



Resituating the Local in Cohesion and Territorial Development



Pictures Kees Dol*

Case study report
National Program Rotterdam South
Neighbourhood Development in a Large Deprived Urban Area,
Netherlands

Authors: Kees Dol, Joris Hoekstra and Reinout Kleinhans

Report Information

Title:	Case Study Report: National Program Rotterdam South. Neighbourhood Development in a Large Deprived Urban Area, Netherlands (RELOCAL Deliverable 6.2)
Authors:	Kees Dol, Joris Hoekstra and Reinout Kleinhans
Version:	Final
Date of Publication:	29.03.2019
Dissemination level:	Public

Project Information

Project Acronym	RELOCAL
Project Full title:	Resituating the Local in Cohesion and Territorial Development
Grant Agreement:	727097
Project Duration:	48 months
Project coordinator:	UEF

*The pictures were taken in the Afrikaander neighbourhood in the Rotterdam South District. The two upper pictures show the older relics of Afrikaanderwijk: harbour front industry and older urban housing. The two pictures in the middle show new housing built for the middle classes and an advertisement that welcomes the visitors into the neighbourhood. The lower left picture shows that primary school children have six additional school hours, which is part of the National Programme Rotterdam South (and funded by the Ministry of Education). The lower right picture shows the door-sign of the Afrikaander neighbourhood cooperative, which is an entirely self-organised, bottom-up societal organisation.

Bibliographic Information

Dol K, Hoekstra J and Kleinhans R (2019) *National Program Rotterdam South. Neighbourhood Development in a Large Deprived Urban Area, Netherlands*. RELOCAL Case Study N° 20/33. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.

Information may be quoted provided the source is stated accurately and clearly.

Reproduction for own/internal use is permitted.

This paper can be downloaded from our website: <https://relocal.eu>

Table of Contents

List of Maps	iv
List of Tables.....	iv
Abbreviations	v
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	3
2. Methodological Reflection.....	5
3. The Locality	6
3.1 Territorial Context and Characteristics of the Locality	6
3.2 Locality, local perceptions and resources.....	9
4. The Action.....	16
4.1 Outline of the Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid (NPRZ)	16
4.2 Analytical Dimension 3: Coordination and implementation of the action.....	18
5. Final Assessment: Capacities for Change.....	28
6. Conclusions.....	33
7. References	36
8. Annexes.....	41
8.1 List of Interviewed Experts.....	41
8.2 Stakeholder Interaction Table	42
8.3 Additional information.....	43

List of Figures

Figure 4.1 Main working structure of the NPRZ

Figure 4.2 Involvement of stakeholders in the NPRZ program

List of Maps

Map 3.1 Rotterdam

Map 3.2 Main target area of NPRZ: Focus Areas are Feijenoord, Afrikaanderwijk, Hillesluis, Bloemhof, Tarwewijk, Carnisse and Oud-Charlois.

Map 3.3 Proportion of individuals with a low income in Rotterdam South, 100 by 100 metres grid (blue is lowest proportion, red is highest proportion)

Map 8.1 Liveability index Rotterdam municipality

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Basic socio-economic characteristics of the area

Table 3.2 Socio-economic indicators of Rotterdam South compared to other Dutch localities (2017)

Table 3.3 Distribution of housing stock by tenure, Rotterdam South

Table 4.1 Main events in the history of the NPRZ-project

Table 8.1 Physical, Social and Safety indices, Rotterdam South

Table 8.2 Population by ethnicity, main groups as % of the entire population, Rotterdam South

Abbreviations

EC	European Commission
EFRD	European Fund for Regional Development
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
NPRZ	Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid
NUTS	Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics
UIA	Urban Innovative Actions

Executive Summary

Background

Rotterdam South is a district where many of the approximately 200,000 residents suffer from a multitude of problems such as low incomes, inadequate professional skills, educational and language deficiencies, unmanageable debts, substance abuse and health/mental problems. Crime has the potential to undermine local society, by luring persons with a poor outlook into criminal careers. Many areas of the district are not considered a positive environment for children to grow up, which restricts youths to reach their full socio-economic potential.

Findings

Spatial injustice in Rotterdam South relates to a **strong concentration of socio-economically vulnerable households**. This concentration can create negative neighbourhood effects, where children and adults have a restricted 'window on the world'. Whilst the metropolitan economy offers many jobs for technical and (health) care professions, there is a huge mismatch with the skill level of the (unemployed) labour reserve in Rotterdam South. Moreover, many children do not choose educational trajectories that match with the demand on the labour market, while some youngsters suffer from the **negative reputation of Rotterdam South** (in the sense that they face discrimination on the labour market), **another form of spatial injustice**. The window on the world of some youngsters hardly reaches beyond their local street culture, which results in unsuccessful job search trajectories. As many adults face a multitude of problems, they are in a 'survival mode', which hinders them in supporting educational trajectories of their children. It also inhibits participation in local societal organisations that attempt to improve the local socioeconomic conditions and liveability.

Localised action

The national government and virtually all local stakeholders (residents' group, employers, housing associations, educational instances) shared the diagnosis that problems in Rotterdam South were of an un-Dutch proportion. They all recognised that a transformation of the local socioeconomic structure requires a long-term approach, because results may only become visible after a generation. Therefore, the intervention should preferably be unexposed to political wavering and other shorter-term interests. Furthermore, many problems of residents are interrelated and need an interdisciplinary approach. These insights resulted in establishment of the **Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid (NPRZ)** in 2010, a network organisation that aims to enhance education, employment opportunities and more social diversification. A small bureau is the locus of this network organisation. **The NPRZ bureau received a strong mandate from stakeholders to keep the program on course**. It coordinates the actions with a small but persistent staff of seven persons. The NPRZ is neither a platform that distributes funding nor a top-down extension of the national government in The Hague. All stakeholders commit themselves, contribute their own projects and execute them. Still, the national government is a key stakeholder as

it provides much funding, especially for the important pillar of education. Overall, **the NPRZ can be regarded as a form of temporal local autonomy.**

Outlook

The NPRZ has been running for nine years now and one major pitfall would be to already expect significant changes in the socio-economic structure of the district. However, there are positive signs now, as educational achievements seem to improve across the area, long term unemployment is declining and new housing projects attract more interest from middle incomes. **About two thirds of the NPRZ projects are now on the expected trajectory, but the NPRZ bureau admits that the achievements are still fragile.** Yet, the proportion of households with complex problems is still as high as before the start of the crisis in 2009. For many residents the general improvements are neither tangible nor durable. However, most stakeholders think the marching route is overall positive and additional funding of € 260 million has been granted by the national government for the implementation program of 2019-2022. In the last few years, the NPRZ bureau has also attracted funds from the EC for improving 'education to employment trajectories' for youths in Rotterdam South. Also, local employers provide career guarantees to young people that choose for education in technique and (health) care professions.

1. Introduction

In 2010 Minister Van der Laan, responsible for Spatial Planning, the Environment, Housing and Neighbourhoods, asked Wim Deetman and Jan Mans¹ for an advice on the way to address the diverse and complex societal problems on the Rotterdam South Bank, which houses about 200,000 residents. Based on information gathering sessions with a wide range of local stakeholders and experts, Deetman and Mans (2011) concluded that the scale of societal problems was of an un-Dutch magnitude and had proven to be quite persistent. Residents that improve their situation usually move out of Rotterdam South, while vulnerable households rely on the district for cheap housing. Important observations by Deetman and Mans were that problems such as unemployment, re-entry into employment, discrimination by employers, educational underperformance, insufficient language skills, school drop-out, mental issues, drug addiction, domestic violence, financial debts and poor housing conditions often interrelate and accumulate in Rotterdam South. It was acknowledged that previous interventions had had their merits, but they 'merely' prevented the district from performing even worse. The only exceptions were Katendrecht and Kop van Zuid that, over the course of about 15 years, had managed to attract middle incomes after drastic physical interventions. Deetman and Mans (2010) proposed to focus on three points for improvement:

1. The need for a shared vision to develop/improve Rotterdam South.
2. To realise much more 'power of perseverance' (by public professionals) in the neighbourhoods in Rotterdam South
3. To include residents and (local) entrepreneurs in developments on the neighbourhood level.

The background to point 1 was that neighbourhood-oriented programs from around 2007 had persisted on a sectoral approach (social welfare, health, housing etc.), while problems of individuals transcend the traditional sectors. One way to address this problem, is to develop a comprehensive shared vision that is supported by all relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, 'power of perseverance' is needed to transcend sectoral approaches. It is quite evident that any solution for households facing a multitude of problems requires coordination between the welfare organisations, but in practice, there was often reluctance by (public) professionals to interfere with other sectoral competences. Deetman and Mans refer to this as 'action shyness'. The 'system' lacked individuals that had the mandate and/or the (personal) authority to break through sectoral barriers (see Deetman and Mans, 2011). Inclusion of residents is relevant because Deetman and Mans recognised that active resident's participation often leads to better results. Furthermore, local entrepreneurs can also benefit from social improvements in the district. After the analysis and recommendations of the Deetman/Mans commission, the basis for the *Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid* (NPRZ) was established.

¹ Both are former mayor of a large Dutch city (The Hague and Enschede), while Deetman is also a former Minister of Education.

The NPRZ revolves around **three main** pillars (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2011)

1. Talent development through education and formation of skills
2. Economic strengthening and employment i.e. reduction of unemployment
3. Physical improvement (housing and living environment)

The NPRZ project bureau is not a governmental institution but needs to be regarded as a network organisation². **The Executive Committee of the NPRZ is made up of representatives of Rotterdam Municipality (mayor), educational institutions, employers, health and care (wellbeing) organisations, the housing associations, the residents and finally the Directorate of Housing and Living Environment of the Dutch central government.** Each of these representatives have their 'table' at which they talk with their constituencies for feedback. This type of governance structure is new to the Netherlands. It resembles the spider in the web of a large network, which on the one hand relies on the participation of all relevant stakeholders, but which on the other hand requires the 'power of perseverance' in order to keep all stakeholders committed to this programme, because it does not have any substantial financial means of its own. The NPRZ project bureau lobbies for additional (incidental) funding of projects. This includes attraction of EC-funds from the ESF, EFRD and the Urban Innovative Action program.

The task the NPRZ sets itself is to raise Rotterdam South to a level comparable to other neighbourhoods in the four largest cities in the Netherlands by 2030. This long-term perspective was agreed on because a fundamental social and physical transformation of the district will take 'a generation'. The first two pillars **are to improve the prospects of young people, while it also aims to activate those adults that do not have any meaningful daily routine.** A multitude of individual problems can impede a decent educational or employment career, so the NPRZ intends to assist troubled residents in regaining control over their personal situation. The third pillar aims to provide residents with a liveable (safe) neighbourhood and a decent dwelling. This pillar includes restructuring of the housing stock, by offering dwellings that are attractive for the upwardly mobile in Rotterdam South in order to reverse the longstanding process of selective out migration.

Especially **the first two pillars of NPRZ (education and employment) reflect national government's approaches that have increasingly promoted Active Labour Market Policies (ALMP).** It contrasts to former approaches that included high degrees of employment protection and/or generous unemployment benefits (see e.g. Veldboer et al, 2015; Kampen et al, 2019). Today, liberal Prime Minister Mark Rutte's third coalition government strongly urges individuals to remain active and stay in work whenever they can. Similar objectives as in pillar 1 and 2 of the NPRZ (see previous page) were being developed in earlier approaches to problematic neighbourhoods (see Schiller, 2010; VROM-Raad, 2006), but the NPRZ now aims to focus much more directly on individuals in problem neighbourhoods, with a more comprehensive approach. **Regarding the role of the EU, there is no mention of social cohesion or direct reference to other EU policies** (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2011). However, the NPRZ has drawn on ESF/EFRD budgets and was awarded a grant from the Urban Innovative Actions program.

² Information in this paragraph is derived from Programmabureau NPRZ (2012 and 2015) and interviews that were carried out with representatives of this bureau.

2. Methodological Reflection

The first author of the report made several walks in the district, often before and after interviews. Some visits were made in the weekend when there are more people in the street and there is a different buzz in the neighbourhood.

Potential interviewees were first identified via the network of the authors and other colleagues in our institute. The first interviewees gave further suggestions for potential candidates and/or organisations. Other relevant interviewees were found by just contacting relevant institutions/stakeholders. Before the formal start of the interview we commenced by telling what kind of information we were looking for. Depending on the interviewee, we focused on different parts of the list of guiding questions. Still, the set of guiding questions turned out to be very ambitious, given that the interviewees were often available for one hour. Furthermore, many interviewees needed some time to grasp the complex concept of spatial justice. Virtually all interviewees understood quite well what kind of information we were looking for. Interviewees were not reluctant at all to be critical of higher-level policy makers and were often quite willing to propose their own solutions.

Interviews were done by the researchers themselves. The interviews were recorded and transcribed, while general notes were made during the interviews. Content analysis was done on the notes, transcriptions and recordings. Finally, the plethora of studies and policy documents on the disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Rotterdam South provided valuable additional information. Several recent studies include interview material with residents of (parts of) Rotterdam South, making them very useful for our case study (e.g. Tersteeg et al, 2015; Doucet and Koenders, 2018). This allowed us to focus a bit more on (primary) schools, who are important recipients of the policy, rather than having extensive rounds of interviews (or informal talks) with residents. Considering that the NPRZ program is so broad, we decided not to have general focus group discussions (at the programme level) but rather a couple of discussions-interviews with two or more participants.

All the material was analysed using an inductive approach, where we attempted to generalise the statements by interviewees and relevant secondary material to workable concepts of spatial (in)justice. Sometimes this was done during the interview by discussing with the interviewee, but it was also done during our content analysis.


3. The Locality

3.1 Territorial Context and Characteristics of the Locality

Expansion of merchant trade and industrialisation in the mid-19th century required large new harbour facilities which were constructed on the south bank of the Meuse river, opposite of the city of Rotterdam. Problems gradually arose in Rotterdam South from the 1960s and onwards, when less manual labour was required in harbour activities and the ship building sector collapsed after competition from East Asia. An economic crisis of the 1970s and (early) 1980s led to additional unemployment and industrial-economic restructuring (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2011).

