buildings in the area, i.e. they are not geared to the quality, age and occupation of a building. There are for example proposals to demolish new buildings and to create public space at the plot of a building that will be occupied for several years. This results in a very critical, or even opposed attitude of private parties towards the developments. However, the development of the European quarter is very dependent on private initiatives, due to the fact that the authorities do not have a powerful stake and no land positions. It is therefore imperative to get the private parties engaged in the development plans.

The development of the European quarter will take up a lot of time and will be spread over several decades. For that reason, plans must be flexible and capable to adapt to the real estate cycle of the existing buildings. It must be a gradual development which can start a places which are promising to begin the transformation.

These promising places are defined by the following elements:

- Locations with old and/or vacant buildings
- Locations owned and/or used by the European Commission where there is a need for transformation.
- Locations that will be left by the European Commission and therefore in the future will be vacant.

On these spots the development process can start, followed in the years after with places that has also became promising to develop. This results in a gradual transformation process, based upon the natural life cycle of buildings.

The urban design framework, as described in the previous section will guide these private initiatives. It provides on the one hand a certain degree of confidence for the private parties for the development possibilities on their lands, as on the other hand a certain degree of freedom to adapt the development proposal to the future demand within the guidelines of the framework. It is important that there is a continuously iterative process between the urban design framework and the financial management, so that the framework will stay in keeping with the financial feasibility of the development.

For the financing of projects on neighbourhood and block level two different principles are applied. On neighbourhood level, projects for the general interest, such as infrastructural projects and public space, are financed by using the instrument of land value capture. Value capture is the appropriation of
land-value gains resulting from the installation of special public improvements in a limited benefit area. It is a betterment levy which aims to finance all or part of the costs of neighbourhood projects. Value capture is based on the premise that property owners benefiting from a public/collective investment should pay some portion of the cost of public improvements from which the added value is originally derived (Smith and Gihring, 2006). This will be executed by the creation of a development fund at neighbourhood level, which will be financed by development levies from new developments in the area.

On block level the principle of balancing is used. A fund at block level will be set up when development is starting to balance unequal costs and revenues between the landowners of the specific block, so that parties will not benefit or be harmed more or less than other parties in that block and can create public space and amenities together.

A precondition for the realisation of an area development project is that the project has to be viable, i.e. whether the project can be met at a desired rate of profit. To study the viability of the proposed projects, a financial land development model is set up. The aim of the model is to get a good impression of the feasibility of the projects. It calculates if the proposed developments on a defined area are feasible, i.e. if the revenues on a certain period of time are greater than the costs. This area is basically a block, although it can also be a part of a block or several (parts of) blocks together. The size and boundaries of the area depend on the development potential of the plots and the possibility to balance costs and revenues.

The land development model consists of four different sections, which are described in more detail below:

- General data
- Costs
- Revenues
- Adjustment tools

**General data**

The general data describes the basic assumptions on price level, interest, costs and revenues. It furthermore handles the characteristics of the specific block, the location and current buildings on the site.

**Costs**

The costs for development are composed of the acquisition costs for current buildings, costs for demolition and land development, building costs and contribution to development fund. The acquisition costs are a representation of the current value of the existing buildings on the block, as a compensation for the expected revenues from the building during the forthcoming exploitation period. This value is determined by indicators for rent level and yield published by agencies and comparison with similar buildings. Costs for demolition and land development are based on indicators from Brussels-Capital Region. The building costs are composed of three elements. First the construction costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of costs</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition costs of current buildings (2, 4, 8)</td>
<td>Built up from estimation current rent level and yield based on indicators and comparison with similar buildings.</td>
<td>Varies from 1375 €/m² GFA to 4000 €/m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for demolition and land development (2, 3)</td>
<td>Distinction between demolition of underground and above ground structures. Based on indicators.</td>
<td>Underground 300 €/m² GFA Above ground 200 €/m² GFA Costs for public space 200 €/m² GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building costs (2, 5)</td>
<td>Built up from cost for building, additional costs and a profit and risk rate for developing parties.</td>
<td>Building costs for offices (example) • Building costs 1500 €/m² GFA • Additional costs 24% • Profit and risk 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to development fund (7)</td>
<td>Levy as fixed amount per square meter new office or commercial development. Based on current Charges d’Urbanism</td>
<td>125 €/m² GFA new office or commercial development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.1 Overview of general data. The numbers refer to sources mentioned in appendix B

Table 11.2 Overview of different types of costs. The numbers refer to sources mentioned in appendix B
– the ‘real’ costs for constructing a building. Second additional costs are charged as a percentage of the construction costs. This debit item covers among others development costs, fees, levies, insurance and financing costs. Third are costs for profit and risk of the developer. This is a compensation for parties who take a risk in developing the projects, which makes it attractive to participate.

Another expenditure is the contribution to the development fund, based on the principle of land value capture. This contribution is a fixed amount for each square meter of new office or commercial development. For new housing or social functions this levy does not have to be paid to make it more attractive to develop these functions. The level of this levy is set on 125 euro/m2, to the example of the current Charge d’Urbanism.

Revenues
This section gives an overview of the revenues in the project from selling and letting buildings. It is based on the expected rent level and yield or selling price. The values are founded on indicators published by agencies and by comparison with similar new buildings.

Adjustment tools
The adjustment tools are the most important element of the model. Here the various elements that directly influence the viability of the project can be varied. This involves the density - or the volume of development -, the portion of public space, division of functions and phasing. By changing one or more of these elements, the viability of the project will change as well. In this way several design options can be tested.

Financial analysis
In the model all above mentioned elements are brought together and placed on a time line. By using net present values and taking the interest into account an estimation can be made if revenues of the developments exceed the costs. When the balance in the end of the project is greater than zero, the project is feasible (figure 11.4). In appendix B the whole financial model is showed.

There are considerable limitations connected to the model. All data is based on assumptions and small changes in these assumptions can give a total different outcome. If for example the estimated value of the current buildings appears to be not very realistic, the viability of the project can be under pressure. However, it does give an indication of the feasibility of projects and shows the effect on viability of changing the adjustment tools. An overview of all indicators where the general data, costs and revenues are based on and the accompanying sources can be found in appendix B.
11.7 Organisation and instruments

At present the coordination of projects in the European quarter, as for example the urban design competition for the area along the Rue de la Loi, comes separately from each involved organisation. This results in a slow, inefficient approach in which individual interests – instead of a collective – play a large role and parties have to wait for each other, creating unnecessary uncertainty.

The nature and complexity of the assignment in the European quarter makes that it cannot be handled within the existing organisational structures. The two main stakeholder groups, the Brussels-Capital Region - as the main authority with responsibility for urban planning and the main local party - and the European Commission – as largest owner and occupier of real estate in the area with great interest in the development – cannot launch the development on their own, let alone the other stakeholders. Therefore an organisational structure should be found that can facilitate the process of corporation between the Region and the EC, to get the process of development going. This can be done in the form of a neighbourhood development company, a public-private organisational structure, which will be leaded by a (from the perspective of these parties) independent director.

This neighbourhood development corporation organises the involvement of the other stakeholder groups. It will direct the process of development over the whole duration of the transformation and has the power to decide upon the development strategy and financing of projects. It is positioned in between the strategic level of decision making and level of detailed implementation (figure 11.5).

Position in existing policy structures

The process organisation and the development strategy must be positioned within the existing policy structure and plans for the European quarter and included in the planning system.

In chapter 3 the existing policy structure in Brussels and plans for the European quarter are described. In short, the Brussels Town Planning Code (COBAT) provides the legal basis for the planning policy (BCR, 2008:13). It defines four types of planning instruments. There are instruments on the regional (Brussels-Capital Region) and municipal level, and on both levels there are indicative and prescriptive instruments (figure 11.6). Furthermore there are some non legal planning instruments that are important for the development of the European quarter: the International Development Plan and Master Plan (Schéma directeur, Richtschema).

There are some difficulties with the policy instruments which are recognized by the Brussels-Capital Region. They state that the policy instruments are sometimes too strict and not enough affiliated with each other. For example the procedure to make changes in the PRAS is very long, because the change must be first laid down in the PRD. This is problematic because some directions of the PRAS are superseded. Furthermore
they state that the policy instruments are not operational enough, miss flexibility and are soon superseded (ADT-ATO, 2011).

Besides the current critiques on the system the proposed new development strategy with its flexible planning mechanism will not fit into this policy structure. The PRAS and PPAS for the European quarter are not in line with the starting points of the proposed strategy. The PRAS for example has put an administrative function on almost the entire district (see chapter 3.3), which will not allow the area to slowly transform into a mixed neighbourhood. Moreover these instruments are too accurate and do not allow for flexible rules, by which the urban design framework cannot be executed.

However, the proposed development strategy is is broadly in accordance with the starting points of the more general plans, the Regional and Local Development plan (PRD and PCD), International Development Plan and Master Plan. The regional development plan and International Development plan discusses the special status of Brussels due to the international organisations extensively and therefore gives also special attention to the European quarter. The nomination of the area as ‘strategic development zone’ (Zone-levier, Hefboomgebied) within the framework of the PRD confirms the special status of the neighbourhood. The proposed development strategy is generally in keeping with the ambition of the master plan to make the district a sustainable place with a mix of functions accessible to all (see chapter 3.3) and with the Local Development Plan which aims at revival of the living environment and introduction of facilities and cultural activities.

Concluding, it may be said that the proposed development strategy in broad lines corresponds to the indicative policies of the municipality and the Brussels-Capital Region, the International Development Plan and Master Plan. However it does not match with the prescriptive plans, the PRAS and PPAS (figure 11.6). Therefore, the special position of the European quarter which is mentioned in the indicative plans must be further expanded to a special planning status for the area, to make the implementation of the development strategy possible.

**Neighbourhood development company**

To be able to implement the proposed strategy, the European quarter must be excluded from the Regional and Local Land Use plans (PRAS and PPAS). The district must get a special status, in which the planning competencies of the Brussels-Capital Region and the municipalities must be transferred to the neighbourhood development company. This special legal status will increase the strength of the organisation. The following competencies will be transferred to the organisation:

- Acquire, dispose and hold land
- Make arrangements for building works and develop transport and other infrastructure
- Being the local planning authority for the European quarter, deciding on development strategy and urban design framework.

The neighbourhood development company must report and is accountable to Brussels-Capital Region and the European Commission for its work.

Summarizing, the neighbourhood development company has the following aims, power, methods and means:

- **Aim** - Watch and manage the general interests in the district as a representation of the main stakeholders.
- **Power** – Being the local planning authority for the European quarter, deciding on development strategy, urban design framework, development approach, infrastructural works and financing.
- **Methods and responsibilities** - Initiate, guide and (partly) finance projects on neighbourhood level, mainly in the field of infrastructural interventions and (large scale) public facilities.
- **Means** – Projects will be financed by a general development which is financed by development levies (see chapter 11.6 for detailed information) and partly by external (governmental) financing for large scale (infrastructure) projects exceeding the scale of the neighbourhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational use (indicative)</th>
<th>Passive use (prescriptive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Plan</td>
<td>Regional Land Use Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PRD, GewOP)</td>
<td>(PRAS, GBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municiple level</td>
<td>Local Land Use Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Development Plans</td>
<td>(PPAS, BBP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PCD, GemOP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11.6 Policy instruments (based on Haumont et al., 2007:4) which are in accordance with the proposed strategy (green) and which must be excluded (red).
Block level – corporation agreement

Besides the neighbourhood development corporation on block level tailored corporation agreements between the Brussels-Capital Regions, the landowners and other interest parties will create per block when development will start at that specific block. These are private agreements between stakeholder and can exist without adjustments in the legal framework. In principle the costs and revenues will be balanced between the different landowners within the block. When there are significantly more revenues or costs at one block compared to the others (by financial favourable or unfavourable development guidelines), landowners or developers must contribute to the general neighbourhood development fund or can claim from it. The organisation on block level has the following aims, power, methods and means:

- **Aim** – Guide development on block level
- **Methods and responsibility** – Manage coordination between different parties, guide detailing of design proposal and manage temporary fund for balancing and investments for general interests.
- **Means** – A fund at block level will be set up when development is starting to balance unequal costs and revenues between the landowners of the specific block, so that parties will not benefit or be harmed more or less than other parties in that block.

