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Introduction

Definitions – Causes – Effects – Strategies – Europe – Case selection
Definition – Shrinking city
Definition - Liveability
Definition - Liveability
Causes

• Demographics are expected to change
Causes

• Death surplus
• Negative migration balance
Shrinkage - Effects

- Hardware
- Software
- Mindware
Effects - Hardware

- High unemployment rates
- Decreased job opportunities
- Labour force moves away
- Vacancy
- Decay
Effects - Software

- Change socio-economic structure
Effects - Mindware

• Negative image
• Inhabitants feel inferior
Strategies shrinkage

- Do nothing
- Deny shrinkage
  - Strategy city as if growth
- Counter
  - Attract more residents
- Accept
  - Maintain liveability for remaining residents
Shrinkage Europe

- Cities with one industry
- Former mining cities
- Closure of the mines
- No jobs
Case selection

• Comparable decline inhabitants
• Regional approach
• International Building Exhibition (IBA)

• Heerlen
• Gelsenkirchen
Research questions

Main question – Detailed questions
Main research questions

• Which measures taken by both the municipality and private parties influence the liveability in shrinking cities?
Detailed research questions

• Which measures taken?
• Effect of measures on liveability?
• Why certain effect of measures?
• Measures taken in GE not taken in HE?
• Possible to apply measures GE in HE?
Heerlen

Problems – Measures - Effects
Heerlen

- Mining city
- Last mine closed 1974
- 95,000 inhabitants in 2000
- 87,503 inhabitants in 2015
Problems - Hardware

• High unemployment rates
• Vacancy & Decay buildings
• Mono-functional neighbourhoods
  – One type of house
  – Only living
  – No shops
Problems - Software

• Less youth more elderly
Problems - Software

• Decline of community morale
  – Less responsibility for the neighbourhood
  – Nuisance
Problems - Mindware

• Negative image certain neighbourhoods
Measures

• Regional (Parkstad Limburg)
• General Heerlen
• Per neighbourhood
Measures - Hardware - Region

- Agreements demolition dwellings
- IBA Parkstad Limburg
IBA Parkstad Limburg

- Accelerate innovation
- 2014-2017 preparations
- 2017-2020 execution of projects
- 291 projects and ideas submitted
- 39 projects will be executed by IBA
Measure - Hardware - Municipality

- Demolishment of dwellings
- Redevelopment of public space
Measures - Software

• Involving residents
• Social assistance
• Improving safety
• Education
Measures - Mindware

• Communication (with residents)
Meezenbroek, Schaesbergerfeld & Palemig (MSP)

- “Vogelaarwijk”
- Demolish dwellings
- New neighbourhood centre
- Green route
- “broad social facility”
Passart

- Demolishment of 3 flats
Passart

- Plan to demolish dwellings
- Stopped by residents
- Temporary public functions
Passart

- Safety
- Participation
- Care & well-being
Leefbaarometer

- Government of the Netherlands
- Monitoring tool
- Detailed scale
- Every 2 years
- Objective, subjective, living behaviour
Leefbaarometer Heerlen

- Dwellings, residents, amenities, safety, physical environment
- Only dimension amenities above national average
- Only dimension physical environment positive development 2012-2014
Leefbaarometer Heerlen

- Hardly any effect visible in most neighbourhoods
- City centre possible decline liveability
Survey Heerlen

• Respondents indicate extra attention is needed
• Little improvement noticed due to extra attention
• Respondents generally positive about projects in the neighbourhoods
## Indicators Heerlen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density dwellings</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rate dwellings</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration rate</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>+0.03%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gelsenkirchen

Problems – Measures - Effects
Gelsenkirchen

• Mining city
• Last mine closed in 2000
• 400,000 inhabitants in 1960s
• 260,000 inhabitants 2015
Problems - Hardware

• High unemployment rate
• Vacancy and decay
• Low quality retail
• Large industrial facilities form barrier
• High share of immigrants
Problems - Software

- Less youth more elderly

Population Gelsenkirchen

- 2000
- 2005
- 2010
- 2014
Problems - Software

• Social disadvantages
• Social conflicts
Problems - Mindware

• Negative image of certain neighbourhoods
Measures - IBA Emscher park

- Project oriented collaboration between cities
- Ecological and urban renewal of Northern Ruhr area
- No extra funds available
- Investment of €2.6 billion
- Improvement image region
- Not many jobs created
Measures - Hardware

• Demolishment of dwellings
• Redevelopment of public space
• Quality improvement of existing real estate
• Education and training activities
Measures - Software

• Social integration activities
• Residential activation
• Neighbourhood centres
Measures - Mindware

• Communication concept
Measures - Tossehof

- Demolishment of dwellings and modernisation of dwellings
- Redevelopment of public space
City centre

Heinrich König platz August 2015

Heinrich König platz Februari 2016
Städteranking

- Explain success of region
- Success: purchasing power and employment
  - Labour market 40%
  - Economic structure 30%
  - Real estate market 20%
  - Quality of life 10%
- 69 biggest cities in Germany
- WirtschaftsWoche & Immobilienscout24
Städteranking Gelsenkirchen

• Level ranking: last place
  – Many people in debt
  – High unemployment persons ≥ 55 years old

• Dynamics ranking: second last
  – Positive development unemployment
  – Negative development people in debt
Survey Gelsenkirchen

• Satisfied with living environment but want to move if possible
• No or little effect extra attention
• Projects cause nuisance
• Dirty, dangerous, old-fashioned, cheap city, unpleasant to live
## Indicators Gelsenkirchen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density dwellings</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rate dwellings</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration rate</td>
<td>-0.06%</td>
<td>+0.32%</td>
<td>+0.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison
Problems

- Vacancy & Decay
- High unemployment
- Ageing population

- HE:
  - low income
  - departure high-educated people

- GE:
  - poor quality schools
  - industrial facilities physical barrier
Measures

• Integrated measures
• Involve residents
• Living
• Employment
• Education
• Integration
• IBA’s
Effects - Survey

- Respondents Heerlen more satisfied
- Both cities extra attention needed
- Heerlen more improvement noticed by residents
Effects - Indicators

• Gelsenkirchen higher unemployment rate
• Gelsenkirchen more vacancy
Conclusions

Reasons effects – transfer measures
Conclusions

• Difficult to determine effect individual measures
• No significant change liveability
• Heerlen more rigorous projects
• “old-fashioned” way of development (masterplan)
• Gelsenkirchen projects take a long time
• After IBA Heerlen attention for collaboration
Conclusions

Figuur 7.1 Gewicht per dimensie in de Leefbaarometer

- fysieke omgeving 18%
- woningen 18%
- veiligheid 24%
- bevolking 15%
- voorzieningen 25%
Recommendations

- Study IBA’s more into detail;
- IBA evaluations;
- Other cities and other countries;
The end
• Unemployment no part of Leefbaarometer but unemployment increased so this could be a reason that liveability did not increase
• Possible that focus of municipality is on other aspects than residents would like
• Possible that it takes more time for residents to notice improvements