Name of Case Study Area	Rotterdam Zuid
Size	NPRZ area 30 km ² NPRZ <u>Focus Areas</u> 7-8 km ² (estimation)
Total population (2016)	Circa 200.000
Population density (2016)	About 3,000/km ² (Rotterdam entire city)
Level of development in relation to wider socio-economic context	Disadvantaged within a municipality that lags somewhat in the Randstad Metropole.
Type of the region	Predominantly urban
Name and Identification Code of the NUTS-3	NL339 'Groot Rijnmond'
Name and Identification Code of the NUTS-2	Zuid Holland

Table 3.1 Basic socio-economic characteristics of the area
Source on 'size': Wijkprofielen Rotterdam (wijkprofiel.rotterdam.nl)



Map 3.1 Rotterdam

Source: Kadastralekaart.com

Rotterdam South was poorly connected to the main city of Rotterdam. Ferries provided all connections until the opening of the Willemsbrug (1878) and the Maastunnel (1942). Another main bridge (Brienoord) was only opened in 1965, but this was a connection that

mostly bypassed Rotterdam South. The Erasmusbrug of 1996 is the second bridge that connects the old city centre directly with Rotterdam South.

Dock workers and industrial labourers were accommodated in low quality housing complexes in the areas of Kop van Zuid, Katendrecht, and Feijenoord (see Oudenaarden and Vroegindeweij, 2015). Of somewhat later date are Tarwewijk, Bloemhof and Hillesluis, the first neighbourhoods with more involvement of non-profit housing associations. After World War II, the 'garden cities' of Pendrecht, Zuidwijk and Lombardijen were developed entirely by housing associations (see Map 3.1 and 3.2). The district now has a disproportionate share of cheap rental dwellings. Unintentionally, regional differences in municipal housing policies during the 1970s and 1980s reinforced selective migration. While neighbouring municipalities set out to construct owner occupied housing to meet the preferences of emerging middle classes, Rotterdam focused on affordable rental housing renovation programmes for the working classes on the South Bank (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2011). These differences lead to an outflow of socio-economically mobile households from Rotterdam South, while the district attracts lower incomes. To counterbalance an influx of lower incomes into the most deprived parts of Rotterdam South, a special law (*'Rotterdamwet'*) was introduced in 2005, but today there is still a high concentration of socio economically vulnerable households in the district. Although it would be grossly unjust to state that all residents of Rotterdam South lack any perspective and depend on welfare, there is a disproportionate share of residents that is inactive and has a multitude of (social) problems.

	Netherlands	Largest cities Netherlands	Rotterdam	Rotterdam South	Rotterdam South 7 focus areas
Households dependent on benefit	9%	15%	17%	21%	27%
Children < 18 in a household with < 110% of social minimum income	11%	20%	24%	31%	34%
% of school leavers without diploma	1.8%	3.0%	3.1%	3.6%	3.6%
% of youths with a starters qualification	-	-	57%	49%	48%
Pupils in higher level secondary education	46%	46%	38%	29%	27%
CITO scores*	535.1	534.2	533.4	530.8	529.8
Children in elementary school with lower educated parents	9%	16%	20%	25%	31%
Inhabitants with a migrant background	22%	49%	50%	60%	75%
Vulnerable housing stock**	-	-	24%	35%	51%
Average house value x € 1,000	204.5	204.5	149.0	113.7	90.3

Table 3.2 Socio-economic indicators of Rotterdam South compared to other Dutch localities (2017)

* Scores for elementary school pupils which determine access to higher level secondary education

**Small apartments < 75 sq. m., without an elevator and at economic value < € 130.000

Source: Programmabureau NPRZ (2017)

Around the turn of the 20th century, Rotterdam South became known in popular media as a 'sewage drain', a metaphor for an area that attracts the most disadvantaged households (see Hoogstad, 2018). Such a stigma is not justified for the entire district, but there were certainly many neighbourhoods in Rotterdam South where residents faced severe social

problems. Table 3.2 gives a general ‘statistical’ impression of the problems in Rotterdam South. Additional statistical information is available in Chapter 8.

Chapter 1 already mentioned that several rounds of interventions have been undertaken in Rotterdam South from the 1970’s and onwards, but these were often of a more physical nature and hardly addressed the real sources of social problems amongst individuals. The overall balance is that problems have not been greatly reduced by 2010. However, a few notable exceptions should be mentioned. Along the docklands of Kop van Zuid, new housing development in higher market segments (owner occupied) attracted middle classes. The former dockland of Katendrecht, once a notorious area for drugs dealing and prostitution, is now transformed into a neighbourhood which still houses lower incomes, but the new developments are inhabited by middle classes.



Map 3.2 Main target of NPRZ: Focus Areas are Feijenoord, Afrikaanderwijk, Hillesluis, Bloemhof, Tarwewijk, Carnisse and Oud-Charlois.

Source: Kadastralekaart.com

Yet, there is an irony to this situation because the Rotterdam region is regarded as a main economic engine for the Dutch economy. There is abundant work for mid-level technical professions, but many people in Rotterdam South lack the skills that are necessary to perform such jobs. Furthermore, a few interviewees claim that mid-level technical professions have a poor reputation in the local (migrant) community (RZ3, RZINF1). Possibly harbour

related technical employment is still associated with the back breaking, filthy and low-paid work by previous generations.

North and South

Gentrification is taking place in several areas in Rotterdam North. It underpins the new elan of a city that struggled to recover from the traumatic experiences in May 1940 (when the city was heavily bombed) and industrial decline during the 1970s and 1980s. Rotterdam is now depicted as a thriving, self-conscious city, that attracts young and creative people who enjoy living in the city centre and surrounding neighbourhoods (Hoogstad, 2018). “*Help we are popular!*” is the title of a recent book by Liukku and Mandas (2016). It reflects a longstanding inferiority complex Rotterdammers and their shock when they first spotted tourists in their town. However, this new elan mostly applies to Rotterdam North while Rotterdam South keeps struggling. Although Kop van Zuid and Katendrecht are now subject to processes of gentrification, it is unlikely that this process will expand to the main areas of Rotterdam South. Still, urban redevelopment and associated displacement of lower incomes can spark a discussion about gentrification, another form of social injustice. In Appendix II we address this issue somewhat further, but we maintain that the key problem here is a concentration of socioeconomically vulnerable residents, while gentrification is no big issue and is sometimes even welcomed by residents.

3.2 Locality, local perceptions and resources

All stakeholders who were interviewed for the Relocal-project regard the high concentration of socio-economically vulnerable households in the district of Rotterdam South as the main problem. They support the analysis of Deetman and Mans (2011), which was largely based on interviews and talks with professional stakeholders and residents of Rotterdam South. Similar views can also be found in other Dutch municipalities, while the central government also rejects a high concentration of vulnerable households (Van Kempen and Bolt, 2009).

However, Relocal interviewees questioned whether one should always regard a high concentration of socio-economically vulnerable households as a spatial injustice³.

Quite often, interviewees made direct links to parents’ poor educational and unsuccessful employment careers, which often impede homework assistance and support/advice in career decisions for their children. Many interviewees also referred to the ‘survival mode’ of many adults in Rotterdam South. They have too many problems of their own and therefore have little time for their children. These discourses appear to be linked to concepts of **intergenerational transmission of poverty rather than spatial injustice** (see Van Ham et al, 2016). However, the boundaries between intergenerational transmission of poverty and spatial injustice can be blurred since poverty tends to be spatially concentrated. In any case, it appears that support for the younger generation is a key issue, which will also become evident in the actions taken (see chapter 4).

Still, many Relocal interviewees did refer to factors that can be categorised as ‘**neighbourhood effects**’⁴, although they were not fully convinced that neighbourhood effects play a decisive role. A neighbourhood effect is commonly defined as effects of the neigh-

³ Interviewees were often puzzled by the concept of spatial injustice (see section 1.1 methodology).

⁴ They did not always explicitly mention the term neighbourhood effect.

bourhood on socioeconomic outcomes of individual residents, beyond the impact of their own individual characteristics (see Galster, 2012). Interviewees sense that neighbourhood effects arise when a high proportion of the neighbourhood's adults experience problems such as unemployment, a poor outlook in life, health problems, debts etc. So apart from their own household, the entire local environment offers a limited perspective for children with regard to their future opportunities. A couple of interviewees state that certain stereotypes can be confirmed: the best prospect some children can come up with is having a barber shop or a snack corner⁵ (RZ2, RZINF1). *"Some kids had absolutely no idea what a welder is, when I asked them."* (RZ2) In other words, there seems to be a restricted 'window on the world' for children and many adults. One interviewee stated that there are many possibilities to go on free informative weekend outings in Rotterdam and surroundings, but parents are just not aware of it (RZ8). Others remarked that some children have never visited any kind of museum. Interviewees social organizations indicated that they provide small internships for children at a museum, just to let them become aware of 'other social worlds' (RZ15, RZINF2). In a similar vein, some interviewees mention that some youths in Rotterdam South live in a street culture that does not match the behavioural norms outside the district. This can hamper recruitment by employers. Many of these aforementioned factors are also found in the international literature on neighbourhood effects (see e.g. Galster, 2012)

Furthermore, language is a problem because quite a few children with a migrant background hardly use Dutch in daily life. One primary school director said *"I, as the teacher, am one of the very few (adult) persons that the children can rely on for some fluent Dutch conversation. I know different schools in this area and I am well aware that the non-native speakers learn Dutch much quicker when they are in a surrounding where a significant share of children speaks fluent Dutch."* (RZ9b)

A second main dimension of spatial injustice is the negative reputation of the district, which can also be regarded as a neighbourhood effect (interviewees and also Tersteeg et al, 2015; Doucet and Koenders, 2018; Hoogstad, 2018). Several sources mention that local residents experience negative reactions when they state that they come from Rotterdam South, while they also often feel that their neighbourhood is (has been) somewhat neglected by the authorities. One interviewee indicated explicitly that the media only focus on bad news in the Afrikaanderwijk (RZ16). **This gives some insight into how residents explain their situation in relation to spatial injustice.** The study by Doucet and Koenders (2018) indicates that the large-scale interventions in the docklands give residents the idea that neglect of this subarea (Afrikaanderwijk) is somewhat reduced. The negative stigma can harm individuals' opportunities and social acceptance outside the neighbourhood. However, one interviewee warned that this should not be exaggerated because a majority of Rotterdam South's adults does hold a job (RZ3).

Next to these two main manifestations of spatial injustice, **interviewees and other sources also mentioned distributional dimensions of spatial inequalities due to the relative isolation and concentration of lower incomes. Nearly all grammar schools (requirement for entry to university), cultural facilities or even a proper bookstore/library are on the North bank⁶.**

⁵ The Dutch equivalent of a British fish & chips shop, which sells deep fried food.

⁶ See Appendix I for a more detailed description.

Physical spaces of injustice within the locality

To many Relocal interviewees, the stereotype of Rotterdam South as a ‘sewage drain’ does not do justice to the entire district. Especially some professionals were able to sketch out quite detailed images of the diversity within Rotterdam South (RZ2, RZ17, RZ19). For instance, **in the general (national and local) Dutch policy discourses, problematic neighbourhoods are usually correlated with a high proportion of social rental housing, but such a ‘causality’ is spurious in Rotterdam South.** A first glance on table 3.3 in combination with additional info on social indicators in chapter 8 can give some insights into this spuriousness.

In fact, local experts indicate that a high percentage of *private* rental is often a warning sign for a high concentration of vulnerable newcomers (migrants) in poorly maintained and overpriced housing. Often this housing is rented out illegally and per room, which leads to overcrowding. Social housing would be the best option for these vulnerable households, but this sector has long waiting lists (or lotteries), while private rental is more readily available. Interviewees regard Tarwewijk and Carnisse as examples of areas with a large share of private rented housing (see table 3.3). Several interviewees told that these dwellings (areas) attract many Eastern-European labour migrants who are very mobile, have different daily patterns, hardly have contacts with other residents and contribute little to social cohesion (RZ7a, RZ7b, RZ8, RZ19; see also Van Steenberghe and Wittmayer, 2012). School representatives also indicate that the turnover of pupils in neighbourhood schools is high *“they pick up their kids within a year and leave”*, (RZ7a) which hinders the bonding with teachers and other children in the school and the neighbourhood.

Furthermore, one interviewee warned about the high degree of owner occupation in Carnisse. **Policy makers often aim for a higher degree of owner occupation but, “... tenure says absolutely nothing. We have many owner occupiers here who cannot pay the home owners association’s fees because they cope with other debts”** (RZ15). As a result, owner occupied apartment complexes often face maintenance problems.

In Feijenoord and Afrikaanderwijk, the commonly held belief of a causal relation between an overrepresentation of social rental housing and problems may be confirmed, but the dwelling quality is usually higher than in Tarwewijk and Carnisse. Feijenoord and Afrikaanderwijk were subject to the 1980s urban renewal operation (*‘Stadsvernieuwing’*): from poor quality private rent into reasonable quality social housing⁷. They are much more stable in terms of population turnover and residents have more affinity with their neighbourhood. Schools in Feijenoord and Afrikaanderwijk also have a much more stable population, with many children from the ‘traditional’ migrant groups (Turkish, Surinamese and Moroccan).

As mentioned, Kop van Zuid and Katendrecht have undergone a drastic urban renewal operation in the last two decades and they now have a much more diverse population in terms of income. Interviewees are aware of this, but they do not regard it as a huge problem⁸. News reports indicate that ‘old’ and new residents usually do not have many conflicts, but they ‘live apart together’ (Trouw Newspaper 2018). Perhaps the best example is

⁷ Transformation of poor quality private housing into decent social housing requires vast investments.

Under the current political ideology, the government is reluctant to provide the means for such operations.