**Remarks**

The planning system in Brussels is very complex and involves several layers of government. The proposed position of the neighbourhood development corporation is therefore in legal terms difficult and based on many assumptions. It is an indication of how the organisational structure could look like, but it requires a lot more research. However it shows a direction which is chosen more and more in complex urban development projects with many stakeholders and a difficult planning situation. Examples of these development corporations are the London Docklands Development Corporation, which guided the regeneration of the London Docklands and Olympic Delivery Authority which is the public body responsible for developing and building the new venues and infrastructure for the Games and their use after 2012. These kind of structures must be studied further before applying a similar organisation in Brussels.

11.8 Reflection

This chapter describes elements that contribute to a successful urban transformation process. All discussed instruments seem rather obvious and one can think that this adds nothing ‘new’ to existing practice. However one can see, from the conclusions from the interviews (chapter 7), that in the European quarter some crucial elements in the process – among others clear commitment, leadership and coalitions – are missing. In that sense there is, although it seems very obvious, still a lot of improvement to be made.

Nevertheless, the difficult point is not to declare that an integral development approach is valuable and necessary and that mutual dependence can bring win-win solutions, but to implement it in the procedures and to get all the parties to work and commit on it. It may be that this way of working is ambitious at the moment and is far from current practice, to implement it in the whole district. Then one can choose to point out one development as a kick-off project, a kind of test case for both the way of cooperation, as for the urban design principles and accommodation of the European Commission.
12. City level

This following chapters (12, 13 and 14) discuss the urban design as part of the overall development strategy, as described in chapter 11. It handles how the concept of smart sustainable and inclusive development is translated into planning and design guidelines. It focuses on three scale levels: the city of Brussels, the European quarter and block/building level. This chapter discusses the urban situation on the level of the city of Brussels. It briefly reflects on the current spatial state in the city and the position of the European institutions in it. It examines the spatial demands of the institutions, the choices they make and what effects they have or could have. After a critical reflection it proposes another perspective to the developments.

This chapter is by no means aiming at giving a complete analysis of the developments in Brussels, nor does it provide an overall vision for the city. It reflects upon the developments in the city from the point of view of the European quarter and the decisions the European institutions can take. From that perspective it proposes a different way of looking at the development of the city and the choices the European Commission can make in this.

Brussels faces major urban challenges like strong population growth, unemployment, shortage of public amenities, traffic problems and the international call of the city – which runs into the residential use (Declerck and Dudal, 2011:14). Additionally there are major differences between districts in the city concerning income, education and employment. One can describe this by drawing a virtual line through the city, which divides the prosperous East and South-East regions from the poor Western and North-Western regions (figure 12.1). The European Commission is now located at three different sites in Brussels, with by far the greatest presence in the European quarter (800,000 m2). In the accommodation strategy of the EC they want to keep this significant presence in the district and develop up to three external sites, mostly to reduce costs.

The Commission has recently decided to develop one external site at Delta, in the South-East of the city. This decision can be heavily criticised, both from the perspective of the authorities as from the perspective of the EC. The establishment of an external site in the South-east of the city will enlarge the differences and contrasts in the city, as it brings employment and an economic impulse to a region that is already very prosperous (figure 12.2). Besides that it is a not yet developed area, where a lot of infrastructure and facilities have to be constructed, whereas there are numerous places in the city where these facilities are present and where there is also a vacancy of buildings or obvious development possibilities. The specific location of Delta – in between three railway lines – is furthermore not suitable at all for integration in the city. There will arise a kind of EU ghetto, closed off from the rest of the city. For the European Commission it is also not a logical choice. It is flatly opposed to the own policy of the EU to promote balanced development in the city. Other locations are better accessible by public transport and there must be heavily invested in the construction of infrastructures and facilities by the EC itself. It furthermore runs counter to their own wish to be integrated in the city and it is questionable if a closed off ‘ghetto’ promotes the image of the EU.
Projecting the concept of smart, sustainable and inclusive development on the choices of the European Commission and the development of Brussels can change the city considerably. The translation of the concept can look as follows:

- **Smart** - Locate at existing urban areas to make efficient use of existing structures and facilities, such as infrastructure and public transport. Locate in more than one cluster to have financial benefits and to be more flexible.
- **Sustainable** - Active promotion of clean transportation by development of clusters at public transport nodes and discouraging car use. Locate at existing urban areas to be able to (re)use resources such as infrastructures, buildings and facilities and not have to construct new ones.
- **Inclusive** - Locate at more than one location in the city, resulting in a balanced development. Have a responsible attitude towards the city by promoting cohesion and not creating larger contrasts in making the decision where to locate the resources.

The central location of the European institutions will remain the European quarter, as a lot of facilities are present there and it is a symbol of the EU. The pressure on the area must be decreased to create space for other functions, and with that better integration in its surroundings. For financial and flexibility reasons and for a balanced development in the city, external clusters of EU functions can be created in existing urban areas at public transport nodes. Examples hereof could be the North and South stations, which are both hubs of public transport. In addition the South station is the gateway to London, Paris, Cologne and Amsterdam as the high speed trains arrive here. There is a lot of vacancy of office space in these areas, giving many possibilities of using existing resources. Besides that the North and South stations are more or less located on the ‘border’ of the prosperous and less prosperous districts. It can therefore be a good first step in the direction of better balanced development in the city, without having the European institutions to be pioneers and to locate themselves in the middle of the less prosperous districts. External clusters, or smaller locations of EU institutions can also be located at other places in the city, for example near the airport or in the city centre, depending on requirements of the institutions.

All together this strategy will result in a more balanced development in the city and an improved integration of clusters of the European institutions. The creation of external locations will give financial benefits and the size of clusters are adapted so that there can be economies of scale. There is furthermore a greater differentiation in locations, which can be in keeping with the requirements of the specific function. Chapter 15 will examine the accommodation strategy of the European Commission further.

The European quarter will certainly remain the prime location of the European institutions. Important facilities and functions must be located here, as the headquarters of the European Commission, Parliament and Council are located there. However, there should be more space for other types of uses, such as housing and amenities, to be able to improve the integration of the area in its surroundings and prevent it from being a European ghetto of civil servants. EU functions that do not need direct proximity of the headquarters can be located in the external clusters, where the prices are lower, so that it will also bring financial benefits.
13. Neighbourhood level

As described in the urban analysis in chapter 6, the European quarter has several problems concerning the urban environment. The area is not well integrated in its surroundings and there is an one-sided distribution of functions which results in a desolated district after 6pm. The headquarters of the institutions are poorly integrated, or so to say ‘aliens in open space’ in great contrasts to its surroundings. The two main infrastructural axes are very pressured and form barriers and heavily decrease the quality of place.

At the moment the most important development in the European quarter is Project Urban Loi, an urban design competition, won by Christian de Portzamparc. The plan focuses on the area along the Rue de Loi and proposes to highly densify the blocks around this axis and to introduce a mix of functions (figure 13.1). Although the project has great ambitions and aims to transform the area from a concrete administrative ghetto into a glimmering ‘open city to the sky’ (Brussels Info Place, 2010), the project does not seem to solve some of the main problems. One can for example question if it is wise to densify along the Rue de la Loi as there still is a great mobility issue and if there is a demand for other functions than offices. Furthermore by densifying this axis, the barrier will be enlarged and there has not been put a lot of attention to the connection with the surrounding neighbourhoods. Besides that, densification will have a huge impact on the living quality North of Rue de la Loi. More importantly there is no ‘solution’ proposed for the other areas in the neighbourhood where there are as many problems, as for example the Rue Belliard is as problematic as the Rue de la Loi.

13.1 A smart, sustainable and inclusive neighbourhood

Projecting the concept of smart, sustainable and inclusive development on the urban environment in the European quarter can change the neighbourhood in a positive way. The translation of the guiding principles will look as follows:

Smart – densifying at strategic points in the neighbourhood, to make new developments possible without building the area over. Introduction of other uses (amenities and housing) in small clusters in the area, to create a better mix of functions, ensuring a critical mass and economies of scale within the clusters.

Sustainable – decrease intensity of traffic by reorganising flows of traffic and slowly reducing it, removing parking at the streets as much as possible to create more space for slow traffic. Invest in new public transport facilities.

Inclusive – improve the integration of the neighbourhood by enhancing the north-south connections, create public space at strategic points where people can meet with amenities around these places which attracts them and stimulate the local economy.

The next pages show what these smart, sustainable and inclusive interventions will look like in the European quarter. The European quarter is split up in two parts, the area around the main buildings of the European institutions in the east of the district and the grid structure with urban blocks in the west (figure 13.2). These areas have a different morphological structure, different functions and types of buildings. They therefore require a different approach in development. The two main east-west axes, the Rue de la Loi and the Rue Belliard connect the two areas. The concept of the interventions will be explained for both areas on the next pages.
Current situation: disconnected aliens in open space...

Use the opportunity to make better connections between the institutions ...

... by removing the barriers of Rue de la Loi and Rue Belliard at strategic points ...

... and creating new public spaces ...

... along which north-south routes can be enhanced, improving the connection to important places in the surroundings.
Neighbourhood level

Reduce the impact of the barriers by implementing two-way traffic and slowly reducing the intensity ...

... add a new metro connection to improve the accessibility by public transport ...

... improve the connection to surrounding neighbourhoods by enhancing the north-south axes ...

... which connects important existing public space and new public spaces at the crossings with the north-south axes...

... densify along east west axes, excluding the north south corridors ...

... offices will be concentrated along the east west axes, whereas the improved north south axes create a good place for the development of housing. Where these two areas meet will be the place for new amenities.
13.2 Development strategy

In the current situation the main buildings of the European institutions are aliens in open space: closed off and not connected to their surroundings. There is a great opportunity to improve the connection between these buildings, as they represent the three main organisations in the European union: the European Commission, the Council of Europe and the European Parliament. At present tourists are lost in the district on their search for the image and representation of Europe. Groups who want to raise their voice to the European institutions have no place to go in the area. The creation of a ‘park of Europe’, a system of connected public spaces can, create a destination for tourist and a place to demonstrate for European citizens. The high security requirements of the buildings are met by removing the barriers at some point and with that traffic flows. With that the risk of attacks with vehicles will be decreased, which makes it possible to make the buildings visibly more open. How this connection between the buildings and their environment will be improved is shown in figures on page 138.

Currently the western area of the European quarter with the grid structure is almost fully occupied with offices. The area is dominated by the east west axes which are overloaded with traffic. The north south streets are meaningless and therefore the connection to northern and southern neighbourhoods is very weak.

To improve the quality of place, the liveability and liveliness in the area six spatial interventions are proposed (figure on page 139). These interventions aim to reduce the pressure of traffic on the area and enhance the public transport. Densifying in well defined clusters enables developments in the area without over building the area and leaving some air. Furthermore certain clusters are indicated to develop new functions, such as housing and amenities. By pointing out these locations, functions will not be scattered over the area, the clusters will create a certain critical mass for each type of functions. Public space is introduced at strategic points in the area, surrounded by amenities, where different groups of people will be attracted to and can meet each other.

The figure 13.3 summarizes the development strategy on neighbourhood level and the spatial interventions. On the following pages the various elements of the plan - grouped around the themes of density, missed-use, human scale, public space, accessibility and security - will be discussed in more detail.

Figure 13.3 Neighbourhood development strategy.
The introduction of a substantial amount of housing and amenities makes that the area now serves more than one purpose, which is a requirement to make it a vital urban area (Montgomery, 1998; Jacobs, 1961). These new functions will be introduced in the area in small clusters. Offices will be concentrated along the east-west axes, whereas the improved north-south axes create a good place for the development of housing. Where these two areas meet will be the place for new amenities for the employees, inhabitants of the surrounding neighbourhoods and later inhabitants from the area itself. Also the existing areas with a mix of functions in the southern part of the neighbourhood will be enhanced.

The development of clusters of functions is based on lessons learned from the reference study and makes sure that there will be a certain critical mass or economy of scale within the cluster. Residents have neighbours, shops are surrounded by other shops and amenities to attract people and office clusters can have economies of scale.

The amenities will be generally placed on ground floor level in combination with offices or housing at the upper floors, depending on the location in the district. The clusters of amenities also make room for special functions of the European institutions, such as conference facilities, cafeterias and canteens, which are (partly) open to the public. This allows facilities to be shared and improves the transparency of the institutions. This matter is examined in more detail in accommodation strategy of the European Commission in chapter 15.
Neighbourhood level
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**Human scale**

There is also attention to the human scale and quality of place in the proposed developments. Large urban blocks are split up into parts to improve the permeability of the area and make it more intricate (Montgomery, 1998). Both the east-west axes and the north-south axes will be redeveloped to improve the human scale in the area, which is now under pressure by small streets and a large amount of traffic. The Rue de la Loi and Rue Belliard will be gradually transformed from a four lane, one-way traffic road, to a two-way traffic road which still has the capacity to transport a considerable amount of traffic, but which gives more space to the soft modes of transport and is more friendly for the human perception. The profiles of the north-south axes will also be transformed. Street parking will be removed to create space for broad sidewalks with trees, which define the axes and give also here more space to the soft modes of transport.

**Public space**

Both the case of London and The Hague have showed the importance of public space on different scale levels with clear defined uses. This is translated in the proposed development strategy in the squares at the crossings north-south and east-west axes, with a concentration of amenities and public functions at these points. These new public spaces can serve as meeting places in the district (Gehl, 1995) for all kinds of people, such as the working population, inhabitants of the surrounding neighbourhoods, tourist and gradually inhabitants from the area itself. Furthermore public space at street level is added due to the transformation of the east-west and north-south axes, as described in the previous section. Important existing public are also connected to the north-south axes, which will make them interesting routes through the area connecting public spaces.
Regarding the issue of security the two cases in the reference study demonstrate that security requirements do not necessarily have to cause a separation of functions or closed off areas for the public. However, safety zones should be clearly defined. In the European quarter this is done by making a distinction in approach between the area around the main buildings of the European institutions – which need a high security level – and the grid of urban blocks. In the first area the high security requirements, which make it difficult to introduce other functions, are accepted. However, the area is made more pleasant by closing large parts off for traffic (which makes it also better secured) and making it better accessible for pedestrians by the introduction of high-quality public space. In the area with urban blocks the security requirements are lower, which makes it possible to create a mix of functions as described in the previous sections.
14. Block level

This chapter discusses the implementation of the principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive development on block level. It builds on the development strategy on neighbourhood level as discussed in the previous chapter and explains the urban design framework.

14.1 Smart, sustainable and inclusive blocks

Projecting the concept of smart, sustainable and inclusive development on block level can change the small scale structure of the neighbourhood. The translation of the guiding principles will look as follows:

- **Smart** – regulated possibilities to densify, clear distinction between functions at ground floor and functions at upper floors.
- **Sustainable** – priority for slow traffic and well integrated public transport, private transportation at the background.
- **Inclusive** – strong control for human scale by design from perspective of users, no massive development. Liveliness on street level by urban plinth, transparent facades and public functions.

14.2 Urban design framework

As stated before, the transformation of the European quarter is complex and will last for several decades. Therefore it is crucial to have a flexible planning system, a dynamic process of development that can be adapted over time to a changing context. Also the fact that many different parties are involved with little governmental influence makes it necessary to guide private initiative, instead of making a blueprint master plan. The flexible planning system, as presented in chapter 11, consists of two layers: the neighbourhood development strategy (chapter 13) and the urban design framework.

The urban design framework regulates the development on block level. It sets out the urban design principles and represents standards and expectations of qualities. It furthermore provides coordination and ensures that components parts contribute to a greater whole. Private or public parties can take the initiative to redevelop (a part of) a block within the guidelines of the framework.

The urban design framework translates the principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive development in three instruments:

- **Block specific rules**
- **Subarea guidelines**
- **‘Bonus’ rules**

The block specific rules are clear defined rules for a particular (part of a) block that cannot be changed. It is a control instrument that guarantees critical urban elements and interests which cannot be regulated with the subarea guidelines. It concerns for example the preservation of heritage, openess of sight lines or position of public space. An example of block specific rules is given in chapter 16.

The subarea guidelines set out design principles on the basis of the five elements for successful urban places: density, mixed-use, human scale, public space and accessibility. It defines minimum and/or maximum values or qualitative criteria within which can be developed. It is a guiding instrument that is tailored to the subarea which it applies to. On the following pages these guidelines are presented and discussed.

‘Bonus’ rules are rules that create an incentive to increase contribution to the general interest. It is an incentive instrument besides the subarea guidelines that rewards extra investment in the general interests with extra development opportunities. These bonus rules are not defined for the area but could for example entail rewarding extra development possibilities (increasing maximum bulk or height) for the development of social housing or public functions.

Figure 14.1 Subareas according to the development strategy.
Subareas
As stated above the subarea guidelines apply to specific areas. On the basis of the neighbourhood development strategy three types of subareas can be distinguished (figure 14.1):

- Central areas – areas at the crossings of north-south and east-west axes with important public spaces and a concentration of amenities.
- Office areas – dense areas with mostly offices.
- Housing areas – areas along the north-south axes that are suitable for the development of housing in combination with offices.

For these three types of subareas different rules apply which are presented on the following pages.

14.3 Sub area guidelines

The subarea guidelines are classified on the basis of the five elements for successful urban places: density, mixed-use, human scale, public space and accessibility. Below the guidelines for each element area are discussed.

Density
The scheme to densify in clusters along the main axes in the European quarter without overbuilding the area is translated in three guidelines: maximum height, maximum bulk and slenderness. The guidelines are based on the viability study, desired human scale and fitting in the urban tissue. The maximum bulk rule regulates the total amount of cubic metre build per square meter plot surface. This ensures a minimum and maximum density in the area. The maximum height ensures that the impact on the surrounding areas remains acceptable and the slenderness rule excludes massif tower development. For the three subareas different values are related to the maximum height and bulk. In the office areas can be build the highest (maximum 120 meter) and with the largest volume (maximum 37 m3/m2), because these are there areas that are indicate to be densified. In the central and housing areas these value are much lower with a maximum height of 65 meter and maximum development bulk of 18 m3/m2. In that way the north-south corridors are excluded from very high and dense developments. The slenderness is for all areas the same, as there is a wish to prevent massif development in the whole district.

Mixed-use
As described in the neighbourhood strategy new functions such as housing and amenities are introduced in clusters. Only amenities will be mixed on building level. The shops and restaurants will generally be placed on ground floor level in combination with offices or housing at the upper floors, depending on the location in the district. The guidelines for the type of functions in the developments is therefore divided in two sections – one for the ground floor level and one for the first floor and above, also because the types of functions on the ground floor are most important for the liveliness on street level and therefore must be regulated separately. The three subareas have different guidelines concerning the types of functions. The central areas have the largest concentration of public functions on ground floor – at least 80% - and a mix of offices and housing at the upper floors. The office and housing areas have at least 40% of public functions and a large concentration of either office or housing at the upper floors.

Human scale
There is significant attention to the human scale and quality of place in the proposed developments, for example in the integration of new (high rise) developments in old structures. The guideline continuity of block guarantees the preservation of the block structure in the area and prevents the development of aliens in open space by demanding 75% of the block to be on the alignment. The setback rule ensures enough light on the streets and prevents a ‘tunnel’ effect: high rise buildings directly on small streets. These guidelines concern all three subareas in the same way. Furthermore the guidelines for transparency and diversity provide open and attractive facades. This is of greater importance in the central areas than in the office or housing areas. Therefore a transparency of 60% is required in the central areas, in comparison with 30% in the other areas.

Public space
The neighbourhood development strategy aims to introduce new public spaces at the crossings of the north-south and east-west axes. Also on other places in the neighbourhood open spaces will be created. The guideline ensures a certain amount of open space accessible to the public on every block. At the blocks in the central areas (at the crossings of the north-south and east-west axes) this public space plays an important role, and must therefore at least 30% of the total block surface. In the other areas an amount of at least 15% public space is sufficient.

Accessibility
The guidelines concerning accessibility guarantee priority for pedestrians and slow traffic and well integrated and highly visible public transport. Private transportation is set at the background, with no parking places on the street and entrances for logistics and parking garages at the backside of the buildings.
## Central areas

### Subarea guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Mixed use</th>
<th>Human scale</th>
<th>Public space</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **D1** - Maximum height | **MU1** - Ground floor
Offices + housing < 20%
Public functions > 80% | **HS1** - Continuity of block
Minimum of 75% block on alignment | **PS1** - Public space
Minimum 30% open space accessible to the public | **A1** - Parking
All required parking for development solved within block |
| **D2** - Maximum bulk | **MU2** - First floor & up
Offices < 60%
Housing > 30%
Public functions > 10% | **HS2** - Setback
H = 1.5 * streetwidth (first 15 meter) |  | **A2** - Entrances
Entrances for parking and logistics at back of buildings |
| **D3** - Slenderness |  | **HS3** - Transparency
> 60% of groundlevel facades transparant |  | **A3** - Public transport
Public transport clearly visible and well accessible |

Figure 14.2 Subarea guidelines for the central areas.
### Office area

#### Subarea guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Mixed use</th>
<th>Human scale</th>
<th>Public space</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong> - Maximum height&lt;br&gt; &lt; 120 meter</td>
<td><strong>MU1</strong> - Ground floor&lt;br&gt; Offices + housing &lt; 60%&lt;br&gt; Public functions &gt; 40%</td>
<td><strong>HS1</strong> - Continuity of block&lt;br&gt; Minimum of 75% block on alignment</td>
<td><strong>PS1</strong> - Public space&lt;br&gt; Minimum 15% open space accessible to the public</td>
<td><strong>A1</strong> - Parking&lt;br&gt; All required parking for development solved within block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong> - Maximum bulk&lt;br&gt; Maximum development bulk 27-37 m3/m2</td>
<td><strong>MU2</strong> - First floor &amp; up&lt;br&gt; Offices &lt; 90%&lt;br&gt; Housing - Public functions &gt; 10%</td>
<td><strong>HS2</strong> - Setback&lt;br&gt; H = 1.5 * streetwidth&lt;br&gt; (first 15 meter)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A2</strong> - Entrances&lt;br&gt; Entrances for parking and logistics at back of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3</strong> - Slenderness&lt;br&gt; Maximum surface of tower (&gt;40m) 750 m2</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HS3</strong> - Transparency&lt;br&gt; &gt; 30% of groundlevel facades transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A3</strong> - Public transport&lt;br&gt; Public transport clearly visible and well accessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14.3 Subarea guidelines for the office areas.
### Housing areas