⁸ See also Appendix II for gentrification in Rotterdam South.

parent's behaviour in school selection. School directors say that 'native, white' middle income Dutch households often do not send their children to the local neighbourhood schools, but rather to 'white' schools in Rotterdam North (RZ7a, RZ9b). This is a disappointment because many expect that more social mix in schools could also stimulate better language skills and perhaps also a better 'window on the world'. This school segregation has also been identified in an urban renewal neighbourhood in Rotterdam North (Bosch and Ouwehand, 2018).


	Social rent	Private rent	Owner occupied
Focus areas South			
Afrikaanderwijk	85%	6%	10%
Bloemhof	58%	20%	22%
Carnisse	13%	40%	47%
Feijenoord	93%	1%	6%
Hillesluis	50%	26%	24%
Oud-Charlois	38%	27%	35%
Tarwewijk	31%	40%	29%
Other relevant areas on South, in Italics former restructuring areas			
<i>Katendrecht</i>	66%	7%	27%
<i>Kop van Zuid Entrepot</i>	54%	15%	31%
Noordereiland	52%	20%	28%
<i>Pendrecht</i>	63%	9%	28%
Vreewijk	82%	6%	12%
<i>Zuidwijk</i>	71%	9%	21%

Table 3.3 Distribution of housing stock by tenure, in Rotterdam South

Source: WoningBevolkingsOnderzoeksBestand (WBOB), Rotterdam Municipality

The perceptions of Relocal-interviewees and other experts usually match with the maps of income diversity constructed by Janssen and Van Ham (2018, see map 3.3)⁹. This type of analysis transcends administrative boundaries and gives a good perspective on the spatial dimensions of segregation and 'social cliffs'. The highest concentrations of lower incomes are found in Afrikaanderwijk, Feijenoord, Tarwewijk, Bloemhof and Hillesluis. Oud Charlois and Carnisse have more variation. Interestingly, Carnisse is often mentioned as a problem area (see previous paragraph), but there is quite a bit of income differentiation. Easily visible are also the higher income spots in areas that used to be very deprived (Katendrecht, Kop van Zuid). **The overall conclusion is that local experts usually have quite a good 'mental map' of the diversity in the area, but that the 'outside world' usually constructs a stigma for the entire district.** However, anyone with an interest in the district can access a multitude of websites of the municipality with socio-economic indicators of neighbourhoods (see also Chapter 8). Also, the NPRZ website offers such information in the *Handelingsperspectieven* (action perspectives) for each neighbourhood in Rotterdam South on its website, which give a quick overview of the problems.

⁹ This particular publication is a Relocal deliverable from WP 5.2.



Map 3.3 Proportion of individuals with a low income in Rotterdam South, 100 by 100 metres grid (blue lowest proportion, red highest proportion)

Source: Janssen and Van Ham, 2018

Analytical Dimension 2: Tools and policies for development and cohesion

Manifestations of spatial (in)justice in local policy?

The developmental trajectory of the locality shows a socio-economic deterioration until 2010, the moment when NPRZ was launched. Some of the general macro-economic backgrounds were described in the previous sections. So, there is a high concentration of socio economically vulnerable households in Rotterdam South of whom many are economically inactive. Although we will not get into all the details of demand and supply mismatches on the labour market, **there is a general sense amongst policy makers and employers that Rotterdam South offers a labour reserve that is under used.** The metropolitan area with its harbour related activities is considered as one of the main assets of the Dutch economy and jobs are (currently) abundant, but many residents in Rotterdam South lack the skills, suffer from stigmas, personal problems etc. Whereas previous policies of the 1980s and 1990s were often targeted at improving the economic foundations of the city, Rotterdam cannot be regarded anymore as a deteriorated post-industrial city. There is a new elan in Rotterdam, but it has not affected the opportunities of many residents of Rotterdam South.

Furthermore, both national and municipal policy circles have recognised that concentration of lower incomes is negative and might restrict the full potential of the population

(see Van Kempen and Bolt, 2009; Kleinhans, 2004). **From the early 1990s (local) policy discourses came to revolve around a need to create more ‘social mix’**, based on the premise that areas with a limited social mix had little *social cohesion*¹⁰ (MVR0M, 1997). Policy makers’ expectations range from the general idea that lower incomes will benefit from the examples set by middle-class residents, to more concrete arguments that the middle classes often have more capabilities to organise themselves and improve the general situation in the neighbourhood in terms of liveability, social organisations and schools (Kleinhans, 2004). Lower incomes in the same neighbourhood would then benefit from the middle classes’ organisational skills. There is a kind of assimilation thinking behind this, which became even more visible when the ethnic dimension started to emerge in policy documents (Van Kempen and Bolt, 2009, p.464). Some policy makers argued that *ethnic* concentration in a neighbourhood could impede social cohesion because several ethnic groups often live ‘parallel lives’ alongside mainstream Dutch society. For Dutch policy makers, a logical measure to stimulate social mix was to demolish the worst parts of the housing stock and rebuild dwellings for the middle classes (see e.g. Dol and Kleinhans, 2012). These urban restructuring operations were often aimed at retaining emerging middle classes in the neighbourhoods and certainly not solely at attracting middle class residents from outside the district (see debate on definitions of gentrification in Appendix I).

Main drivers of the development programs, central government, municipality and housing associations

The objective of creating more social mix as a means to combat low income concentration and create more social cohesion became dominant in the early 1990s (see e.g. Stouten, 2010). However, there was also awareness that individual persons/households would need assistance in improving their lives. At the time, the authorities noticed the mismatch between the supply of low-skilled labour of a significant share of the urban population and the demand for more knowledge driven, high (and medium) skilled jobs. The central government created the Big Cities Policy of 1994 and the Urban Restructuring Policy of 1997 (see MVR0M, 2007). The latter was strongly focused on the physical side, creating more diverse neighbourhoods in terms of housing, while the former had a more social dimension (see Stouten, 2010). **To cut a long story short, there has been agreement amongst policy makers from around the 1990s that social policies, education and social mix can help to combat social and spatial injustices, but this is easier said than done.**

These policies usually require a comprehensive approach, supported by all relevant stakeholders. Stouten (2010) speaks of **problems due to compartmentalisation/sectoral interests and waiting games by stakeholders**. Furthermore, the large private housing stock (table 3.3) in some neighbourhoods has proven to be very complicated to restructure. In areas with a large social housing stock such as Pendrecht and Zuidwijk restructuring was much ‘easier’, because ownership was not so fragmented. The gentrified areas of Katendrecht and Kop van Zuid are former docklands, which are also less complicated to restructure.

The Rotterdam Pact op Zuid of 2007 was led by the municipality and housing associations. It focused on restructuring (much in aforementioned Zuidwijk and Pendrecht) and sup-

¹⁰ Neighbourhood effects were hardly mentioned explicitly.

ported many social initiatives. An evaluation of the Pact op Zuid in 2011 shows **no restraint by the municipality and other actors to reach out to one another and start up neighbourhood related actions**. Municipality, housing associations and wider community set out with great enthusiasm, to such an extent that it became “*a project carousel*” (RZ5a), some neighbourhoods in Rotterdam South became “*a hangout for professionals*” and a high share of this budget was dedicated to such professionals (Van den Bent, 2010). However, the high ambitions evolved into **overactivity and a plethora of (social) projects without much consideration for the general objective to substantially improve the socio-economic structure of Rotterdam South** (see Loorbach et al, 2009; In ‘t Veld, 2018). Van den Bent (2010) indicated that such overactivity is somewhat embedded in the culture of Rotterdam municipality.

Overall, however, the Dutch neighbourhood programs have been abandoned by the central government, which was partly supported by insights that the neighbourhood approach did not bear much fruit (see Permentier et al, 2013). This is contested by those that state that reducing problems in disadvantaged neighbourhoods is a matter of patience and tenacity (see Ouwehand, 2018). Political short sightedness could harm longer term objectives. In this, one of the Relocal interviewees mentioned that improvement of Rotterdam South is a matter of the long view and that part of the current generation may be lost “*...everyone above 35 years.....I will not use my energy.....my energy is based on those youngsters, who are 16-17 years and who might become the next lost generation.*” (RZ3).

Around 2010 **both the national government retrenchment from neighbourhood programs and a changing context for housing associations¹¹ can be regarded as important motives for the Rotterdam lobbies, led by the municipality, to ‘scramble for help’ because problems in Rotterdam South were of an un-Dutch proportion** (RZ4, RZ17). Minister van der Laan of the central government recognised this problem and subsequent actions led to the implementation of the NPRZ, which will be discussed further in chapter 4.

¹¹ Related to a large scale corruption case at Vestia, one of the largest social landlords in Rotterdam South. Furthermore, new legislation requires social landlords to focus on housing and less on liveability. Both events restrict the investment potential of housing associations in Rotterdam South neighbourhoods.

4. The Action

4.1 Outline of the Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid (NPRZ)

As indicated in the introduction, there are three main pillars in the NPRZ approach:

1. Education
2. Work-employment
3. Housing and physical environment

First pillar: education

Here we give a general outline of the main activities, but this is certainly not a complete list. This would require a very detailed and long analysis. As indicated, an important pillar is to provide the young generation with a proper outlook through several activities. The inspiration was the Harlem Children's Zone in New York. The core activities are:

- **Neighbourhood Intervention Teams (NIT; Wijkteams Rotterdam Zuid)** which engage children's households when problems at the home front are suspected. It supports the idea that 'the home base is in order', for children to function properly in school. The NITs work intersectoral and reach out when households problems have accumulated (such as debts, substance abuse, domestic violence, (mental) health issues, etc). The NIT's are supposed to provide an integrated approach coordinated by the municipality, wellbeing and health care institutions. **The NIT's include students from higher educational institutions** who give support and acquire some learning on the job experiences.
- **Additional school hours** for education and general development in primary schools (Financed by Ministry of Education).
- **Mentors on South**, where students from Rotterdam higher educational institutions coach children from Rotterdam South. They assist in school work and teach 'soft skills' (partners Rotterdam University of Applied Science personnel and students; philanthropic organisation 'De Verre Bergen'). A similar track under development is to **muster more parental commitment**.

Second pillar: work-employment

A major frustration of Rotterdam stakeholders is the mismatch between labour supply and skills demanded by the employers. Ample jobs are available in technical, harbour and wellbeing/health care professions, but many children in Rotterdam South appear to be unaware of the opportunities¹².

- **Career guarantees** by several employers in technique and wellbeing/health care. These guarantees imply that a choice for a certain profession/education guarantees a job and avoids non-selection because of the poor reputation of Rotterdam South graduates.
- **Career orientation activities** (NPRZ as coordinator, with input by employers)

¹² While technical professions allegedly have a negative reputation amongst the residents.

It is worth mentioning that the awarding of an **Urban Innovative Action** grant (BRIDGE¹³) in 2016, has enabled the NPRZ project bureau to implement a much more comprehensive career orientation program for children in Rotterdam South.

The second pillar also includes the general Labour Market Activation Policies of Rotterdam. However, the NPRZ project bureau has succeeded in diverting a higher proportion of the municipal budget to Rotterdam South. Examples of projects are ‘Social Return on Investment’, where municipal contractors or urban redevelopment/construction programs need to hire part of their personnel locally or provide work-experience places to local people. Noteworthy is also that funds from the **EFRD** (*Kansen voor West II*), were used for projects targeted to combat **youth unemployment in Rotterdam South**.

Several rounds of Urban Renewal	1980s-2005
Prelude	
‘Pact op Zuid’ (Rotterdam) and Krachtwijken (Central Government)	2006/2007
Critical evaluation Looibach et al (2009) ‘Pact op Zuid’	2009
Global Financial Crisis and looming budget cuts	2009-2012
First steps of the NPRZ project	
Visit of Minister van der Laan to Rotterdam South	2010
Investigation Commission Deetman/Mans on persistent problems in Rotterdam South	2010
Report Deetman/Mans “Kwaliteitssprong Zuid”	2011
Policy document “Zuid werkt! Nationaal Programma Kwaliteitssprong Zuid” + signing of agreement by relevant stakeholders	2011
Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid 2011-2030 (main milestones)	
<i>Implementation Plan NPRZ 2012-2014</i>	
Additional funding extra school hours Children’s Zone € 18 mln/pa	2012
Fiscal incentive for housing associations 60 mln	2013
Investment 494 mln by housing associations	2014-2018
<i>Implementation Plan NPRZ 2015-2018</i>	
Extra pillar: combat undermining illegal activities (drugs, gambling, money laundering)	2015
Awarded BRIDGE-project by EU, € 4.7 mln for projects “school to work”.	2016
EFRD (Kansen voor West) grant, € 1.45 mln, for projects “youth unemployment”	
Regio Deal Rotterdam Zuid: additional funding € 130 mln by Central Government and € 130 mln Rotterdam by Municipality/local stakeholders	2018
<i>Implementation Plan NPRZ 2019-2022</i>	2019
Includes formal policy document Regio Deal Rotterdam Zuid (see above)	
Additional pillar Culture (and sports)	

Table 4.1 Main events in the history of the NPRZ-project

Source: author’s overview based on policy documents and other sources

¹³ <http://www.uia-initiative.eu/en/uia-cities/rotterdam>

Third pillar: housing

The third pillar is housing. The main activities here are:

- Continuation of **urban restructuring** which is aimed at retaining or attracting middle income groups (partners housing associations, private development companies).
- **Improvement of private rental dwellings**, mainly in Tarwewijk and Carnisse (partners private owners, municipality, housing associations)
- **War on malicious landlords**, illegal letting, letting by rooms, extortionate rents (main partner municipality).

In addition, several large-scale investments are underway to improve Zuidplein, where the existing infrastructure of Rotterdam Ahoy entertainment centre (expos, concerts, congresses) will be significantly modernised. This plan will also include more cultural facilities, which are underrepresented in the Rotterdam South district. The current shopping centre will also be modernised and expanded. Such investments give opportunities for Social Return on Investment and work experience places.