#### Subarea guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Mixed use</th>
<th>Human scale</th>
<th>Public space</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 - Maximum height &lt; 65 meter</td>
<td>MU1 - Ground floor Offices + housing &lt; 60% Public functions &gt; 40%</td>
<td>HS1 - Continuity of block Minimum of 75% block on alignment</td>
<td>PS1 - Public space Minimum 15% open space accessible to the public</td>
<td>A1 - Parking All required parking for development solved within block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 - Maximum bulk Maximum development bulk 8-18 m³/m²</td>
<td>MU2 - First floor &amp; up Offices &lt; 50% Housing &gt; 50% Public functions -</td>
<td>HS2 - Setback H = 1.5 * streetwidth (first 15 meter)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 - Entrances Entrances for parking and logistics at back of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 - Slenderness Maximum surface of tower (&gt;40m) 750 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS3 - Transparency &gt; 30% of groundlevel facades transparant</td>
<td></td>
<td>A3 - Public transport Public transport clearly visible and well accessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14.4 Subarea guidelines for the housing areas.
15. Accommodation of the European Commission

As described in the analysis of the accommodation of the European Commission (chapter 8), there are several challenges concerning the real estate portfolio the EC has to deal with. The organisation is spread over many small buildings, the office space used per person is very high, not efficient and result in high costs. Possible future uncertainties in the demand are not taken into account. The accommodation policy is furthermore not responsible to the city and acts sometimes flatly opposed to the EU policies. This section discusses what the concept of smart, sustainable and inclusive development can mean for the accommodation of the EC.

15.1 Smart, sustainable and inclusive accommodation

Planning and designing the accommodation according to the principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive development can improve the current situation and will imply the following:

- **Smart** – be efficient by gearing the accommodation - location and building - to the needs of specific functions and manage only these functions that are strictly necessary to be manage by the EC itself.
- **Sustainable** – be flexible to be able to respond on possible future changes and be responsible by promoting clean transportation and resource efficiency.
- **Inclusive** – be responsible by promoting cohesion and integration in the urban environment

15.2 Analysis of demand

To project the concept of smart, sustainable and inclusiveness on the accommodation of the EC, the spatial demand must be investigated in more detail. The EC is now planning for a demand of approximately 1.000.000 m² as a whole, not specified in one way or another. By dividing the spatial demand by function a much clearer idea of the requirements is created. Nine categories of functions are identified:

- Offices
- Parking
- Cafeterias and canteens
- Conference facilities
- Facilities for children
- Workplaces
- Archives
- Leisure functions
- Commercial functions

The office space is further subdivided into different categories, based on the study of Singh (2010):

- Main head quarters
- Line head quarters
- Business back offices
- Support back office

![Figure 15.1 Overview of spatial demand of the European Commission project on scale on the European quarter, divided in several functions.](image-url)
At this moment all types of functions are housed together in more or less the same buildings. However, these functions do have specific requirements with regard to location and building specifications, for example requirements about security. In the following diagrams, the different functions are sorted according to some of these requirements, the level of security needed, the possibility to be outsourced and the possibility to be open to the public (figure 15.2-15.4).

The diagrams show a regularity in the classification of functions. Functions that need a high security level, such as the main headquarter offices, are not suitable to be outsourced or open to the public. Functions on the other side of the spectrum, such as leisure and commercial functions, but also cafeterias, canteens and parking places, do not have high security requirements, can be open to the public and do not necessarily have to be managed by the EC itself. There are opportunities to outsource these kinds of functions. Besides these large contrasts between the main head quarters and leisure functions, more subtle - but important - differences exist between the several types of office functions. There are for example significant differences in security requirements between the main head quarters and the support back offices. These functions can therefore be treated in a different way, i.e. their accommodation can be geared to the specific requirements, what can result in large advantages. This classification will therefore be used as starting point for the proposed accommodation strategy.

Figure 15.2 Different functions of the European Commission classified according to the required security level.
Figure 15.3 Different functions of the European Commission classified according to the possibility to be open to the public.

Figure 15.4 Different functions of the European Commission classified according to the possibility to outsource the function.
15.3 City level

The EC has to deal with rising pressure on property prices in the European Quarter due to the concentration of buildings of the institutions within the restricted area. This has a direct impact on rents and purchase prices. To reduce costs it is sensible to locate the buildings of the EC in more than one cluster. Besides financial benefits, this will also result in a more balanced development of the city, as integrating several smaller clusters is easier than one large cluster.

The creation of external sites will provide a greater differentiation in locations. The location choice can be geared to the requirements of the specific function. The size of the clusters must be adapted so that there can be economies of scale. The choice for the location of the external sites must be based on a good position with regard to public transport, preferably on a public transport node, to promote clean transportation. Furthermore it is important to locate at existing urban areas to make use of existing resources and to choose a location that promotes cohesion in the city, or at least does not increase contrasts.

As described in the section about development on city level (chapter 12) the European quarter will certainly remain the prime location of the European institutions. Important facilities and functions must be located here, as the headquarters of the European institutions are there. Other external locations can be the North and South station – as important transport hubs and on the border of the less prosperous districts – and for example near the airport or in the city centre, depending on the location requirements of the functions.

15.4 Neighbourhood level - the European quarter

The European quarter will remain the main base of the European Commission. Within the district the buildings will be located in several clusters. These clusters will be large enough to ensure an economy of scale and a critical mass for facilities, whereas they will be small enough to ensure a better integration in the neighbourhood, as it leaves place open for other developments. All clusters will be close to public transport and in walking distance of the other clusters in the area.

The clusters in itself must be flexible and able to grow and shrink to respond to uncertainties about future developments. The clusters are ideally composed of one building which represents the identity of the EC, surrounded by a growing and shrinking amount of standardised buildings, depending on the demand of the EC. Those standardised buildings have flexible floor plans, so that they can easily be adjusted to new users, possibly even dwellings or other functions. The buildings within a cluster are relatively small, between 10,000 and 20,000 m², with a few exceptions of buildings of 30,000 m² and more. This because very large buildings are difficult to find on the real estate market and vice versa also very difficult to get rid of when they are not necessary anymore. The European Commission can, using this strategy, decide how many buildings in a cluster they need at a certain moment in time as buildings can be abandoned or involved relatively easy.

In this system DG's will not necessarily be located in one building, but certainly in one cluster. That means that there will be a maximum distance of 200 meter. This makes the accommodation of the EC also more flexible, as changes in the structure or size of DG's will not necessarily have to mean a change in accommodation, or rearrangement of buildings. Figure 15.6 shows plausible locations for the clusters of the EC.

15.5 Block and building level

On block and building level the accommodation needs to be adjusted to the specific requirements of a function. Not one building on one location where a variety of functions are located, but adjusted accommodation for specific functions. This does not impose all separate buildings, also in one building or a small cluster of buildings there can be a differentiation of accommodation characteristics, such as openness to the public and security.

Functions that do not necessarily have to be owned or managed by the EC can be outsourced. This involves functions that stand far away from the core business of the Commission and can better be placed under the responsibility of a private party, for example leisure and commercial functions. This outsourcing provides cost reduction for the EC, employment in the local economy and better integration in existing structures.

Besides that functions that cannot be outsourced, or which are not desirable to be outsourced, but which can be more open to the public can be shared with other user groups. This creates a greater openness of the institutions to the public and results in a better use of resources and facilities. For example functions that are used by the EC during the day can be used by other groups during the evening and in the weekends. This will lead to activity outside office hours and more liveliness in the district. Suitable functions for sharing are cafeterias and canteens, parking and conference facilities. These functions
must be located clearly visible and easily accessible at the crossings of east-west and north-south axes, where also other amenities are located (see chapter 13 and figure 15.6).

Furthermore the utilisation of office space can be improved. Currently almost all employees have private offices with a fixed computer and telephone. This results in a very high average use of space per person. Innovation and intelligent office concepts can lead to a reduce of office space. Many organisations make use of these innovative office concept and it is remarkable that this is not at all the case at the EC, as it can save a lot of space and costs (figure 15.5).

15.6 Result

Designing the accommodation strategy on the guiding principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive development can provide for the EC:

- Efficiency – accommodation adapted to the needs of the function, the essential functions managed and owned by the EC and all other functions are outsourced or shared.
- Cost reduction – financial benefits by location of part of portfolio on external locations, outsourcing and sharing of functions and more efficient use of office space.
- Flexibility – diversity in location and ability to react on future changes by clusters that can grow and shrink in accordance with the demand.
- Pleasant working environment – a pleasant working environment for the employees of the EC as the offices are well integrated in the urban environment with facilities in its surroundings.
- Responsible attitude and better image – better balanced development and integration in city and neighbourhood, stimulation of local economy by outsourcing facilities and more openness by sharing facilities.

Figure 15.6 Possible office clusters of the European Commission in the European quarter and visualisation of differentiation on building level between secured functions (first floor and up) and functions that can be open to the public (ground floor). These public functions are pointed at the central squares where also other amenities are located.
16. Implementation

This chapter discusses the implementation of the development process and strategy as described in the previous chapters. It examines the phasing and order of development in the neighbourhood and handles the two levels of interventions: interventions on neighbourhood level and interventions on block level. It furthermore gives a demonstration of how a transformed European quarter will look like. The last section discusses the financial consequences of the transformation.

16.1 Phasing

The development of the European quarter will take up a lot of time and will be spread over several decades. For that reason, as described in chapter 11, plans must be flexible and capable to adapt to the real estate cycle of the existing buildings. It must be a gradual development in which the phasing is based upon seizing opportunities and starting development at places which are promising to begin the transformation. These promising places are places where private parties or owners would like to invest in the buildings by transformation or new development. Examples of these places in the European quarter are characterized by the following elements:

- Locations with old and/or vacant buildings
- Locations owned and/or used by the European Commission where there is a need for transformation.
- Locations that will be left by the European Commission and therefore in the future will be vacant.

The European Commission is put centrally in this issue because they are the largest occupier of real estate in the area and it is known that there will be quite some mutations in the portfolio of the Commission in the coming years and decades. The buildings that they will keep and like to transform and the buildings that they will leave in the future and be vacant afterwards will therefore be interesting spots for the development of the district.

The age of buildings varies quite a lot in the area, even within one block. The vacancy is also quite evenly spread over the area. That means that there will be opportunities now and in the future for development, but particularly for small scale interventions at building or (part of) block level.

The maps give an overview of the buildings of the EC and their type of ownership, age and contract ending. It shows where the Commission is likely to stay and where they are likely to leave according to these criteria. There are three clusters where they have a lot of buildings in ownership: Berlaymont-Charlemange, Breydel and Rue de la Loi (figure 16.4) and where it is likely that the Commission will stay. In two (parts of) these clusters buildings are quite old and transformation will be necessary in the coming years (figure 16.3). These are important places for development.

Figure 16.5 shows buildings where contacts will be ending in the near future. These buildings are likely to be left by the Commission, which will make them vacant afterwards and a potential development project, especially when they are at an advanced age.
All this information is summarized in an opportunities map (figure 16.6). This gives a general indication where opportunities for development will be, now and in the near future. Figure 16.7 to 16.13 show how the gradual development process in the district can look like, sketches a picture from the current state up till a possible situation 2040. It shows a principle idea, however it is by no means a fixed development scheme, as the development is dependent on private initiative. There can also be other reasons for private parties to take, or not to take initiative for development and circumstances can be changing. However it does give an indication where developments in the near future will be likely.
Impression of possible development over time

Figure 16.7 Impression of current situation (2011).