4.2 Analytical Dimension 3: Coordination and implementation of the action

4.2.1 Process of implementation

The Deetman/Mans commission talked with all relevant stakeholders and formulated a 'diagnosis' of the problems and a way forward to address the problems¹⁴. Furthermore, Deetman and Mans set first steps towards creating commitment of relevant stakeholders. Relevant stakeholders are the residents' organisations, employers' organisations, educational facilities, housing associations and governmental agencies, both at the municipal level and the central level.

The Central Government shared Deetman and Mans vision and was willing to participate financially, but it demanded commitment and contributions of the relevant stakeholders. **The Central Government had absolutely no intention of coordinating such an action** (RZ4). This appears to be in line with contemporary policies targeted on decentralisation of government. As indicated, **the relevant stakeholders sought for the introduction of an independent organisation that could transcend sectoral interests and is not 'shy' to take action**. As such, an organisation was required with a strong mandate and/or the authority to stimulate action and to keep all partners involved and committed to the long term ambitions (Gemeente Rotterdam, 2011). This new organisation was the *Projectbureau Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid* (Projectbureau NPRZ). The start document 'Zuid Werkt' of 2011 (see table 4.1) was the formalisation.

4.2.2 Coordination of the action and decision-making capacity

While the Central Government was a crucial initiator of the NPRZ program and provides significant funding for the three pillars, it needs to be stressed that **the NPRZ-program bureau is an independent network organisation** that solely serves the greater goal of

¹⁴ This diagnosis is still valid and shared by Relocal-interviewees and many other experts.

achieving a social economic level for Rotterdam South that is comparable the other large cities in the Netherlands.

The NPRZ is a coordinator of the action and is responsible for monitoring and drawing up implementation plans. It has a strong mandate to keeps stakeholders committed and to stimulate new majour actions by the stakeholders. In this, it has successfully lobbied for additional funding from, for instance, the central government or the EU (ESF, EFRD, UIA). However, **it needs to be stressed that the NPRZ bureau is no platform that receives budgets and then distributes them. At the start of the project such a model was considered, but the stakeholders regarded this as overly bureaucratic (RZ3).** Stakeholders formulate relevant projects, commit them to one or more NPRZ objectives and execute them. In the case of the central government this implies that it allocates additional funding directly to, for instance schools and/or urban renewal projects. Other stakeholders provide all kinds of contributions to NPRZ causes (see also Section 4.1). The staff of the NPRZ project bureau consists of only seven persons and the operating costs (including networking, website, engagement events with residents) are funded by the municipality and the stakeholders.

So, NPRZ receives contributions from the central government, the municipality and from local stakeholders. **Local stakeholders are usually part of existing, self-organised platforms**, such as umbrella organisations of primary schools, secondary schools, or employers' organisations. Some of the larger employers in (metropolitan) Rotterdam have also committed themselves directly, such as the regional public transport company (RET), the harbour company Deltalinks and the Ministry of Defence. Furthermore, physical urban restructuring projects often have involvement of the local housing associations. Still, **the Central Government has a dominant role** in network because it provides a majority of the funding for the important educational pillar, while it is also has important financial and legislative contributions for the housing pillar.

The main working structure of the NPRZ is as follows (see figure 4.1). As indicated, the NPRZ is a network organisation. It has a board with the Mayor of Rotterdam as the chair¹⁵, the NPRZ director and delegates of the stakeholders. Delegates of the stakeholders remain in close contact with their 'constitutions'. Each sector has its own consultation tables, where participants from practice can provide input and feedback on the progress of the actions (school directors, housing association, neighbourhood managers etc). The main policy reference is the 'Zuid Werkt' vision document. This long-term vision is executed in four-year plans. It is crucial that these four-year plans are monitored on their progress and therefore the NPRZ program bureau is responsible for drawing up annual reports. Each four-year plan is evaluated and based on the evaluation results, some changes can be made. For instance, in the second plan 'safety' was added as a new pillar, while in the latest plan (2019-2022) culture became a new point of attention (Programmabureau NPRZ, 2019). There is an active lobby from the NPRZ board for additional funding and any substantial contribution is welcome, as long as it fits within the main policy of the NPRZ.

¹⁵ This used to be a politician from the city council, but they usually have a seat for only four years. The Mayor is appointed by central government and usually stays for a prolonged period. As such the Mayor often has more attention for longer term objectives and strategies.

4.2.3 Modes of leadership and distribution of power

As a former municipal alderman in Rotterdam NPRZ director Pastors built a reputation that is the very opposite of ‘action shy’. He is known to be able to break through intersectoral barriers. Several sources mention his ‘sharp and persistent attitude’ (RZ3, RZ5a; Rekenkamer Rotterdam, 2016). The current chair of the NPRZ organisation is Rotterdam mayor Ahmed Aboutaleb (Labour Party), a former state secretary of Social Affairs and Employment and alderman for the municipality of Amsterdam. Both Pastors and Aboutaleb are known in central government circles and have committed themselves to lobbies for additional funding for NPRZ related projects.




Figure 4.1 Main working structure of the NPRZSource: Author’s illustration, based on literature and interviews

The NPRZ project bureau is strict in keeping the stakeholders committed. NPRZ director Pastors himself explained in an interview that this is an absolute requirement in order to run a complex program with a long-term scope. He claims that (local) politicians and municipal departments often commence new projects with great enthusiasm, but they are also known to lose focus or even abandon the project after a few years. This often happens when there are no significant results after some years.

Because of the long-term objectives of NPRZ, the democratic mandate was brought up during interviews. Every four years a new municipal council is elected and it might have different ideas on how to address the problems in Rotterdam South. A new council might

even question the scale of the problems and the need for certain interventions. The NPRZ bureau is quite outspoken about this *“At any rate, you have the task to take care that the new director (alderman) takes over properly...so we do a light exit talk with the leaving director about the experiences and what they would like to convey to their successor. And then in particular the new intake with the new director. It also goes for the housing association manager, the school manager....”* (RZ1) The general approach at these talks is *“one of your predecessors has committed himself in 2011 for the coming twenty years, he’s done so consciously..., it means that you are also committed. And these are the agreements, this is where we are now, and this is the agenda for the coming years.... I’m saying it a bit shortly now (exaggerating)....”* (RZ1)

And about the democratic legitimacy:

“The new city Council of 2011 committed itself for twenty years. They were elected and they committed themselves.” Continues that the central government demands commitment from the local stakeholders as a basic requirement for its’ (financial) involvement in the NPRZ: *“...they also said: we only participate with extra interventions in Rotterdam South when all parties (stakeholders) commit themselves for twenty years.”* (RZ1) This also underpins the importance of the Central Government in the NPRZ network, not so much in the traditional role of a funder and coordinator but as a stimulator of local networking.

The previous relates strongly to the topic of continuity, which the NPRZ regards as the main condition for this long-term project. There is strong aversion towards change in the program and the risk that stakeholder’s managers/directors try to change the current course of the plan. While new funding/initiatives that support the current course are welcome, Pastors take every opportunity to emphasize that only long-term commitment will work and that in the first years it will be hard to see much progress. It is a matter of persistence and endurance. Following this line of thinking, discontinuity in policies and PPP’s can be regarded as an example of injustice.

4.2.4 Decisions on the program (trade-offs)

One decision that the municipality of Rotterdam thought about when establishing the NPRZ was the way in which the NPRZ project bureau would function. One option was to ‘*swipe up*’ all relevant budgets from the stakeholders and have the NPRZ project bureau distribute all these budgets to the individual projects (RZ1, RZ3). *“the other option is where you are responsible for your own budgets, but that.....the agreements are made in the NPRZ, that you execute them and that you are transparent, so you hand over information on progress and if we (NPRZ bureau) think that things do not go well or should be better or different, that you need to gear up. So, the telephone is answered, we have a chat and make an agreement that satisfies me.”* (RZ1). This second option was chosen, because the first option requires a large NPRZ bureaucracy and administration.

At the time of the creation of the NPRZ, it was clear that education, employment and housing would be the main pillars. In this, it follows the *neighbourhood approach* of the central government during 2007-2011. The NPRZ can be regarded as a more intensified variant, with stronger agreements between the partners and a more integral (intersectoral) approach. While crime was no pillar in the first implementation program, more emphasis

was put into addressing crime in the 2015-2018 program. *“We have quite a bit of crime over here... it was hardly recognised at the start of the program. Deetman writes little about it (see Deetman and Mans, 2011), there was an idea of: Rotterdam has addressed safety quite well, because in the street there are less robberies, there are conductors on the trams, the junks are out of public view, that is all true but there is also crime thatentrenched itself...”*. (RZ1) As a result of additional police effort, crime is less visible, but it is still there. NPRZ representatives and written documents confirm that drugs related crime is (still) undermining society and thereby also the progress of NPRZ. The high financial ‘rewards’ from performing little tasks for drug lords are often irresistible to many young people who feel disadvantaged in ‘regular’ society (RZ1; Jansen, 2017).

Another decision was the choice of focus-areas. There is general agreement that the current seven focus neighbourhoods had severe problems around 2010 and they would logically benefit from the NPRZ intervention. However, the non-focus neighbourhoods of Zuidwijk and Pendrecht are also regarded as problem areas. Admittedly, they have undergone a far-reaching physical restructuring from around the mid-1990s (see Kleinhans et al, 2007; Ouwehand, 2018), but these neighbourhoods still face social problems. When asked about this choice, one interviewee is very critical, *“if we talk about procedural and distributional injustice, that is included in the NPRZ choices.” “.... those vulnerable schools in Pendrecht and Zuidwijk, but also the ones in North, they do not get six hours extra education.”* (RZ6). Interestingly a local philanthropic organisation started an alternative for four schools in Pendrecht, the “Children’s Faculty” (see Appendix I) ¹⁶.

4.3 Analytical Dimension 4: Autonomy, participation and engagement

4.3.1 Processes of participation and engagement

The NPRZ has an organisational structure that aims to include all possible stakeholders, from the highest levels to those that work ‘in the field’. Figure 4.2 gives an illustration of the main structure of stakeholder engagement and the participants. The NPRZ board discusses regularly with the delegates of the ‘partner clusters’. Subsequently, the delegates of the partner clusters regularly discuss at the ‘consultation tables’ with their constituency. Part of the constituency at the consultation tables are umbrella organisations themselves, such as employers’ organisations and schools’ umbrella organisations. These umbrella organisations receive feedback from their individual members. There are also opportunities for individual members (for instance school directors) to meet people from the NPRZ board.

4.3.2 Procedural fairness

In general, there are **ample possibilities for those stakeholders in the NPRZ network to participate and express their ideas and opinions about the progress of the NPRZ**. However, as indicated, the NPRZ project bureau is quite strict in keeping all committed

¹⁶ In fact the additional hours of education at primary schools has been expanded to 10 ‘vulnerable’ schools outside the Focus area (see new plans for 2019-2022), which points towards some flexibility.

stakeholders on course. The two new pillars of safety and culture were based on demands from (local) society and serve to support the three main pillars (education, employment and housing). In the next section we give an example how individual primary schools have experienced their possibilities to **articulate their viewpoints**. Furthermore, they reflect on how their **feedback** on the progress of the education pillar has been processed and how **their participation has evolved over time**. We regard this as important information for this particular project, because active involvement of (primary) schools in deprived neighbourhoods is important and school staff/directors are participants at the lowest local level.




Figure 4.2 Involvement of stakeholders in the NPRZ program

Source: Author's illustration, based on literature and interviews

Still, within the NPRZ network there is a delegate of the residents, but this is only one single person who serves as eyes and ears in the entire district. This person is no formal representative of neighbourhood associations, ethnic collectives or bottom up projects. It implies that **at the lowest level the representation of marginalised groups within the NPRZ network is not very strong**¹⁷. And yet the NPRZ is targeted at marginalised groups and the NPRZ bureau continuously stresses that it stimulates residents' participation: not so much in a formal voice but in grasping the opportunities that NPRZ provides in terms of education, employment opportunities and assistance from neighbourhood teams when a multitude individual problems become insurmountable. The logic of the NPRZ also ap-

¹⁷ We had expected more involvement of local groups at the start of the research. We dwell on this in some more detail in Appendix II.

appears to be that the initial diagnosis of the Deetman/Mans commission was shared by all related organisations and the residents. NPRZ seems to be wary of involvement of a multitude of resident groups (see Appendix II for some possible backgrounds). Furthermore, NPRZ cannot finance any local initiatives on its own. It welcomes initiatives and in case relevant projects are forwarded, they can be included in the NPRZ approach, but **there also seems to be some reluctance to become a network for a multitude of small-scale initiatives such as during the former 'Pact op Zuid' approach.** *"I wish them well, as long as they do not interfere with our ambitions"* (RZ1) An interviewee at a higher educational institution confirms that inclusion of many bottom up initiatives has the potential to create another subsidy carousel, as the 'Pact op Zuid' was. *"Let them find their own means"* (RZ5a)¹⁸. Furthermore, **local professionals often indicate that bottom-up initiatives often need a kick start from an outsider because residents often lack the (social) capital.** Many people in the district are in a survival mode. They can express their problems and needs, but they find it hard to start initiatives (see also Appendix II for further elaboration). And lastly, some sources indicate that a tradition of 'overactiveness' by the Rotterdam Municipality leads to few possibilities for active participation by residents (Van den Bent, 2010, implicitly also RZ2). However, it needs to be stressed that Rotterdam Municipality currently has embraced the idea of the 'participation society' provides support to local initiatives for residents that want to voice concerns and/or take action. This includes the 'Right to Challenge' which will be elaborated on in Appendix III.

Still, the NPRZ bureau does reach out to the broader public of residents as well as the stakeholders. **Access to information** about NPRZ is granted via an up to date website. This includes monitoring of progress and the 4-year implementation plan. Furthermore, the NPRZ organised large scale consultation events such as the Citizens Summit, Youth Summit, Parent's Summit, and several Neighbourhood Summits. These summits are used to gather inspiration from the local residents about ways to address problems in Rotterdam South. However, **it seems that the role of resident's organisations as formal stakeholders in NPRZ is somewhat minimised for reasons mentioned above** (and in Appendix II).