Figure 16.8 Impression of possible situation in 2015.

Figure 16.9 Impression of possible situation in 2020.

Figure 16.10 Impression of possible situation in 2025.

Figure 16.11 Impression of possible situation in 2030.

Figure 16.12 Impression of possible situation in 2035.
Figure 16.13 Impression of possible situation in 2040.
16.2 Neighbourhood interventions

Next to the interventions on block level, as will be described in the next section, there are some large scale interventions for the general interest of the neighbourhood, which cannot be executed by individual parties. These interventions are initiated and managed by the neighbourhood development company. Projects will be financed by a general fund, which is managed by the project organisation, where all parties contribute to as part of the costs for development. Large scale (infrastructure) projects exceeding the scale of the neighbourhood can be partly financed by external (governmental) funds.

These large scale neighbourhood interventions are transformation of east-west axes and extension of the tunnel between Berlaymont and Council, construction of new metro line between Merode and South station, transformation of north-south axes and creation of public spaces between main buildings of the institutions (figure 16.14). These neighbourhood interventions do not necessarily have to be realized at the start of the process, but can gradually be realised next to transformations on block level.
Figure 16.15 Impression central square.

Figure 16.16 Impression central square.
16.3 Demonstration of intervention on block level

The opportunity map points out a few locations where the transformation of the neighbourhood is likely to start. One of these places is a large urban block at the Rue de la Loi where there is a great potential for development. Besides this potential for development, it is an crucial place in the development of the neighbourhood as the block has some important characteristics. It is located in the northern part of the neighbourhood on the border of the grid of urban blocks and the large buildings in open space. It is at the crossing of the Rue de la Loi and a north-south axis which will be developed and there are important buildings of the European Commission. Furthermore an important public space will be created here (figure 16.17).

The transformation of the neighbourhood should start here on this block, because it has the before mentioned special qualities and high potential for development. The transformation of this block has a great potential to show the benefits of the developments strategy and can therefore serve as an impulse for the development in the whole area. This section gives a demonstration of how the design framework works in practice and how the developments can look like.

**Block specific rules**

The block plays a central role in the district as connection between two areas, along the main axis Rue de la Loi and at the place where important north south axes will be connected. Therefore there are a few specific characteristics of the block that should be taken into account in the transformation, next to the general guidelines from the urban design frameworks. These characteristics are laid down in the block specific rules (figure 16.19).

1. Sight lines connecting the north-south axes must be open.
2. Clear defined public space must be created around the sight lines.
3. Connection for pedestrians from the main square to the park Jardin de la Vallee.
4. New or redeveloped buildings at the Rue de la Loi must create a setback of their buildings at ground level of three meters deep and at least eight meters high.

![Figure 16.17 Location of block.](image)

![Figure 16.18 Block characteristics.](image)

![Figure 16.19 Block specific rules.](image)
Applying the block specific rules and the subarea guidelines to the block can result in the following design. It is a demonstration of what can be the effects of the urban design framework on the transformation of the neighbourhood. The rules can also be applied differently, what would result in a different outcome.

**Design**

The starting point for the design is on the one hand preservation of old structures as much as possible and on the other hand at the contrary breaking through these structures at strategic points. The largest intervention is the establishment of a public square in the middle of the block, connecting the north-south axes and creating a central meeting point. The current buildings on the block are partly renovated and extended with new structures, which create a higher density without putting too much pressure on the area. An important connection is made from the central square to the Jardin de la Vallee through a public atrium, to improve the relationship between grid of urban blocks and the large scale buildings of the institutions.

The guidelines regarding density create a good potential for new developments on the block. Some of the existing buildings will be renovated and extended with four new slender high rise developments, varying from 64 to 106 meter (18 to 30 floors). Well balanced proportions are guaranteed by the guidelines on human scale. All high-rise developments have a setback according to the street width which ensures a pleasant environment at street level with enough day light and no a feeling of massive development.

The public square forms the central point of the block and the larger surrounding area. It is partly closed off to clearly define the place and to create a sense of security. The difference in height between the southern and northern part of the square reduces the impact of the Rue de la Loi. On the other hand there are two large openings to make the square well visible and accessible from both sides. The north-south axis runs over the square, guided by trees. The sight lines are kept open by raising the buildings on the southern part of the square.

---

**Figure 16.20 Public space.**

**Figure 16.21 Preservation of existing structures.**

**Figure 16.22 Functions on ground floor.**

**Figure 16.23 Functions on first floor and above.**
The public functions are mostly concentrated around the square on ground floor level. There are also the main entrances of the surrounding buildings and facades are for the most part transparent. On the first floor and up housing is combined with offices. This together makes the square a central point where EU offices assemble with housing and facilities and where different people can meet.

The design of the accessibility is closely connected with this. The entrance of the metro has a central position on the square. People will arrive and depart from this point everyday which will create a flow of people on the square and increase the liveliness. The exits for pedestrians from parking garages are also on the square, which again contributes to the activity on the square. The entrances for cars and are consciously located at less active places or rear sides, way from the main square.

In the block a distinction is made between public areas, where anyone can entre and secured areas, where you need to be authorized to enter. The aim is to have as much public area as possible on ground floor level, so that there can be interaction between all the users on the square on the functions in the buildings. Only a few areas on ground floor level must be secured, to guarantee selective entrance to the offices and housing. The first floor and up of buildings can be totally secured and closed off from the public, so that here functions can be placed that need a certain security level.
Figure 16.28 Possible floor plan.

Figure 16.29 North-south section aa

Figure 16.30 North-south section bb

Figure 16.31 North-south section cc

Figure 16.32 East-west section AA
16.4 Financial management

The development of the block is divided in two phases (figure 16.33). Phase 1 – the eastern side of the block – can start right now, as the buildings are old and redevelopment is necessary. Phase 2 – the western side – is not ready for development yet. There are some rather new buildings on this side of the block and it will take approximately up till 2020-2025 till these buildings need redevelopment and the transformation can start on this side.

For phase 1 of the development a feasibility study is executed with the land development calculation as described in chapter 11.6. The design is based on a continuously iterative process between the urban design guidelines and the viability study, by changing the adjustment tools in the financial model. On the next page the financial results of phase 1 are showed.
The development process is spread over a period of 9 years, from the first initiative till the completion of the last building. In total 120.000 m2 is developed of which 68% is office space, 17% housing and 15% public functions (figure 16.35). Calculated with a discounted cash flow the total costs amount almost 154 million euro (in numbers of 2011), including the financing costs (interest) (figure 16.36). The revenues are over the whole period more than 155 million euro (in numbers of 2011), which results in a positive balance.

The contribution to the development fund in phase 1 is 11.7 million euro (in numbers of 2011). If this is extrapolated to the whole neighbourhood, the revenues for the development fund will lay approximately between 150 and 225 million euro over the whole duration of the transformation of the neighbourhood.

The financial model gives an estimation of the costs and revenues of the transformation on block level. There are considerable limitations connected to the model. All data is based on assumptions and small changes in these assumptions can give a total different outcome. Further research is necessary to determine if it is an realistic model that can be used as starting point for the transformation. It must be also examined further wether the calculated revenues for the development fund are reliable and if it will meet the costs for the neighbourhood projects (see chapter 18).

An overview of the financial model, all indicators where the general data, costs and revenues are based on and the accompanying sources can be found in appendix B.

---

**Table: Costs phase 1 (t=2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition costs of current buildings</td>
<td>€ 87,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for demolition (including 21% VAT)</td>
<td>€ 25,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for public space</td>
<td>€ 1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (10%)</td>
<td>€ 11,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>€ 28,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 153,900,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Revenues phase 1 (t=2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>€ 108,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing - Private</td>
<td>€ 13,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social</td>
<td>€ 1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public functions - Commercial</td>
<td>€ 30,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social</td>
<td>€ 1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 155,400,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Contribution to development fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offices phase 1</td>
<td>€ 10,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial functions phase 1</td>
<td>€ 1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contribution phase 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>€ 11,700,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 16.35 Development characteristics phase 1.

Figure 16.36 Overview of costs and revenues of development phase 1.
Part G - Reflection

17. Reflection
18. Conclusions and recommendations
Reflection

This research started with the question: What spatial design interventions can contribute to a solution to the problems and interests of the stakeholders in the European quarter in Brussels and how can these be implemented? The answer to this question is given in the form of a combined strategy for the development process, urban design and accommodation of the European Commission, as described in Part F of this report. This chapter will reflect on how the proposed strategy is established, what it will bring to the district and if it solves the problems of the stakeholders. First the proposed strategy is evaluated and compared with the existing plan for the area around the Rue de la Loi of de Portzamparc. The effects of both plans on the development process and urban form are discussed. Second the outcomes of the strategy for individual stakeholder groups are analysed. What does this strategy bring them? Is it an answer to their problems and interests or does it not fulfil the aims?

17.1 Evaluation

This section shows an evaluation of the proposed development strategy, divided in a part on the development process and a part on the urban design. It examines how the strategy, based on lessons from theory and reference projects, approaches the current problems in the area.

Process

Evaluating the process of development in the European quarter from a theoretical point of view as described in chapter 5, and following the opinions of the main stakeholder groups, one can see that there is a wish to transform the area. Unfortunately the development process is stuck: there is no common vision, little support for existing plans to improve the neighbourhood and a very complex political environment, which results in a situation in which everyone is waiting for everyone.

The guiding principles that contribute to the success of urban (change) management (chapter 5) are used as a starting point for the proposed development strategy and process. Coalitions between stakeholder groups based on their mutual dependency are stated to be important, while this is missing in the current situation. Therefore the creation of coalitions with commitment and support from all parties is highlighted in the proposed development process, by including of the various stakeholders groups early in the process.

Urban design

The stakeholder groups perceive various problems in the European quarter, as is described in chapter 7. The urban analysis on the basis of the theoretical elements of successful urban places also shows several issues. The area is experienced as a desolated district after office hours due to the low population density and one-sided distribution of functions. The two main infrastructural axes are very pressured and put a high demand, inconvenience and pollution on the area. Besides that a lack of public space is perceived and there is no decent place for the soft modes of transport in the public realm. Furthermore the three main buildings of the European institutions come across as fortifications - aliens in open space - which is problematic for public life in its surroundings.

The foundation of an independent process organisation, the neighbourhood development corporation (NCD) can break through the current vicious circles in the process, as shown in theory and reference projects. The NCD represents the different stakeholder groups and will direct the process of development. By its legal position and financial means it has the power to carry out changes.

The development approach which emphasises gradual, flexible planning and design is in keeping with the lessons learned from theory. It anticipates on the fact that the transformation of the area is complex and will last for several decades, which raises the need for a flexible system that can respond to changes over time. It is furthermore a gradual development process – a step-by-step transformation lead by existing and future investment streams. This process is likely to be supported by private parties as it provides a lot of freedom and takes the real estate cycle of buildings into account. The establishment of a development fund provides for means to do investments for the public interest, through which the neighbourhood can be structurally changed.

However, the success of the proposes development strategy is dependent on the understanding of the interested parties of their mutual dependency and support on the highest level to the proposed strategies and plans. Furthermore it is vital to the process that the neighbourhood development corporation gets enough power and competences, otherwise big changes cannot be made. This shows the vulnerability of the proposed strategy. As also mentioned in chapter 5, the before mentioned principles can contribute to a good course of the process, but can by no means guarantee that it will be an actual success. The crucial question is not if coalitions should be formed and support should be build, but how they could be created.
The elements for successful urban places (chapter 5) form a useful framework for the urban design. They are not utilised as Jane Jacobs once based them on Greenwich Village, but they are translated to current practice and get sometimes a different interpretation. The reference study of two districts in London and The Hague (chapter 9) result in practical guidelines next to the theoretical lessons.

The scheme to densify in clusters along the main axes in the European quarter is inspired on the clearly focused high rise policies in The Hague and London. By allowing higher densities at strategic points in the quarter, other functions such as housing and amenities can be introduced. The increase of density and especially the population density will result in the required concentration of people to generate diversity and with that achieving greater urbanity (Montgomery, 1998; Jacobs, 1961). The introduction of a substantial amount of housing and amenities makes the area now serves more than one purpose, which is a requirement to make it a vital urban area (Montgomery, 1998; Jacobs, 1961). The way of introducing mixed-use – small clusters of functions and only a mix on building level with shops and restaurants – is based on lessons learned from practice. What also became clear from the reference study is that there is a limit to the liveliness you can create in these areas. In London it is observed that all shops and restaurants are closed during weekends, making it a desolated area at these moments. This points out the need for housing, as is included in the proposed strategy, but also the fact that a working area cannot be lively all the time, as for example an inner city area. This can be seen in the proposed plan for the European quarter: the predominant function remains offices, however completed with such an amount of housing and amenities that it becomes an attractive area.

There is also great attention to the human scale and quality of place in the proposed developments. Large urban blocks are split up into parts to improve the permeability of the area and make it more intricate (Montgomery, 1998). The aspect of human scale returns by integrating new (high rise) developments in old structures. The cases show that contrasts do not necessarily have to be a problem, as long as the integration on small scale level is done carefully. This is seen in the Resident in the Hague (section 9.4), which has served as an example for the composition of the guidelines regarding human scale, i.e. the setback of buildings, urban plinth and transparency on ground floor level.

Both the case of London and The Hague have showed the importance of public space on different scale levels with clear defined uses. This is translated in the proposed development strategy in the squares at the crossings north-south and east-west axes, with a concentration of amenities and public functions at these points. These new public spaces can serve as meeting places in the district (Gehl, 1995).

The accessibility and mobility issues are also of importance in the reference cities. There the emphasis lies on public transport – in London with the extensive metro network and in The Hague with the proximity of the Central Station. Besides that private transportation is restricted, by means of congestion charging, car free zones and no parking on the streets. This is adopted in the new strategy by creating a new metro line and introducing two-way traffic. The feeling of intensity of the traffic is furthermore decreased by reducing parking on the streets and broadening the Rue de la Loi. Doing so it will be easier to get to and get through the area (PPS, 2010) - especially for the soft modes of transport.

Regarding the issue of security measure the two cases demonstrate that security requirements – which are also high in The Hague (governmental institutions) and London (large financial institutions) – do not necessarily have to cause a separation of functions or closed off areas for the public. However, safety zones should be clearly defined.

The principle of a clear division between secured and public zones is made in two ways in the European quarter. First a distinction is made in approaching the area around the main buildings of the European institutions – which need a high security level – and the grid of urban blocks. In the first area the high security requirements, which make it difficult to introduce other functions, are accepted. However, the area is made more pleasant by closing off large parts for traffic (which also increases security) and making it more accessible for pedestrians by introducing high-quality public space. Second by making a distinction between the various functions within the buildings of the European Commission with regard to the required security level. By translating that in the choice for type of accommodation and location, some functions can be open to the public and are placed easily accessible on ground floor level. Functions that require high security measures are placed on higher situated floors, with a compact entrance at ground floor level, leaving as much place as possible for public functions. This clear distinction between public and secured areas guarantees high security requirements while preserving public life on ground floor level.
However, some remarks can be made on the proposed urban design. The gradual approach will slowly transform the area. As a result some areas could stay unpleasant for many years. Besides that, although a mix of functions is introduced, the office function will remain dominant in the area. The area will therefore not be busy and lively every hour of the week. In the area surrounding the main buildings of the institutions there will be no mixture of functions. Furthermore the traffic in the area stays problematic. The feeling of intensity is reduced by introducing two-way traffic, removing parking from the streets and in a later stage by decreasing the real intensity, however the pressure of traffic will remain high in the area. Nevertheless the proposed development strategy results in a realistic way forward to a better integrated, balanced, lively and sustainable neighbourhood.

17.2 Comparison with existing plans

To get an idea of what the proposed strategy can bring to the neighbourhood and the stakeholders the strategy is compared with an existing plan for the area. The urban design of the Portzamparc from 2008 for the area around the Rue de la Loi (see chapter 3) is a relevant plan to put side by side to the proposed strategy, to see advantages and drawback of both approaches.

Development process

There is not much publicly known about the proposed development process behind the urban design of Christian de Portzamparc for the area around the Rue de la Loi. It proposes a phasing of the implementation of the plans and the urban design will be elaborated in several architectural competitions. However, the does not anticipate on possible future changes. The plan also misses commitment and support, because stakeholders are not consulted in the preparatory stage of the design and it is not based on the mutual dependency of stakeholder groups. Furthermore it lacks a proposition for the organisation and financing of the project. It is left open how responsibilities are divided in the project, who has to take the initiative and who will have to pay for the investments for the general interest.

De Portzamparc's strategy brings no 'solution' for the other areas in the European quarter, where there are also many problems. The Rue Belliard is for example just as bad as the Rue de la Loi, but there is no statement made about this.

However, the plan of the Portzamparc certainly has positively stimulated the discussion in the European quarter. It breaks down old patterns and shows new directions for development with clear aims. It causes action in the district after a long period of stagnation.

Urban design

The urban design of de Portzamparc uses some starting points similar to the proposed strategy. It also aims at creating a higher density, introducing a mix of functions and creating new public spaces and thus fits well with the elements for successful places as defined in chapter 4. A large difference is that it focuses only on the area along the Rue de la Loi and not on the whole European quarter, which results in a few questionable elements of the plan. There is for example still a great mobility issue on the Rue de la Loi – which is not solved in the plans – which makes it doubtful to densify on this axis. It will make the traffic problems larger and increase the barrier. There is not paid a lot of attention to the connection with surrounding neighbourhoods and the densification will have a substantial impact on the living quality north of Rue de la Loi. There is also little attention to the human scale of the project. Very large and massive developments are proposed in a small area. Besides that it is questionable if the redeveloped area can provide enough space for the introduction of a substantial amount of housing and amenities and if it is attractive to have those functions on the busy axes.

The largest differences between the proposed strategy for the European quarter in this report and the plan of the Portzamparc are in the field of the process design. In the plan of the Portzamparc there is little attention for this, whereas in the development strategy there is a very close connection between the development process and urban design. Also on the level of urban form there are considerable differences. By focusing only on the area along the Rue de la Loi makes it a very dense, massive development with little attention to the human scale and experience from street level and a large impact on its surroundings. The strategy presented in this report is focused on the whole European quarter, which results in a more balanced development with an eye for human scale, integrating the area in its surroundings and introducing a substantial amount of other functions.

17.3 Effects for stakeholders

Besides the influence of the proposed strategy on the development process and urban form, the effects for the individual stakeholder groups are also very important. What will this strategy bring them? Is it an answer to their problems and interests or does it not fulfill the aims? The effects for the main stakeholder groups are discussed one by one in the following sections. Each section starts with a repetition of the major perceived problems and aims of the respective stakeholder, followed by the effects of the proposed strategy.
Brussels-Capital Region

Major perceived problems in the European quarter:
- Monofunctional and deteriorated office area
- Lack of inhabitants
- Mobility (dominance of road traffic)

Major aims / ambition:
- Main centre of European and international employment
- Introduction of housing
- A cultural and recreational centre

Effects of proposed strategy:
The introduction of housing and amenities phase out the monofunctional nature of the neighbourhood and improve the urban character. The dominance of road traffic is reduced by implementing two-way traffic and slowly decrease of amount of traffic. This decreases the feeling of intensity, but does not solve the problem entirely. This is however in line with the policy of the Region, as they are not aiming at a radical decrease of traffic, due to political reasons.

The Region’s policy focuses primarily on the addition of housing in the area. The strategy does introduce a substantial amount of housing in the area, but focuses furthermore on the opportunities to develop other functions such as amenities that can improve the liveliness in the area. Although the Region would have preferred a mix of functions at building level, in the proposed strategy functions will be placed in clusters and only shops and restaurants will be mixed at ground floor level with other functions. In that way a certain critical mass is provided for each function.

The European quarter will not be a cultural and recreational centre. That is aiming too high and does not match to the current character of the neighbourhood. The area will remain a kind of ‘special’ area with its special function as home of the European institutions. However, facilities of the European institutions, such as cafeterias and conference facilities, will be more open to the public. That creates possibilities to organise activities and to show the cultural diversity of Europe.

Furthermore the creation of the ‘park of Europe’, a system of connected public spaces between the main buildings of the institutions makes the area a destination for tourist and a place to demonstrate for European citizens.

The authorities will have to share the power and competence on urban planning with the neighbourhood development corporation. This will result in a different position of the Brussels-Capital Region and municipalities, which can lead to opposition in the organisations and on political level.

European Commission

Major perceived problems in the European quarter:
- Low efficiency and dispersion of buildings
- Pressure on property prices

Major aims / ambition:
- European quarter is an efficient home for the majority of the European Commission

Effects of proposed strategy:
The proposed strategy makes the accommodation of the European Commission more efficient by adapting the accommodation to the specific needs of its function, concerning for example required security level. Only the essential functions are managed and owned by the EC and all other functions are outsourced or shared. This outsourcing and sharing results in cost reductions. Also by locating a part of the portfolio on external locations and increasing utilisation of office space, costs can be reduced.

The European quarter is a good basis with several office clusters with an economy of scale and flexibility to react on possible future changes. A balance is found between the security requirements and wish to be easy accessible and transparent to the public. Therefore a clear distinction is made between functions which need a high security level and functions that can be more open to the public, which is translated into the characteristics of the accommodation.

In the portfolio flexibility is improved through by the diversity in locations and clusters that can grow and shrink in accordance with the demand. It provides a pleasant working environment for the employees of the EC as the offices are well integrated in the urban environment with facilities in its surroundings. Furthermore the better balanced development and integration in the neighbourhood, stimulation of local economy by outsourcing facilities and more openness by sharing facilities creates a more responsible attitude towards the city.

However, there are some drawbacks to the strategy. The outsourcing and sharing of facilities and having public functions on ground floor level of buildings of the EC require a change of mentality which is very sensitive in the organisation and will raise opposition. Furthermore the strategy does not fulfil the requirement of having few (very) large buildings which can house one or more DG’s. There is opted for clusters of smaller buildings to be able to react to possible changes in the demand. DG’s will always need to be in one cluster, but not necessarily in one building.
The EC will (indirectly) have to pay for projects for the public interest in the neighbourhood in the form of a development levy. This also is a very sensitive subject, as the EC states to be excepted from taxes and therefore also from development levies. However by making this contribution they will have a more responsible attitude towards the city, improving the image of the EC.

**Private parties**

**Major perceived problems in the European quarter:**
- Uncertainty about developments
- Existing plans not adapted to real estate cycle of buildings

**Major aims / ambition:**
- Clarity about urban planning decisions and needs and constraints of EC
- Development possibilities

**Effects of proposed strategy:**

The proposed development strategy makes the private parties more involved in the development process. The strategy and urban design framework gives degrees of certainty about future developments in the area as it present the direction in which the area will be developed and how this will be filled in. It provides clear guidelines which are flexible at the same time, providing scope for interpretation. The guidelines are based on viability studies, which results in many development possibilities which are attractive and profitable.