Example: participation of primary schools and procedural fairness

Within the NPRZ focus neighbourhoods all primary schools now provide (mandatory) extra teaching hours for general development of children. This idea is based on the (Harlem) Children's Zone in New York, USA. The way in which individual schools and their umbrella organisations are involved in the decision making about the children's zone, provides a good example of how the NPRZ operates in practice.

At the start of the NPRZ project, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, provided € 18 million per year for additional teaching hours. Individual schools had the opportunity to decide on which subjects these hours should be spent. It turned out that school's choices on the subjects varied significantly, ranging from music and arts to more 'serious' topics such as improving language skills. The NPRZ project bureau only demanded that all schools in the focus-neighbourhoods participated, i.e. extra teaching hours. The NPRZ-

¹⁸ Which was positively stated in the sense of becoming active and convincing governmental authorities, third sector organisations, philanthropic foundations, existing neighbourhood organisations or the EC that you have a good idea.

director personally persuaded the last three school boards (out of 60) to participate. These school boards resisted by arguing that “... *parents do not appreciate it at all, those extra lessons*”, but it would be “*a bomb under the entire programme if we don’t let those last three schools give the extra lessons*” (RZ1), otherwise some parents might choose for a school which did not give additional teaching hours. This seemed quite logical to one primary school director: “*At school X there are (some) parents, really highly educated ethnic Dutch parents. Yes, then one can say: it is mandatory, but they want to bring their child to music (lessons) and swimming (lessons) and anything else. They already do it! It is hard to say, all children mandatory six hours additional lessons*” (RZ9b)

The mandate to choose subjects at their own discretion was appreciated by the schools. The NPRZ-bureau’s objective was that individual schools would gradually learn what works best for their pupils and in a later phase they might even exchange best practices. “...*We now are six years into it (NPRZ), that schools themselves also know: well this (lesson) works smoothly, children return happy and that other (lesson) is a bit disappointing... a bit messy in the class, kids confused, so that is something we’d better abandon.*” The NPRZ project bureau explicitly stimulates exchange of experiences between schools. “...*which are the things that work well? Well that is what we share with the entire group (of schools) and then you see a sort of convergence that more schools draw on these (successful) interventions. And spend less time themselves in search of improvement.*” (RZ1)

So the initial idea was to let schools explore for themselves what works best, which relates to a high degree of independence on educational curricula within the Dutch schooling system. The state pays but leaves a high degree of discretion¹⁹. Interviews show that the boards of the traditional pillars (Catholic, Protestant Christian, public) were reluctant to give strong guidelines (RZ1) but some schools were better than others in developing a proper program (RZ9a). One school director also mentioned that hopes may have been a bit too high about cooperation between schools. “... *they have entirely ignored the culture. Previously, the culture was: you were competitors. You had a bit of consultation (rounds) with one another, but you would, above all, not say what went well, because then your neighbour takes off with it.*” (RZ9b) This ‘culture’ was maligned by one interviewee “*that is that very unruly world of education where saying ‘yes’ and doing ‘no’ is almost a rule, or where everyone finds themselves quite unique, all schools find themselves unique, all teachers find themselves unique...*” (RZ5a)

Overall, the primary schools in the focus areas were not always positive about the extra lesson hours in the Children’s Zone (RZ7a, RZ7b, RZ8, RZ9a, RZ9b). Although NPRZ gave them much discretion to decide the subjects to teach, they complained about the strictness of the amount of (prescribed) teaching hours. They also argued that they were hardly heard when they proposed alternatives such as fewer, but more intensive learning hours, possibly even focused on those children that most need it. One school director asked herself what would happen after an influx of more middle-income households in the wake of urban restructuring, which, after all, is the main housing action in NPRZ. Children with a middle-income background usually have better school results anyway, so why not only

¹⁹ Subsidiarity is a main trait of the Dutch corporatist welfare regime.

focus on the children that are most in need extra attention. Primary school directors also emphasized differences between neighbourhoods. The more stable neighbourhoods in terms of population turnover usually cope with fewer children that need extra attention. In the Afrikaanderwijk, a school principal regarded this as a fundamental difference between her school and a school in the neighbourhoods of Tarwewijk and Carnisse, where many Eastern Europeans and other newcomers have structural problems.

Interestingly, the new NPRZ round of 2019-2021 aims for an increase of the additional school hours to 10 per week (Programmabureau NPRZ, 2019) and this has sparked some commotion amongst the school boards (Algemeen Dagblad 2019)²⁰. Several school representatives argue that more funding is very welcome for schools in Rotterdam South, but they challenge the need for even more teaching hours (ibid). NPRZ director Pastors said that this was the agreement of 2011 and this is how things will be done (ibid).

4.4 Analytical Dimension 5: Expression and mobilisation of place-based knowledge and adaptability

4.4.1 Place based knowledge

NPRZ itself is the product of decades long learning in neighbourhood interventions. From the 1990s Dutch municipalities and the central government recognised that concentration of low incomes could be negative and possibly even create neighbourhood effects. Social mix through demolition and rebuilding of middle-income homes was regarded as a possible solution. In time, it was accepted that not only social mix could solve problems for individual households and the attention was shifted to supporting the local economy. Yet this did not prove to emancipate disadvantaged households that coped with more problems than only unemployment. Around 2000, the authorities recognised that urban restructuring could help in terms of creating a more balanced social structure in neighbourhoods, but that individual households that coped with problems also needed assistance. Furthermore, it had become clear that the young generation needed support with regard to educational choices and guidance towards employment. After the implementation of NPRZ, the authorities also made increased efforts to resist social undermining by drugs related criminals who lure young people into alternative careers.

It is possible to conclude that the diagnosis and solutions to problems developed from more abstract, top-down formulated ideas of social mix **to increased place-based knowledge** that recognises the problems of local households and also **consults the locality** in formulating solutions. The Deetman/Mans report can be regarded as a broad summary of what local actors knew about the problems. As far as known, **no grand issues were neglected** in the formulation of the problems and the development of the policies that address them. However, safety only became a pillar several years after the start of the project.

Organisational learning

²⁰ This press release came after our interviews rounds had finished, but given the remarks made in the Relocal interviews, the concerns expressed in the Algemeen Dagblad newspaper came as no surprise.

The scope of the project is too large to give an overview of organisational learning, or even suggest that such an overview is possible. However, there are a few relevant remarks to be made. First of all, it appears that the long-term perspective of NPRZ (2011-2030) enables the stakeholders to learn. The objectives are clear and stakeholders in the field can experiment with methods, while not being exposed to (political) pressure to deliver very quick results. The strict course of the NPRZ bureau enables this, but at the same time **there are some doubts whether the bureau isn't too strict and inhibits a certain level of flexibility** (see example of primary schools).

Yet one stakeholder of a higher educational institution (RZ5b) indicates that their own efforts in NPRZ have benefited from a longer time perspective. It enables them to gradually learn how to address the 'wicked problems' in the complex social environment of Rotterdam South. At the start of NPRZ, each participant in this institution was very focused on grasping the problems in their own pillar (education, employment, housing/neighbourhood), but eight years into the project, the staff is more confident and reaches out to other sectors/disciplines in search for collaboration.

A similar experience was mentioned with regard to the Neighbourhood Teams (RZ10). For several years now, all Dutch municipalities have neighbourhood teams that bring together different sectors/disciplines in order to assist troubled households. For Rotterdam South an additional effort is required by the Neighbourhood Intervention Teams because of the scale of the problems and. They are learning to improve the inter-sectoral approach and managers are quite positive about the progress (RZ10). Furthermore, especially in Rotterdam South, the NITs aim for a pro-active approach where they try to interact with a household as soon as they receive indications of problems, for instance when children show problematic behaviour in school. NIT members then try to assess whether there are more problems during talks with the entire household (kitchen table talks), but this implies that they 'invade' the private environment of the households, which can be a barrier for NIT members. This also requires some adaptability in order to develop a successful approach.

4.4.2 Flexibility (adaptability) with respect to changing contexts

Flexibility is a buzzword in contemporary modern society, but our experience with the interviews and other first-hand sources shows that it is not commonly shared in Rotterdam South. **Many interviewees indicate that continuity is a key in achieving success. It fosters long term relationships much needed**, while it also allows some room for experimentation in approaches. At the same time some experience the NPRZ as overly strict. The NPRZ bureau is intent on pursuing its goals and is wary of changing direction. Yet, two new pillars have been added (safety and culture), although they do not interfere with the standing objectives. There has been some criticism from the working floor to such a strict approach (see for example primary education), but so far the stakeholders have continued their collaboration.

In the interviews some main risks of dis-continuity were mentioned:

- NPRZ Stakeholders with short term perspectives
- Turnover of professionals in NPRZ projects (e.g. Neighbourhood Teams)
- Turnover of teachers in (primary) schools
- Four-year bids by the municipality for wellbeing services (turnover of professionals)
- High turnover in the neighbourhood population (building relations with children)

5. Final Assessment: Capacities for Change

5.1 Synthesising Dimension A: Assessment of promoters and inhibitors

The NPRZ consists of a multitude of projects such as the ones to enhance educational achievement, stimulate children/teenagers to choose educational trajectories that offer good career perspectives²¹, activate long-term unemployed adults, improve the housing stock and stimulate social mix through diversification of the housing stock. Furthermore, neighbourhood intervention teams involve themselves with households that face a multitude of interrelated problems such as debt, domestic violence, substance abuse and health conditions. So, it goes beyond the scope of this report to merely suggest that we can identify promoters and inhibitors on a detailed level. However, there are some general issues that can be raised.

Continuity versus flexibility

First of all, **the long-term focus of NPRZ is both a promotor and possible inhibitor.** Everyone agrees that a long-term perspective is much needed, because history has shown that new municipal councils can lead to drastic changes or even abandonment of the programs. **This risk becomes greater when results fail to materialise in the shorter run. In such a context, the big debate is whether some flexibility improves the program's outcomes or whether a persistent course will finally materialise into the desired results.**

Continuity is regarded as a form of procedural justice. Interviewees indicated that a steady course of the NPRZ is important in order to avoid political wavering. It creates clarity for the recipients as well as for the stakeholders themselves. Such signals were also heard on a more concrete level, from professionals who were involved with children. Sudden changes in policies can lead to change of staff or abandonment of programs, which can lead to discontinuity of carefully moulded relationships and trust. This also applies to high turnover levels of staff in primary schools and Neighbourhood Intervention Teams.

We stayed quite close to the educational pillar because it is a new 'shoot on the branch' of Dutch urban policies. Primary schools do participate with the NPRZ, although some expressed their doubts about the amount of additional school hours and whether they could not use the money for those pupils most in need. This inflexibility might be regarded as a procedural injustice.

The central government

One main initiator and well-willing funder of the NPRZ is the central government. In case political wavering on their part leads to an abandonment of the NPRZ, this could be disastrous for the educational pillar. However, the Dutch government committed itself to the initial, long term agreement and even though Dutch national politics become increasingly liberal (less state intervention), the latest coalition government has provided generous funding for the 2019-2022 implementation plan.

²¹ An entire Urban Innovative Action revolves around this topic, while stakeholders also commit themselves.

Social mix and neighbourhood improvement

An outflow of socio-economically mobile households might be reduced by construction of middle-class housing. Hopefully, a more diverse neighbourhood population reduces neighbourhood effects and gives local children a broader window on the world. Furthermore, retainment of emerging (ethnic) middle classes in the district, may lead to less resistance towards urban renewal than invasion of (white) middle classes from outside the district (gentrification). Influx of (white) middle classes is also expected to improve social mix and reduce neighbourhood effects, but unfortunately it turns out that many gentrifiers bring their children to schools in Rotterdam North, rather than in Rotterdam South. Furthermore, there seems to be little contact between adult gentrifiers and local residents.

5.2 Synthesising Dimension B: Competences and capacities of stakeholders

Production and reproduction of spatial injustice

The main perception of spatial injustice emanates from the high spatial concentration of socio economically vulnerable households in the district of Rotterdam South.

This concentration is largely reproduced because of a homogeneous stock of cheap, poor quality housing as well as a negative social stigma of the district.

Virtually all professionals and (in)formal stakeholders regard these factors as the main driver of the problems. After several rounds of urban restructuring to create more socially diverse neighbourhoods, a shared awareness grew that there was still a high concentration of problems that cannot be solely addressed through social mixing. Children live in an environment where other adults and peers hardly stimulate the development of their further career. They have a very 'narrow window on the world' i.e. have little awareness of opportunities that children in other social environments have. Parents and other adults are often in a 'survival mode' as they face their own complex problems, while they themselves often received little education. This inhibits assistance in home work and/or school careers for children in the district. A social stigma of the neighbourhood can also be regarded as a negative neighbourhood effect.

According to some, the 'narrow window on the world' is also reproduced because of the long-standing geographical isolation from Rotterdam North. Because of a concentration of lower incomes, there was no high-quality education (grammar schools), few proper bookstores and cultural facilities.

Furthermore, employers' representatives mention a deep mismatch between abundant work for mid-level professions in harbour related activities (and care work) and the substantial underused, lowly educated labour reserve in Rotterdam South. They perceive it as an injustice to Rotterdam South that they often need to hire labour migrants.

Lastly, another dimension of spatial injustice is related to the fact that voluntary participation in societal groups is usually small amongst lower incomes. A concentration of lower incomes would logically translate in little participation, which is another neighbourhood effect. Although some local professionals mentioned that it can be hard to activate local residents because of 'survival modes', others say that there is quite a bit of volunteering.

Potential for localised action

For Rotterdam South, the municipality is the decision-making body at the lowest level with the formal democratic mandate. **In Rotterdam and in Dutch policy culture in gen-**

eral, it is regarded as a good practice to reach out to other actors when policies are developed, even if they are known (or expected) to have opposing views²². Furthermore, the central government is less inclined than before to coordinate urban actions from the central level but requires municipalities to do a proper job at the local level.