The development strategy foresees in the realisation of clusters of medium sized buildings, in contradiction to the very large buildings that are asked for by the European institutions. This is an advantage for private parties because it makes developing at own risk easier and buildings are better transferable to other parties.

However, a possible drawback of the proposed strategy is that private parties need to cooperate with other parties on block level, as costs and benefits must be mutually balanced. Consequently parties cannot act individually in many cases. Furthermore private parties must contribute to the development fund by development levies. This results in higher costs than before, although these costs will probably be charged to the client. Besides that an improvement of the urban environment will positively influence the value of real estate.

**Citizens**

**Major perceived problems in the European quarter:**
- Lack of communication about developments
- Uncontrolled expansion of offices

**Major aims / ambition:**
- Openness and involvement in the process
- Creating a ‘truly’ mixed neighbourhood

**Effects of proposed strategy:**

The development approach, with an emphasis on building coalitions and broad commitment and support, creates much space for contributions of interested parties. Also the citizens get an explicit role and are included in the coalitions. The transformed neighbourhood will be better integrated and easily accessible with new functions. The outsourcing and opening of functions of the European Commission will result in a greater openness of the institutions and stimulates the local economy. For the residents north and south of the neighbourhood the area will be better accessible and the new amenities will create an interaction between the two areas.

However, the area will remain an important office location and the main seat of the European institutions. Making the area a ‘truly’ mixed neighbourhood in the sense of an equal division of housing and offices is not realistic and will not be executed. Nevertheless the introduction of new functions and housing will provide more liveliness. The district will transform slowly. Little by little, parts of the district will be improved and new developments will be realised, but the overall results can only be seen after a few decades. Nonetheless, the development strategy can show the value of the presence of the European institutions and will let the citizens of Brussels share in facilities, cultural activities and prosperity.
18. Conclusions and recommendations

18.1 Conclusions

This research started with the question: What spatial design interventions can contribute to a solution to the problems and interests of the stakeholders in the European quarter in Brussels and how can these be implemented? A broad analysis of the situation, based on a theoretical framework of successful urban places and urban change management, resulted in the conclusion that there are problems on three fields: urban environment, the accommodation of the institutions and the development process.

The European quarter is severely transformed by the arrival of the institutions. Several stakeholder groups experience the district as a disconnected, desolated, monofunctional office area with great barriers, poorly integrated buildings of the European institutions and heavily pressurised quality of place. In addition the accommodation of the European Commission is by itself also faced with difficulties. The organisation is spread over many small buildings and the office space used per person is very high and inefficient, resulting in high costs. The accommodation policy does not show a responsible attitude to the city and acts sometimes flatly opposed to the EU policies. Problems in the European quarter are recognized by the main stakeholders who express a wish to transform the area, but the development process is stuck: there is no common vision, little support for existing plans and a very complex political environment, which results in a situation in which everyone is waiting for everyone.

No single party has full control over the area. This mutual dependency of stakeholders demands an integral approach based on a shared vision that can bring parties closer together. This report proposes strategy that takes the current growth strategy of the European Union, the Europe 2020 program, and its key concepts - smart, sustainable and inclusive growth – as a starting point for the development of the area. It will increase the utilisation of the position of the EU as main seat. Not by leaving a dominant mark ‘Capital of Europe’ on Brussels by making great interventions in the city and placing grand, bombastic buildings in the European quarter, but by using small-scale actions and progress showing the value of the EU for European society.

The principles of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth should be translated one by one to the development process, the urban design and accommodation of the European Commission. It is essential that the strategy addresses the three elements - the development process, urban planning and design and accommodation of the European Commission – collectively, because they are closely related. No real change can be made in the current situation when one of these elements is left aside. Excluding the development process from the strategy makes realisation of projects difficult. Processes will remain slow, there will be no guiding of and coherence between projects and there will be no method for financing projects. Leaving out the urban planning and design will result in development without a clear direction, no image to work towards and will miss goals and methods to make it a more pleasant environment. Keeping out the accommodation of the European Commission will mean excluding a substantial part of the real estate in the neighbourhood. If they are not willing to change and cooperate, transformation of the district is very difficult. Therefore only a collective strategy can find a way out of the existing situation.

Development process

On the basis of lessons learned from theory on urban change management a smart, sustainable and inclusive development process is proposed to transform the area. It entails a process in which all interested parties are involved and planning is based on their mutual dependency. For the European quarter it is crucial to have a flexible planning system that can be adapted over time to a changing context. This implies no grand master planning, but a gradual, step-by-step transformation of the neighbourhood by making use of opportunities and steering existing and future investment streams. It will be adaptable to changes over time and an independent body will direct the process of development over the whole duration of the transformation.

Urban design

The urban design is guided by a flexible planning system composed of a development strategy on neighbourhood level and an urban design framework on block level. These instruments set out urban design principles which are adaptable to changes to transform the area into a smart, sustainable and inclusive environment. This implies, based on literature and reference projects, densifying at strategic points with an eye for human scale, introducing housing and amenities in small clusters and decreasing the intensity of traffic. The integration of the neighbourhood in its surroundings is improved by enhancing the north-south connections and creating public space at central points where people can meet.
Conclusion and recommendations

Accommodation of the European Commission
To make the accommodation of the European Commission smart, sustainable and inclusive and reduce its negative influence on the city, the housing will be better geared - location and building - to the needs of specific functions. Functions such as cafeterias and canteens can for example be outsourced or shared with the public to be on the one hand more efficient and reduce costs and at the same time be more open to the public and stimulate the local economy and liveliness. The buildings will be located in several clusters in the European quarter which are large enough to guarantee an economy of scale and small enough for better integration in the neighbourhood.

The proposed strategy for the development process, urban design and accommodation of the European Commission results in an integral approach to deal with the problems in the area. It combines a gradual transformation process which can change over time with a clear direction - the direction of a smart, sustainable and inclusive neighbourhood which provides an attractive place for residents and workers, offers efficient accommodation and contributes to showing the value of the European Union.

18.2 Recommendations
The result of this thesis is an integral strategy for the European quarter in Brussels consisting of three parts: the development process, urban design and accommodation of the European Commission. It entails a possible future for the area and an approach to reach it. This approach requires further research and validation, before it could be implemented. These recommendations for further study are divided in three parts and discussed below.

Development process
With regard to the development process it is important to elaborate further on the position of the neighbourhood development corporation. There is no experience with these kind of structures in Brussels. Hence research on the feasibility to transfer (planning) competences to this organisation and its legal status, is vital. Furthermore it should be examined how the urban design framework can be translated into legal rules. Reference projects with similar process structures can serve as an example for this. It is also recommended to examine further how coalitions can be formed and how commitment at the highest level can be created. This is difficult, due to the complex political structures in the organisations of the two main stakeholders: the Brussels-Capital Region and the European Commission. Here, reference projects can also serve as an example.

The proposed financial structures of the project should be examined further. Research should be done to make a reliable estimation if the neighbourhood development fund can raise enough money to finance projects for the general interest, such as infrastructural projects and public space. When this is not the case and there is a deficit to execute the desired projects, investigation should be done if either the development levy must be increased or external financing must be sought.

Urban environment
Concerning the urban development strategy further research is needed to validate the proposed guidelines in the urban design framework. Do the guidelines result in projects that answer to the aims of the strategy, or do they need to be adjusted? It is also essential to check whether the guidelines offer enough development possibilities so that private parties take initiative in transforming the area. In addition to this the interpretation and effects of the ‘bonus’ rules must be studied further and the urban design framework should be extended to the areas that are not classified as one of the subareas.

Research should be performed on the interventions in the traffic system. The effects of implementing two-way traffic, reducing parking on the streets and making some areas car free must be mapped and analysed. Moreover the impact on the traffic system of increasing the density at some points in the area must be studied.

The transformation will go step-by-step and will cover a long period of time, which can result in potential undesirable situations. It must be examined how these ‘in between’ situations in the district can be prevented or handled in an appropriate way.

Accommodation of the European Commission
For the accommodation strategy for the European Commission further research is required on outsourcing and sharing possibilities. It should be mapped which functions are suitable for this and what kind of impact it will have on the organisation. The location requirements for each function must be identified to be able to adjust the accommodation to these needs. Moreover it is recommended to examine the possibilities to implement innovative office concepts to make more efficient use of office space.

It is essential to examine comprehensively what the financial yield of the proposed accommodation strategy will be, as increasing efficiency and reducing costs are major aims of the European Commission. Finally it is recommended that a study is performed on how the transformation of the current situation to the desirable situation should take place.
## Appendix A - Interviews

### Overview of interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Interviewee(s) and position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European institutions</td>
<td>Directorate General Human Resources and Security, European Commission</td>
<td>Enrico Armani, Head of Unit Administrative Offices and Agencies, HR.D.5, Luca Ferroni, Policy Officer - Coordinateur offices politque immobilière, HR.D.5</td>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European institutions</td>
<td>Office for Infrastructure and Logistics Brussels (OIB)</td>
<td>Marc Mouligneau, Head of Real Estate Department (OIB-a)</td>
<td>20 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European institutions</td>
<td>Office for Infrastructure and Logistics Brussels (OIB)</td>
<td>Konstantin Konstantinou, Head of Unit Implementation of buildings policy (OIB-b)</td>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European institutions</td>
<td>DG Translation</td>
<td>Piet Verleysen - Director Resources and former director of OIB (2003 – 2006)</td>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European institutions</td>
<td>European Parliament, Brussels Buildings Management and Maintenance Unit</td>
<td>Pascal De Backer, Head of Unit, Patrick De Schrijver, Administrator, Francesca Borgonovo, Trainee</td>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European institutions</td>
<td>European Council, Directorate 2 B - Buildings, Logistics - Buildings Unit</td>
<td>Kristin Van Hoolst, Head of Buildings Unit</td>
<td>14 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>ADT-ATO, L'agence de développement territorial pour la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale</td>
<td>Cédric Van Meerbeeck – Project manager</td>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>Municipality of Brussels</td>
<td>Sarah Moutury, Afdeling stedenbouw, Cel Plan</td>
<td>3 May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>BRAL, Brusselse Raad voor het Leefmilieu</td>
<td>Hilde Geens</td>
<td>5 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>l'Association Quartier Léopold</td>
<td>Marco Schmitt, member of l'Association Quartier Léopold</td>
<td>18 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Touring</td>
<td>Thierry Willemarck, CEO</td>
<td>26 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private parties</td>
<td>Cofinimmo</td>
<td>Xavier Denis, Development &amp; Area Manager</td>
<td>5 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private parties</td>
<td>AG Real estate</td>
<td>Johan Haesendonck, Head of letting services</td>
<td>20 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private parties</td>
<td>Jones Lang Lasalle</td>
<td>Jean-Michel Meersseman, Associate Director, Pierre Bondé</td>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private parties</td>
<td>CB Richard Ellis</td>
<td>Cédric Mali, Head of letting and sales</td>
<td>5 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private parties</td>
<td>Buelens, projectontwikkelaar</td>
<td>Pascal Buelens – CEO, Marc Schuermans – Development manager</td>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting cards for interviews

MIXED-USE
Type of mixture: offices + shops, cafes and restaurants

DENSITY

MIXED-USE
Type of mixture: offices + dwellings

ACCESSIBILITY

MIXED-USE
Type of mixture: offices + leisure

FLEXIBILITY

Grainsize of mixture:
at building level

HUMAN SCALE

Grainsize of mixture:
at block level

PUBLIC SPACE

Grainsize of mixture:
at neighbourhood level

SAFETY & COMFORT

Time of activity:
during office hours

SAFETY AND COMFORT

Future focus on safety inside buildings

MORE

LESS

Time of activity:
from 8.00-22.00

SAFETY AND COMFORT

Future focus on safety on the street

MORE

LESS

Time of activity:
24 hours a day/7 days a week

DENSITY

Less dense than it is right now

DENSITY

Same density as it is right now

DENSITY

More dense than it is right now

DENSITY

A lot more dense than it is right now
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PUBLIC SPACE

Small scale public space at regular places

Mid-scale public space at one or more locations

Large scale public space at one location

ACCESSIBILITY

Future focus on private transport

Future focus on public transport

Future focus on cyclists and pedestrians

HUMAN SCALE

Block size: many blocks and crossings (every 50 m)

Block size: several blocks and crossings (every 100 m)

Block size: few blocks

Block size: only one block (+ 200m/100m)

Filling-in of blocks: large buildings in open space

Filling-in of blocks: massive closed blocks

Filling-in of blocks: several large buildings in one block

Filling-in of blocks: many small buildings in one block
Setup interviews

Set-up interview European Council

1. Introduction

- Explanation of content and setup of the project:
  o What spatial design interventions can contribute to a solution to the problems and interests of the stakeholders in the European quarter in Brussels and how can these be implemented?
- Explanation of the discussed topics:
  o Stakeholder analysis document study (show matrix)
  o Check interest, problems and ambitions
  o Looking into possible spatial futures
  o Look more in detail to the process
- Is it alright if I tape this interview? I will only use it as a tool to work out the interview more easily. I will send you the findings of my interview by email, so you can correct me if I have made wrong interpretations.