The NPRZ is a network organisation with a mandate from relevant stakeholders, including central government and municipality, to coordinate actions. There is thus a great deal of support from a wide range of stakeholders. **The approach of NPRZ is very localised** and the individual projects reach out to vulnerable households who experience a multitude of problems.

The main task of NPRZ is to keep stakeholders committed. **So far there have been no major breaches in the network**, in fact the NPRZ network has expanded when new measures were deemed necessary with regard to safety and undermining activities of criminal gangs. Also, culture has recently received a more prominent place in order to expand the 'window on the world' of residents. Still, there have been some disagreements between NPRZ and the housing associations about the scope of the housing associations input. There also has been some criticism by the primary schools on the way in which additional budgets from the central government should be spent.

Nonetheless, one NPRZ board member who was involved from the very start, indicates that the NPRZ is now really gaining momentum. He states that the long-term approach and strict guidance is bearing fruits.

The NPRZ board and project bureau continuously keep searching for possibilities for further funding of its activities. Examples are the diversion of a greater proportion of Rotterdam's Municipality 'work and income' budgets to Rotterdam South (from 40% to 50%), an additional € 260 million by the municipality and the central government in 2018 and even **EC funding** (ESF/EFRD and UIA).

Participate! (Meedoen!) is a term often used by the NPRZ bureau when it engages residents of Rotterdam South. NPRZ organised several well attended events for residents, where participants could express their concerns and desires with regard to the Rotterdam South. The NPRZ continuously attempts to motivate children and parents to grasp the opportunities that NPRZ projects provide. Still, **direct formal representation of vulnerable groups is not sufficiently granted in the NPRZ network**. The representative of the residents is one single person who merely acts as 'eyes and ears' in the district. NPRZ aims to coordinate a few strategic objectives that are endorsed by residents and stakeholders in quite a large geographic entity (over 200,000 inhabitants). Although it has a positive stance towards initiatives from neighbourhood groups, it does not finance nor coordinate their actions. Still, we had expected to see more involvement in NPRZ of representatives of resident's groups. **However, one complicating factor is that it is hard to speak about one single 'local community' in Rotterdam South. There is a mosaic of community groups in Rotterdam South, who muster around a multitude of ethnic, religious and social backgrounds. Moreover, many residents only undertake action when their personal interests are directly harmed, such as urban renewal operations.** Until relatively recently, there were formal neighbourhood pressure groups but they were often

²² In simple terms, this relates to an electoral system that hardly results in an absolute majority. Coalitions need to be moulded, so dealing with other political parties and/or societal interests is part of the daily practice.

dominated by the older (Dutch native) residents and they had little grip on the increasing diversity of the neighbourhood. These old pressure groups are also regarded somewhat as relics of the past and do not fit well in the contemporary neo-liberal political ideology of self-reliance. Furthermore, many people are in the survival mode, which inhibits participation. However, Dutch national governments (and city councils) of the last decade, have embraced the concept of participation society. This involves the aforementioned 'Right to Challenge' (appendix III), while there are also other possibilities for citizens and non-profit organisations to 'self-organise' welfare services (see Bosch, 2016).

5.3 Synthesising Dimension C: Connecting the action to procedural and distributive justice

Achievements

In the second half of 2018, the latest in a series of warnings about decline of liveability in vulnerable Dutch neighbourhoods was published (see Leidelmeijer et al, 2018; Uytterlinde and Van der Velden, 2018). The message is clear, neighbourhood decline set in after national government's abandonment of the neighbourhood policies in 2011. Another reason was an increasingly 'exclusive' distribution of housing association dwellings to lower incomes, i.e. vulnerable households, in areas that already have a high concentration of cheap housing. **So how would the locality of Rotterdam South have performed, had there been no NPRZ?** There is good reason to assume that Rotterdam South would be even worse off without the interventions of the NPRZ. It is beyond the scope of this report to assess all the output indicators for the different policies within NPRZ. There are monitoring instruments by the NPRZ project bureau, and for all they are worth, **indeed it seems that there are is some positive momentum**. The NPRZ annual progress report of 2017 states that of all the subprojects, about two-thirds are now on course to reach the expected target (Programmabureau NPRZ, 2018).

For our specific point of interest, education, a main **achievement** is that additional resources are now **distributed** to education and that general educational scores at elementary and secondary levels are improving. School drop-out levels are declining. In fact, many that 'drop out' of school, do so because they accept a job. Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Intervention Teams in the Children's Zone have engaged about a thousand households. There has been a sharp increase in the number of students of higher-level education that mentor children in Rotterdam South. However, the NPRZ itself admits that the progress is still fragile and many residents do not benefit from the general economic growth in Rotterdam and the rest of the Netherlands (Programmabureau NPRZ, 2019).

The main **institutional change** is the creation of the NPRZ project bureau. It is an independent network organisation, which relies on the goodwill of all stakeholders, but once stakeholders agree to participate, the NPRZ bureau will strictly commit them to the long-term vision. This can be regarded as a means to **enhance procedural justice**, because too much flexibility and wavering (political) preferences may harm the **continuity** of the project. Critics (primary schools) argue that it leaves too little space for manoeuvre, but plans are realigned every four years and if certain NPRZ-projects really do not work, they would certainly be abandoned. One critical note is that Rotterdam South, especially the seven Focus Areas, receive much funding and expertise, while there are still problematic areas

on the North Bank. **Non-focus areas in Rotterdam South with problems may experience this as distributional injustice.**

Link between achieved impact and place-based or community-based approach

Interestingly, one potential selling point of Rotterdam South, **the ethnic diversity of the population, hardly plays a role in the NPRZ approach.** The presence of such a population could stimulate ethnic entrepreneurship that draws people to the neighbourhood, such as food markets and specific shops. This type of entrepreneurship exists, but it receives little attention in NPRZ. Yet many organisations, including the municipality, recognize the ethnic potential²³. However, one drawback of some forms of ethnic entrepreneurship is that they are merely a means of survival (tropic supermarket, kebab place etc). Indeed, NPRZ aims for participation of (young) residents of Rotterdam South in more knowledge and capital-intensive industries. **The harbour and related activities still offer numerous jobs, making it a crucial element in a local approach towards high in-activity of the Rotterdam South population.**

²³ The EC funded DIVERCITIES project explored some of these dimensions in a sub district of Rotterdam Zuid (Feijenoord). The Wijkcoop Afrikaanderwijk (see Appendix IV) utilises some of these ethnic advantages, while the Afrikaander (food) market also draws out a large crowd.

6. Conclusions

Rotterdam South and spatial injustices

This case study investigated Rotterdam South, a city district of about 200,000 residents, with a high concentration of socio-economically vulnerable households. The concentration of lower incomes originates from a historical distributive injustice, when the district was designed as a new harbour area, with housing mostly targeted at the working classes.

Spatial injustice in Rotterdam South relates to a concentration of socio-economically vulnerable households. Stakeholders regard this as a negative situation. It can create negative neighbourhood effects, where children and adults have a restricted 'window on the world'. This leads to little awareness of opportunities that reach beyond the individual experience of neighbourhood residents. As many adults face a multitude of problems, they are in a 'survival mode', which hinders them in supporting educational trajectories of their children or participating in local societal organisations. Many children do not choose educational trajectories that match with the demand of employers, who require technically skilled people and mid-level (health) care professionals. Employers regard the mismatch between abundant work and a large underused labour reserve as a form of injustice.

Some stakeholders stress that neighbourhood effects are one part of the story. They mention many success stories of people from Rotterdam South and indicate that personal qualities play a role. Furthermore, on the individual level, intergenerational transmission of poverty might be more important than neighbourhood effects, but the distinction between these two factors is not always clear. Stakeholders also warn that Rotterdam South is not uniformly deprived and that there are neighbourhoods or urban blocks where residents are better off than others.

Another spatial injustice is related to the negative reputation of Rotterdam South.

This stigma can impede successful job applications, particularly for those youngsters that are trapped in their local street culture. **A spatial injustice of a distributive nature** is the lack of higher-level secondary schools (grammar schools), cultural facilities and decent book stores (libraries). In addition, Rotterdam South was poorly connected to Rotterdam North. This all enhances a restricted 'window on the world' for residents.

The Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid in relation to local autonomy

The introduction of the Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid (NPRZ) is the latest in a long history of urban renewal in Rotterdam. It has taught that only social mixing in low income neighbourhoods is not the only solution.

With these lessons in mind and the fact that Rotterdam South was still a major problem area, the central government supported the initiative for a Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid (NPRZ). Additional solutions are sought in improving the outlook of residents through education and supporting employment careers.

The NPRZ is a local network organisation, which coordinates and stimulates participants to commit themselves to this long-term project (2012-2030). Stakeholders are from the

government (municipality, state), employers, housing associations, education and wellbeing organisations. Local stakeholders use their own means for NPRZ projects, but they also receive additional grants from the government, especially for education. **The NPRZ bureau received a strong mandate from stakeholders to keep the program on course. It coordinates the actions with a small but persistent staff. The NPRZ is no platform that distributes funding nor is it a top-down extension of the central government in the Hague; all stakeholders commit themselves, contribute their own projects and execute them.**

However, the focus of NPRZ is much on stakeholders that have concrete contributions for projects, such as additional teaching hours, job guarantees and development of middle-income housing. The residents have one representative on the NPRZ board and so far, the NPRZ is reluctant to include small scale neighbourhood initiatives. NPRZ aims for a few strategic targets while community groups are 'welcome' to start local initiatives via different means than NPRZ; as long as they do not interfere with NPRZ ambitions. To the NPRZ bureau participation implies that residents have meaningful daily activities (including volunteering) or grasping the educational and career opportunities provided by NPRZ. Several times the NPRZ has engaged with residents at large scale events and welcomes suggestions for neighbourhood improvements. This does not imply that there are many community organisations in Rotterdam South, but they are fragmented along ethnic, religious and sectoral lines. Moreover, many residents hardly participate in the neighbourhood because they are in a survival mode.

Overall, **the NPRZ structure is a manifestation of temporary local autonomy.** It is often both praised and feared for its persistence in keeping stakeholders on course. This autonomy seems to have some traits of inflexibility: this is illustrated by the reactions of NPRZ to well-intended suggestions from school boards and individual teachers.

The NPRZ has a strong focus on continuity and the longer-term objectives. This seems to make sense because interviewees told that continuity can be very important in building relations and winning trust of residents.

The outcomes

The long running project is into its' eight year now and one majour pitfall would be to expect significant changes in the socio-economic structure of the district. However, there are positive signs now, as educational achievements improve, long term unemployment is declining and new (lower middle income) housing projects attract more interest. About two thirds of the multitude of projects are now on the expected trajectory, but the NPRZ bureau admits that the achievements are still fragile. The percentage of households with complex problems is as high as before the start of the crisis in 2009. For many residents the general improvements are not tangible. Yet the stakeholders think the marching route is overall positive and additional funding of € 260 million by the government has been granted for the implementation program of 2019-2022. In the last few years, the NPRZ bureau has also attracted funds from the EC for improving education-to-employment trajectories for youths in Rotterdam South. Also, local employers keep providing new career guarantees to young people that choose for education in technique and (health) care.

Although significant results may not be very visible, NPRZ seems to have avoided further decline in Rotterdam South. When the national neighbourhood approach was abandoned, it turned out that the situation in some other problem districts in the Netherlands took a turn for the worse (see Uytterlinde and Van der Velde, 2017).

What are the policy changes ahead for bigger impact?

At the time of writing this report the central government granted € 130 million additional funding for the next round (2019-2022) of the NPRZ on the premise that the municipality (and other stakeholders) grant another € 130 million. There is thus little doubt on the part of policy makers on all levels that the NPRZ project is promising.

7. References

Research reports and policy documents

- Broekaar, L. and F. Wassenberg (2018) *Sociale stijgers op Zuid. Voorstellen om sociale stijgers in Rotterdam-Zuid vast te houden of aan te trekken*. [Social climbers on South. Proposals to retain or attract social climbers in Rotterdam-Zuid.] Platform31, Den Haag.
- Bosch, E. and A. Ouwehand (2018) At home in the oasis: Middle-class newcomers' affiliation to their deprived Rotterdam neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* (online first) <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018777462>
- Bosch, E. (2016) *The 'self-organisation' of welfare services in deprived and wealthier urban neighbourhoods in the Dutch Participation Society*. PhD-thesis. Dipartimento di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale, Bicocca, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italia.
- De Boom, J., Van Wenseveen, P., Roode, J. & P. De Graaf (2018) *Basismonitor Onderwijs Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid 2017*. Risbo, Erasmus University Rotterdam & OBI Rotterdam.
- De Boom, J., Van Wenseveen, P., Roode, J. & P. De Graaf (2017) *Basismonitor Onderwijs Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid. Verklarende analyse*. Risbo, Erasmus University Rotterdam & OBI Rotterdam.
- Deetman, J. and W. Mans (2011) *Kwaliteitssprong Zuid. Ontwikkeling vanuit kracht*. <https://www.nprz.nl/over-nprz/onze-documenten/kwaliteitssprong-zuid-ontwikkeling-vanuit-kracht> (formal publisher not stated in document).
- Dol, K. and R. Kleinhans (2012). Going too far in the battle against concentration? On the balance between supply and demand of social housing in Dutch cities. *Urban Research & Practice*, 5(2), 273-283.
- Dol, K. and R. Kleinhans (2011) *Op zoek naar de kernvoorraad. Ontwikkelingen in de sociale huurvoorraad in Breda, Den Haag en Rotterdam*. Platform Corpovenista.
- Doucet, B. and D. Koenders (2018) 'At least it's not a ghetto anymore': Experiencing gentrification and 'false choice urbanism' in Rotterdam's Afrikaanderwijk. *Urban Studies*, online first.
- Engbersen, R. and M. Uytendil (2017) *Bijsturen op de compositie van wijken. Verkennend onderzoek naar het werken aan gemengde wijken in Rotterdam*. Platform31, Den Haag.
- Engbersen, G., Snel, E. and M. 't Hart (2015) *Mattheüs in de buurt: over burgerparticipatie en ongelijkheid in steden*. Erasmus Centre for Citizenship, Migration and the City (CIMIC), Erasmus University Rotterdam.

- Galster, G. (2012) The mechanism(s) of neighbourhood effects: Theory, evidence and policy implications. In: Van Ham, M., Manley, D., Bailey, N. & L. Simpson (eds.) *Neighbourhood effects research: New perspectives*. Springer Media, Dordrecht, the Netherlands.
- Gemeente Rotterdam (2016) *Woonvisie Rotterdam, koers naar 2030, agenda tot 2020*. Gemeente Rotterdam.
- Gemeente Rotterdam (2014) *Kansen voor West II. Uitvoeringsplan Kansen voor Rotterdam II*. Gemeente Rotterdam.
- Gemeente Rotterdam (2011) *Zuid Werkt! Nationaal Programma Kwaliteitssprong Zuid*. Gemeente Rotterdam.
- Gemeente Rotterdam (2016) *Komen en Gaan. Een onderzoek naar selectieve verhuizingen in Rotterdam*. Onderzoek en Business Intelligence (OBI), Rotterdam.
- Gemeente Rotterdam (2010) *Komen en Gaan. Selectieve migratie in Rotterdam in 2009*. Gemeente Rotterdam, Centrum voor Onderzoek en Statistiek.
- Hoekstra, J. (2017) Reregulation and Residualization in Dutch social Housing: a critical Evaluation of new Policies. *Critical Housing Analysis*, 4:1, p. 31-39.
- Hoogstad, M. (2018) *Rotterdam, stad van twee snelheden*. Trichish Publishing, Rotterdam.
- In 't Veld, R. (2018) *Ligt Rotterdam in Nederland? Een vergelijkende verkenning van de ontwikkeling in Nederland en Rotterdam in de afgelopen dertig jaar*. D.G. van Beuningenlezing. Uitgeversmaatschappij Ad. Donker bv. Rotterdam.
- Janssen, H. and M. Van Ham (2018) *Report on multi-scalar patterns of inequalities*. Relocal Deliverable 5.2. Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands.
- Jansen, M. (2017) *Aanpak ondermijning Rotterdam Zuid*. Centrum voor Veiligheidspreventie en Criminaliteit, Utrecht.
- Kampen, T., Veldboer, L. and R. Kleinhans (2019). The Obligation to Volunteer as Fair Reciprocity? Welfare Recipients' Perceptions of Giving Back to Society. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, online first. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-018-00082-4>
- Kleinhans, R. (2004). Social implications of housing diversification in urban renewal: a review of recent literature. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 19(4), 367-390.
- Kleinhans, R., Priemus, H. and G. Engbersen (2007). Understanding Social Capital in Recently Restructured Neighbourhoods. Two Case Studies in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. *Urban Studies*, 44 (5/6), 1069-1091.

- Kleinhans, R. & Kearns, A. (2013). Neighbourhood Restructuring and Residential Relocation: Towards a Balanced Perspective on Relocation Processes and Outcomes. *Housing Studies*, 28(2), 163-176.
- Lees, L., Slater, T and E. Wyly (Eds.) (2013) *Gentrification*. Routledge, New York.
- Leidelmeijer, K., Van Iersel, J. & J. Frissen (2018) *Veerkracht in het corporatiebezit. Kwetsbare bewoners en leefbaarheid*. RIGO Research & Advies, Amsterdam.
- Liukku, E. and S. Mandias (2016) *Help, we zijn populair. Rotterdam stad in verandering*. Nai Publishers, Rotterdam.
- Loorbach, D, Van Aubel, W. and J. Rotmans (2009) *Ontwikkelen op Zuid! Evaluatie 'Pact op Zuid'*. DRIFT, Erasmus Universiteit, Rotterdam.
- Mak, A. and P. Stouten (2014) Urban regeneration in Rotterdam: Economic and social values. *European Spatial Research and Policy*, 21 (12), p. 101-122.
- Ministerie van Financiën (2018) *Miljoenennota, 2018*. Ministerie van Financiën, Den Haag.
- MVROM (1997) *Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing* [White Paper Urban Renewal]. The Hague: Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment.
- MVROM (2000) *Wet ter stimulering van integrale stedelijke vernieuwing* [Act on Stimulation of Integrated Urban Renewal], File 26884, No. 3. The Hague: Second Chamber of Parliament.
- MVROM (2007) *Actieplan krachtwijken: van aandachtswijk naar krachtwijk* [Action plan for power districts: From problem neighbourhood to power neighbourhood]. The Hague: Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment.
- Nientied, P. (2018) Hybrid urban identity. The case of Rotterdam. *Current Urban Studies* 2018, 6, p.152-173.
- Ouwehand, A. (2018). *Menging maakt verschil: Hoe bewoners buurt- en wijkverandering ervaren en waarderen ondanks en dankzij herstructurering*. [Mixture makes a difference: How residents experience and value neighbourhood change despite restructuring.] PhD-thesis, Delft University of Technology. Architecture and the Built Environment DOI: 10.7480/abe.2018.8
- Oudenaarden, J. and R. Vroegindeweij (2015) *Rotterdam*. Kick Uitgevers, Rotterdam.
- Permentier, M., Kullberg, J. and L. van Noije (2013) *Werk aan de wijk. Een quasi-experimentele evaluatie van het krachtwijkenbeleid*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Den Haag 2013.

- Posthumus, H., Bolt, G. and R. van Kempen (2013) Why do displaced residents move to socioeconomically disadvantaged neighbourhoods? *Housing Studies*, 28 (2), 272-293.
- Programmabureau NPRZ (2019) *Uitvoeringsplan 2019-2020*. Programmabureau NPRZ, Rotterdam.
- Programmabureau NPRZ (2018) *Zuid op Koers. Voortgangsrapportage 2017*. Programmabureau NPRZ, Rotterdam.
- Programmabureau NPRZ (2018b) *Zuid op Koers. Voortgangsrapportage 2017 deel II*. Programmabureau NPRZ, Rotterdam.
- Programmabureau NPRZ (2017) *Zuid op Koers. Voortgangsrapportage 2016*. Programmabureau NPRZ, Rotterdam.
- Programmabureau NPRZ (2015) *Uitvoeringsplan 2015-2018*. Programmabureau NPRZ, Rotterdam.
- Programmabureau NPRZ (2012) *Uitvoeringsplan 2012-2014*. Programmabureau NPRZ, Rotterdam.
- Rekenkamer Rotterdam (2016) *Zorg om Zuid. Onderzoek Nationaal Programma Rotterdam Zuid*. Rekenkamer Rotterdam, Rotterdam.
- Schiller, H. (2010) *De kunst van het stijgen. Over sociale mobiliteit en welzijnswerk dat ertoe doet*. Verdiwel, Utrecht.
- Staatscourant (2019) *Regio Deal Rotterdam Zuid*. Staatscourant Nr. 1913.
- Stouten, P. (2010) *Changing contexts in urban regeneration. 30 Years of modernisation in Rotterdam*. Techne Press, Amsterdam.
- Stuurgroep Pact op Zuid (2006) *Buit op Zuid*. Pact op Zuid, Rotterdam.
- Tersteeg, A. Bolt, G. and R. van Kempen (2015) *Fieldwork inhabitants, Rotterdam, the Netherlands*. DIVERCITIES-project, D6.1. Utrecht University, the Netherlands.
- Tweede Kamer (2015) *Parlementaire enquête Woningcorporaties*. Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, Vergaderjaar 2014-2015, No. 33606, Den Haag.
- Uyterlinde, M. and J. Van der Velden (2017) *Kwetsbare wijken in beeld*. Platform31, Den Haag.
- Van den Bent, E. (2010) *Proeftuin Rotterdam. Bestuurlijke maakbaarheid tussen 1975 en 2005*. PhD-thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Van Ham, M., Tamaru, T., De Vuijst, E. and M. Zwiers (2016) *Spatial Segregation and Socio-Economic Mobility in European Cities*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 10277

Van Kempen, R. and G. Bolt (2009) Social cohesion, social mix and urban policies in the Netherlands. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24, p. 457-475.

Van Steenbergen, F. and J. Wittmayer (2012) *Carnisse in transitie? Een verkenning van het verleden, het heden en de toekomst van een Rotterdamse wijk*. DRIFT Essay 2012.05. Dutch Research Institute for Transitions, Rotterdam.

Van Wonderen, R. and A. Mein (2013) *Quick scan functioneren wijkteams Children's Zone*. Verwey-Jonker Instituut, Utrecht.

Veldboer, L., Kleinhans, R. & Ham, M. van (2015). *Mandatory Volunteer Work as Fair Reciprocity for Unemployment and Social Benefits?* IZA Discussion Paper No. 9111. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).

VROM-Raad (2006) *Stad en stijging. Sociale stijging als leidraad voor stedelijke vernieuwing*. Advies 054. VROM-Raad, Den Haag.

Zwiers, M. (2018). *Trajectories of neighbourhood change*. Architecture and the Built environment 21. Delft University of Technology (PhD-thesis).

Newspapers, magazines, websites

- Programmabureau NPRZ (2013) 'Handelingsperspectieven' Documents that give strengths-weakness overviews for each neighbourhood of Rotterdam South.
<https://www.nprz.nl/over-nprz/onze-documenten/handelingsperspectieven>
- Algemeen Dagblad (2019) *Scholen in Rotterdam-Zuid niet blij met nóg langere schooldagen*. Algemeen Dagblad Newspaper, 16 March, 2019.
- Trouw (2018) *POP-UP Katendrecht*. Trouw Newspaper, 8 March 2018
- Trouw (2018) *POP-UP Afrikaanderwijk*. Trouw Newspaper, 14 March 2018
- Trouw (2018) *De campagne denderde aan Rotterdam-Zuid voorbij*, 21 March 2018

8. Annexes


8.1 List of Interviewed Experts

Interviewee number	Institution	Date
RZ 1	Stakeholder	April 5
RZ 2	Stakeholder	April 30
RZ 3	Stakeholder	July 10
RZ 4	Stakeholder	May 15
Multiple person interview-discussion	Institute of higher learning	April 20
<i>RZ 5a</i>		
<i>RZ 5b</i>		
<i>RZ 5c</i>		
RZ 6	Philanthropic Foundation	June 14
Multiple person interview-discussion	Primary school A	June 15
<i>RZ 7a</i>		
<i>RZ 7b</i>		
RZ 8	Primary school B	June 15
Multiple person interview-discussion		June 25
<i>RZ 9a</i>	<i>Umbrella organisation primary schools</i>	
<i>RZ 9b</i>	<i>Primary school C</i>	
RZ 10	Municipality, manager	August 17
RZ 11	Housing association	May 30
RZ 12	Housing association	June 8
RZ 13	Housing association	June 21
RZ 14	Housing association	June 25
RZ 15	Civic organisation	May 9
RZ 16	Civic organisation	June 12
RZ 17	University	April 3
RZ 18	Research institute urban and housing policies	April 3
RZ 19	Social entrepreneur-architect	April 6
RZ 20	University	April 12
Multiple person interview-discussion	Institute secondary education for mid-level professions	July 9
<i>RZ 21a</i>		
<i>RZ 21b</i>		
<i>RZ 21c</i>		
<i>RZ 21d</i>		
Informal talks		
RZ INF1	Informant	May 1
RZ INF2 (+ walk neighbourhood)	Informant	June 13

8.2 Stakeholder Interaction Table

Type of Stakeholders	Most relevant 'territorial' level they operate at	Stakeholders' ways of involvement in the project (What do we gain, what do they gain)
Local politicians	City	Interview (NPRZ bureau)
Local administration		
Associations representing private businesses	Metropole Rotterdam	Interview
Local development companies/agencies		
Municipal associations		
Non-profit/civil society organisations representing vulnerable groups	Usually not in NPRZ, but are active in Rotterdam South	Interview
Other local community stakeholders	Little representation in NPRZ	Walk and Talk, interview
Local state offices/representations	Nap	
Regional state offices/representations	Nap	
Ministries involved in (national or EU) cohesion policy deployment	All levels	Interview, interest in further discussion (for scenario's)
Cohesion Policy think tanks (national/EU-level)	Nap	
Primary and secondary educational institutions	Primary: Neighbourhood, or even sublevel Secondary: usually Rotterdam	Interview, discussions (usually these meetings were with more than one respondent)
Colleges and universities	City	Interview, discussion
Social and health care institutions		
Cultural institutions and associations		
Media		
Housing associations	City and neighbourhood	Interview
Professionals involved in neighbourhood research		Interview, discussion, follow up planned

8.3 Additional information



Map 8.1 Liveability index Rotterdam municipality

Source: Programmabureau NPRZ 2018b

	Physical index	Social index (cohesion)	Safety index
Focus areas South			
Afrikaanderwijk	91	85	95
Bloemhof	89	82	84
Carnisse	83	71	86
Feijenoord	93	78	100
Hillesluis	84	81	77
Oud-Charlois	90	95	89
Tarwewijk	79	77	73
Other relevant areas on South, in Italics former restructuring areas			
<i>Katendrecht</i>	127	117	121
<i>Kop van Zuid Entrepot</i>	114	106	123
Noordereiland	111	108	122
<i>Pendrecht</i>	104	90	95
Vreewijk	103	94	90
<i>Zuidwijk</i>	98	81	95
ROTTERDAM Municipality	107	105	108

Table 8.1 Physical, Social and Safety indices in Rotterdam South
Source: WoningBevolkingsOnderzoeksBestand (WBOB)

	Dutch	Surinam/Dutch Antilles	Turkey	Morocco	Other EU
Focus areas South					
Afrikaanderwijk	15%	17%	29%	16%	4%
Bloemhof	23%	10%	24%	11%	10%
Carnisse	34%	9%	6%	5%	23%
Feijenoord	17%	11%	25%	18%	4%
Hillesluis	17%	11%	28%	15%	8%
Oud-Charlois	38%	9%	10%	7%	14%
Tarwewijk	21%	13%	12%	8%	18%
Other relevant areas on South, in Italics former restructuring areas					
<i>Katendrecht</i>	46%	9%	4%	8%	6%
<i>Kop van Zuid Entrepot</i>	34%	10%	11%	13%	7%
Noordereiland	57%	6%	6%	5%	9%
<i>Pendrecht</i>	28%	14%	12%	9%	7%
Vreewijk	55%	8%	6%	6%	7%
<i>Zuidwijk</i>	43%	10%	8%	8%	6%
Rotterdam municipali- ty	49%	12%	7%	7%	8%

Table 8.2 Population by ethnicity, main groups as % of the entire population
Source: WoningBevolkingsOnderzoeksBestand (WBOB)

Appendix I Gentrification and social injustice in Rotterdam South?