2. Position of Brussels Capital Region regarding the European quarter

- Can you give a short sketch of the 'experience' with the development of the European quarter in your organization?
- What is the formal role of your organization in the project? What is your personal role? Have these roles changed over time?
- Weight of development of the European quarter within the organization. Who is, in what function, involved in the development of the European quarter?

3. Your organisation and other stakeholders

- How would you describe the collaboration between the main organizations/people involved in the project?
- In what ways has your approach to/your organization’s collaboration with others changed in relation to the project?
- How do you work together with the other institutions? Would a closer cooperation be beneficial for your organisation?

4. Real estate strategy

- In the presentation at Arau last December you described the real estate strategy of the Council as follows:
  o Location: one location in the city centre
  o Accessibility: easy accessible by visitors and staff
  o Ownership: owning almost all buildings
  o Image and visibility (symbol)
  o Security concerns (summits-VIP’s)
- Can you explain these elements (i.e. can you give definitions?)?
  o Location: why one location in the city centre?
  o Accessibility: easy accessible by what mode(s) of transport? How critical is the accessibility for location decisions?
  o Ownership: why?
  o Image and visibility: what kind of image does the Council want to have? What kind of symbol? How is the image influence by its neighbourhood?
5. Interest in the European quarter

- What is the main interest of the European Council in the (development of) European quarter? Why?
- Are there more/other interests?

6. Perceived problems in the European quarter

- Does the European Council experiences problems in the European quarter? What are these problems?
- Can you explain these problems (i.e. can you give definitions?)
- Priorities: what is the biggest problem? And what are less important problems?

7. Ambitions

- What are the ambitions of the European Council concerning the development of the European quarter?
- Can you explain these ambitions (i.e. can you give definitions?)
- Priorities: how would the European Council prioritise these ambitions?

8. Elements for successful urban places

Introduction: for my research I have done a theoretical study of what spatial elements contribute to the success of urban places. These elements are the following:

- Density
- Mixed-use & diversity
- Human scale
- Public space
- Accessibility
- Flexibility & adaptability
- Safety & comfort

From the basis of these elements I have done an urban analysis of the European quarter.

[Show A3’s with urban analysis]

From my analysis I see this (show analysis) as the problems in the European quarter.

- If I have listened well to your answers:
  - You do agree upon these elements?
  - I am doubting if you agree upon these elements?
  - You do not agree upon these elements?
- What elements are the most important? And which are the least important?

To discuss the future of the European quarter, I have made for all 5 elements different options.

[Show A3’s with futures for the European quarter]

Per element:

- How do you like to see the future of the European quarter? Why?
9. Process
- Do you have an idea what can be promising spatial interventions that can bring these wishes (make up from answers above) (in a certain period) closer?
- What has to be done for this?
- What can you (your organisation) contribute to this?

Possibly supporting with suggestions:
- Are you thinking about...
  - Underground infrastructure
  - ....
  - ....

Further process questions
Opportunities
- Which opportunities do you see in future transformation of the area? (to solve the problems and to answer to interests and ambitions)

Blockades
- Which problems/blockades do you expect in the future for transformation of the area? On which field? By whom?
- What can you do yourself to solve these problems/remove blockades?
- What can other people do? Who?
- Are there other strategies to reach your goals?
- What is preventing you from....?

Other ways
- If the BCR (or another party) does ...., would you be willing to .....?
- What must the BCR (or another party) do, to make you do ....?

10. Historical development
- What developments in the past in the European quarter have gone well? What has gone wrong?
- Why was it good or bad? And why did it go like this?
- What historical and current initiatives have come to a standstill? Why?

11. Closing

Back up questions
Do you have a reference of what the European quarter must look like in the future (in Belgium, Europe, USA...)?
What do you like about this example?
## Appendix B - Financial analysis

### General information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General starting points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price level</td>
<td>1-1-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation period (in years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of building</td>
<td>1-1-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total building period (in years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>1-1-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Starting points calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase of revenues (1)</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of costs (1)</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest (2)</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building interest (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected costs (1)</td>
<td>15% of all costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs for acquisition current buildings

See tab 2

### Costs for demolition and land preparation

Demolition underground structures (3) € 390 per m² GFA
Demolition above ground structures (3) € 220 per m² GFA

### Cost for public space

Costs for public space (2) € 230 per m² public space

### Contribution for works

Charges d'Urbanism (7) € 12 per m² additional office space

### Uitgangs punten Vastgoed

#### Private housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface per apartment</th>
<th>m² GFA</th>
<th>110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface per apartment</td>
<td>m² LFA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VON-price (excl. VAT) (3)</td>
<td>€ 2.184 per m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (excl. VAT) (3)</td>
<td>€ 2.800 per m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building costs (2)</td>
<td>€ 1.800 per m² GFA excl. VAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional costs (5)</td>
<td>24.00% of building costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit and risk (2)</td>
<td>10.50% of building costs+add. costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>€ 1.910 per m² GFA excl. VAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual land value (excl. VAT)</td>
<td>€ 890 per m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land quota</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface per apartment</th>
<th>m² GFA</th>
<th>110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface per apartment</td>
<td>m² LFA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VON-price (incl. VAT) (3)</td>
<td>€ 2.920 per m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (excl. VAT) (3)</td>
<td>€ 2.600 per m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building costs (2)</td>
<td>€ 1.800 per m² GFA excl. VAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional costs (5)</td>
<td>24.00% of building costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit and risk (2)</td>
<td>10.50% of building costs+add. costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>€ 1.910 per m² GFA excl. VAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual land value (excl. VAT)</td>
<td>€ 227 per m² GFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land quota</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Offices

| Rent level (2,3,6) | € 215 per m¹ LFA, excl. BTW |
| Form factor (4) | 100% |
| GfT (6) | € 3.600 per m¹ GFA excl. VAT |
| Investment value | € 3,900 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Building time | year |
| Building costs (3) | € 1.500 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Additional costs (5) | 24.00% of building costs |
| Profit and risk (2) | 10.50% of building costs+add. costs |
| Interest | € 189 |
| Contribution for public works (7) | € 125 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Total costs | € 2.045 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Residual land value | € 1,102 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Land quota | 38% |

#### Commercial function

| Rent level (3) | € 160 per m¹ LFA, excl. BTW |
| Form factor (4) | 100% |
| GfT (8) | € 2,600 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Investment value | € 3,900 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Building time | year |
| Building costs (3) | € 1.500 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Additional costs (5) | 24.00% of building costs |
| Profit and risk (2) | 10.50% of building costs+add. costs |
| Interest | € 98 |
| Total costs | € 1,631 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Residual land value | € 248 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Land quota | 31% |

#### Social function

| Rent level (3) | € 130 per m¹ LFA, excl. BTW |
| Form factor (4) | 100% |
| GfT (8) | € 7,000 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Investment value | € 1,857 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Building time | year |
| Building costs (3) | € 1.500 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Additional costs (5) | 24.00% of building costs |
| Profit and risk (2) | 10.50% of building costs+add. costs |
| Interest | € 98 |
| Total costs | € 1,631 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Residual land value | € 248 per m² GFA excl. VAT |
| Land quota | 31% |
### Acquisition costs current buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General information</th>
<th>Surfaces</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Estimation</th>
<th>Costs for acquisition buildings (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupied by Commission</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Floor area parcel (m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SPA-3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>11.501</td>
<td>2.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 L-78</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1-79</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.616</td>
<td>16.540</td>
<td>7.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-82</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>4.738</td>
<td>1.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 L-84/86</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>13.642</td>
<td>6.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 L-99</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>8.450</td>
<td>4.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 L-102</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 L-130</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.103</td>
<td>34.915</td>
<td>16.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.906</td>
<td>95.636</td>
<td>41.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demolition costs current buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General information</th>
<th>Surfaces</th>
<th>Costs (including 21% VAT)</th>
<th>Costs for buildings that will be demolished (including 21% VAT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupied by Commission</td>
<td>Floor area parcel (m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SPA-3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>11.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 L-78</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-82</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>4.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 L-84/86</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>13.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 L-99</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>8.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 L-102</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>4.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 L-130</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9.103</td>
<td>34.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Financial Analysis
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**1.473.090**

- **78.669.724**
- **1.785.961**

**42.947.065**

- **42.521.847**
- **3.762.100**

**354.356€**

**5.615.919**

- **6.876.251**

**1.156.680€**

**227 €**

**108.446.400€**

**189**

### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Current Price</th>
<th>Development Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (Building)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Calculation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (Building)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Calculation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs

- **42.947.065€**
- **3.762.100€**
- **1.156.680€**
- **227 €**

**354.356€**

**5.615.919€**

### Cashflow

- **305 €**
- **329 €**
- **81.600**

**6.417.473€**

**1.156.680€**

**227 €**

**305 €**

**329 €**

**81.600**

### GFA (Social)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Calculation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (Building)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Calculation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjustment tools

New developments (quantitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative data is leading</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative data</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land area of new developments</td>
<td>16.040 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>120.000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total built up area (footprint)</td>
<td>10.745 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total open space</td>
<td>5.295 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ratios**
- FSI 7.4812968
- GSI 0.6698878
- L 11.167985
- OSR 0.044125

New developments (qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land area of new developments</td>
<td>100% 16.040 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>100% 120.000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>68% 81.600 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>17% 20.400 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>75% 15.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>25% 5.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10% 12.000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>5% 6.000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>5% 5.295 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution to public works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution for public works</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Total contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office development</td>
<td>81.600</td>
<td>€ 125</td>
<td>€ 10.200.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>€ 125</td>
<td>€ 1.500.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€ 11.700.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources

(1) Examples of land development calculations, among others from TU Delft (Ricardo), Twijnstra Gudde and Fakton
(4) DTZ 2008. Inventaire des immeubles et propriétaires des îlots de part et d’autre de la rue de la Loi, Brussels, DTZ.
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