Government/housing associations interventions that aim to create a more diverse housing stock, usually lead to displacement of (vulnerable) low income households. Many perceive such a process as (state-led) gentrification (see Lees et al, 2013), which can be considered as a form of social injustice. The ambition of social mix may pose a dilemma, but the Dutch experience of gentrification is usually not one where entire neighbourhoods are rapidly transformed into middle income areas (see for example Zwiers, 2018). Furthermore, as Zwiers (2018) argues, the question is whether neighbourhood restructuring should be regarded as state-led gentrification or just as neighbourhood restructuring. In this, restructuring and state-led gentrification should be clearly distinguished, as the first focuses on diversifying the housing stock of neighbourhoods with a large share of social rented housing, whereas the latter aims to create a class-based transformation of an area in terms of not only the housing stock, but also facilities and consumption. Moreover, restructuring is a more neutral term whereas gentrification is too often subject to conceptual and political ‘misuse’, with an overly negative focus on its social and economic implications (Kleinhans and Kearns, 2013). The Rotterdam South case shows that Katendrecht is an example with an influx of middle-income newcomers (Trouw, 2018), but in other neighbourhoods, the urban restructuring operation encompasses housing provision for social climbers that would otherwise leave (Relocal interviewees).

Some residents of the Afrikaanderwijk in Rotterdam South assign symbolic values to the housing stock interventions that aim to create more social mix (Doucet and Koenders, 2018). Quite a few old-time residents in the Afrikaanderwijk welcomed the initiatives to create more housing for middle incomes. Many of these residents voiced the expectation that a return of more native Dutch (middle incomes) might remove the “ghetto stigma” that the neighbourhood suffers from.

Although there is displacement before demolition of (low-income) housing complexes, tenant protection is strong in the Netherlands. Those that are forced to relocate can usually find decent social housing in the same neighbourhood or district (see e.g. Posthumus et al, 2013). In this vein, even those interviewees with a research background, who usually hold a critical view, saw positive effects of restructuring and social mix. *“There is a group of academics that is only negative about ‘gentrification’. When you write positively about gentrification, you will never be accepted by gentrification specialists such as Loretta Lees (Relocal interviewee x)”*. Furthermore, some interviewees mentioned that not all new middle-income dwellings attract households from outside the Rotterdam South. Many new dwellings in the focus neighbourhoods of NPRZ are bought by social climbers who would otherwise leave the neighbourhood in search of better housing options²⁴. The perception is that occupation of new owner-occupied dwellings by local residents will create less tension as opposed to an influx of middle incomes from outside Rotterdam South.

²⁴ Broekaar and Wassenberg (2018) conducted an interesting study on the conditions/requirements that social climbers set to remain in Rotterdam South. Some of these requirements link to *distributional injustice*, i.e. they are not available in the neighbourhood so people leave in search of these requirements. Good schools and decent owner occupied housing are frequently mentioned as motives for leaving.

Appendix II Residents' participation in Rotterdam

A general problem that impedes resident's/community participation is the recent dismantling of the sub-municipalities (*deelgemeenten*) and the abandonment of subsidies for residents- and migrants organisations. Many of these organisations have been entirely dissolved, while others lead a dormant existence. The main motive for the budget cuts was government austerity after the Global Financial Crisis, but one could speculate about political motives. For instance, a good reading of Hoogstad (2018) about political events in Rotterdam shows that new-right parties were not positive about formal, subsidized neighbourhood organisations. The new-right Leefbaar Rotterdam party considers them as relics of a city monopolised by the Labour Party. The Labour Party did not only hold the city council for decades, but it also had close ties with neighbourhood and migrant associations. Furthermore, many increasingly self-conscious second and third generation migrants, who usually voted for Labour, feel that they have been used as 'voting-cattle' (see Hoogstad, 2018). Interviewees who know these communities tell that they now have their own (religious) organisations that are held together by rich volunteering traditions (RZ16, RZ19).

Neighbourhood organisations were often established during the era of urban renewal of the 1970s-1980s. They functioned as platforms for negotiation between residents and municipality that helped to address social unrest and support resident's interests during the designs process of urban redevelopment plans. However, some of these organisations were dominated by a board composed of older (Dutch) persons that were already involved during the urban renewal era. One complaint is that they have often become part of the municipal system and rely on subsidies to maintain their (resident's) organisation. There were also complaints about the dominance of persons with long involvement in several local community organisations. Although the NPRZ includes the 'Bewoners op Zuid!' organisation, this organization is made up of only one representative who has a good network in the neighbourhood. He mostly serves as 'eyes and ears' in the neighbourhood rather than as a 'representative' with a substantial mandate from residents and their organisations (RZ2). One interviewee attributes this to another way of working by the NPRZ, which is focused on assisting individuals in improving themselves by offering (more or less) tailor made interventions, without the involvement of an extra level of neighbourhood representative's platforms (RZ5a).

Some interviewees also indicate that there are many organisations in the focus-neighbourhoods of Rotterdam South and people volunteer for many chores in, for instance, a Mosque or Church, but there seems to be little enthusiasm to take a seat on a board of a residents organisation which has (many) meetings with the municipality or other authorities (RZ13, RZ16).

One interviewee says that many residents only raise their voice when their direct interest is involved (RZ13). Such is often the case when housing associations or the municipality design redevelopment plans, that involve housing renovation or demolition of housing complexes. Usually this entails short term participation groups that discuss the projects with officers from housing associations and/or the municipality.

Another explanation put forward directly or indirectly by a majority of Relocal-interviewees as well as by the written documentation is that many people in the focus neighbourhoods just cannot participate in neighbourhood organisations, let alone establish and operate bottom-up initiatives. There is a general discourse that residents in the focus areas are too involved in their own problems. *“They are in a survival mode”* and *“very involved with their own problems”* (RZ13). As such, they have little time and energy to participate. Interestingly, this argument is also often heard with respect to underachievement of (young) children in the focus areas of Rotterdam South. Parents are often too caught up in their own problems, and they often cannot offer meaningful support in matters such as homework and choices for educational careers with good job perspectives²⁵.

The survival mode argument has been brought up frequently for the entire focus area of Rotterdam South, but ‘rapid resident’s turnover’ in some neighbourhoods was also often mentioned. According to several interviewees, many residents in Tarwewijk and Carnisse have an Eastern European background and they only focus on work (RZ7a, RZ8, RZ19). Many have temporary and/or seasonal jobs and often move out of the neighbourhood after seasonal employment. These residents often reside in the private rental sector, which is relatively easy to access as opposed to the social rental sector, where long waiting lists apply. It is no coincidence that the neighbourhood statistics show a correlation between ‘other EU’ residents and a high proportion of private rental dwellings²⁶.

These workers leave the neighbourhood for work at around 6 am and return at around 8 pm and have little time to participate in community associations. In this, language is also considered as a barrier to participation, because especially the Eastern European migrants and many other newcomers lack the language skills to participate. This is confirmed by an interviewee who states that some of the isolated indigenous Dutch working-class communities in the harbour area (Heijplaat and Pernis) do come up with their own initiatives. She mentions that social cohesion of Dutch working classes in geographically isolated communities plays a role in participation (RZ14).

Overall, the interviews give some proof for theories that suggest a negative relation between participation on the one hand and, on the other hand, ‘survival modes’²⁷ and lack of language skills. The general literature also suggests that lower educational attainment (organisational skills) leads to little participation (see Engbersen et al, 2015). In case of spatial concentration of disadvantaged households, such could lead to yet another form of spatial injustice, but research in Rotterdam is not entirely conclusive. Engbersen et al (2015) find that low income neighbourhoods have lower participation rates, while a (rigorous) PhD thesis of Bosch (2016) finds more participation and volunteering in Rotterdam’s low income neighbourhoods. However, Bosch (2016) also finds that the initiators of volunteering groups are often highly educated people, who sometimes are ‘social entrepreneurs’ and rely on this kind of work. This kind of experience was also mentioned when speaking to one Relocal interviewee who herself was committed to a neighbourhood organisation in Rotterdam South. She mentions that there is much more volunteering work

²⁵ Hence a direct link with discourses on spatial injustice (dimension 1) and the motives to establish the NPRZ program.

²⁶ See statistics in section 3

²⁷ Which includes underpayment and therefore too long working days by Eastern European migrants.

in Rotterdam South than policy researchers usually find (in the formal statistics). She also confirms that it helps to have highly-educated persons who take the initiative.

The NPRZ project bureau itself has no special funding to support local initiatives. The director thinks it is fine when local communities establish new (neighbourhood) organisations, but they should not turn to the NPRZ for support. During interviews it was not exactly mentioned why there seems to be little interest of NPRZ in including community organisations, but the reason may be found in a new way of addressing societal problems. NPRZ focuses strongly on activating individuals, both adult and child (teenager). Adults need to work or have another meaningful daily routine, while children should be in school (including extra school hours) and prepare for a profession that is needed in society. In case they have problems, they can receive assistance in managing these problems from the 'neighbourhood (intervention) teams'. As such, they engage directly with individual residents rather than with community associations' representatives. The latter only happens in case of interventions that affect another scale, such as refurbishment (or demolition) of housing blocks. In that case there is a collective problem (and interest) rather than a problem of individuals. Finally, it needs to be mentioned that the NPRZ has held the so-called several Burgertop (Civil Summit) meetings where residents of Rotterdam South could provide feedback on the NPRZ.

However, Rotterdam municipality supports neighbourhood initiatives by residents and has a special organisation for this. This includes 'the right to challenge' as described in Appendix IV. So, whereas the NPRZ does not support (or even stimulate) local initiatives, there are platforms within the municipality that fill this gap.

Appendix III Examples of bottom-up initiatives alongside NPRZ

Here we present a couple of initiatives that are relevant to the main targets of the NPRZ, but which are no part of it. Some are pure bottom up while others emanate (more or less) from initiatives by local practitioners who are employed by the municipality. The motivation to present them is to illustrate that local society takes relevant initiatives and some even receive additional support from the municipality or other organisations. The NPRZ does not have any 'flexible' budgets to support these initiatives. The attitude of the NPRZ is also in general to praise the initiatives, but to let them organise their own funding and organisation. NPRZ director Pastors indicates that support for all initiatives might make for too many additional claims: "let them do it for themselves and see how it works out".

Afrikaander Wijk Coop

This organisation was initiated around 2007, when the Afrikaanderwijk was still a notorious area. The initiator was an artist who thought about ways to promote more social cohesion within the neighbourhood through activation of local talents who have a 'persistent' distance to the labour market. The current director states that in this ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, there are many (former) migrants who have brought (inherited) particular skills into the neighbourhood. Many of them cannot participate in the formal labour market but they can use their specific talents at the neighbourhood coop. People who provide their skills get some payment, which can sometimes be complicated when they are on a benefit, but all is organised ("sorted") in a proper way. In many cases the municipality also allows people on a benefit to do some volunteer work. The coop does not aim to give people skills to enter the labour market. "That is for municipal re-integration trajectories. I just want motivated people who have some kind of structural 'distance' to the labour market²⁸, but who have their own skills. However, we also have a few permanent staff who just did a good job. We need a few of these people as well and they get a decent salary." All profits of the coop are spent on new projects. The Afrikaander neighbourhood coop has three main activities:

"The Wijkkeuken" (Neighbourhood Kitchen) With such a range of ethnic backgrounds come many kitchens. The neighbourhood is awash with Surinam, Turkish and Moroccan places, but there is much more. At the wijkkeuken people can taste the variety of (other) ethnic food cultures. Residents of the various ethnic backgrounds cook meals and sell them to the public in their building next to the popular Afrikaander (open air) market. It's also become quite popular for catering services.

"Het Wijk Atelier" (Neighbourhood Atelier) In the Afrikaanderwijk there are many people (females), who know traditional sewing skills from their native country. Often this relates to very fine/detailed embroideries or making complicates dresses. These skills are not really 'marketable', because everyday fashion does not demand this. However, local fashion designers are often in much need of such skills for a short period of time. The Wijk Coop intermediates between the fashion designers and the local people.

²⁸ For many reasons, such as home care commitments (usually single mothers), (light) disabilities or even labour market discrimination.

De Kinderfaculteit (The Children's Faculty)

The area of Pendrecht is not a focus area within Rotterdam Zuid and therefore primary schools receives no Children's Zone funding for extra school hours. One respondent in our fieldwork argued that the selection of focus areas has been quite arbitrary and could therefore be regarded as a form of spatial injustice (and distributional injustice). The focus areas receive € 18 million per year for extra lessons while Pendrecht also has schools with children that could use a bit of extra support. Furthermore, this respondent was not quite positive about the way NPRZ let the schools in the focus area experiment with the subjects/topics for the lessons. He indicated there is enough information on what types of lessons might work better than others. In Pendrecht, philanthropic foundation De Verre Bergen developed the 'Kinderfaculteit' at four primary schools. They included parents and residents' organisations in the development of the program. The officer of De Verre Bergen argues that there could be two more types of injustice. The first is that parents and neighbourhood organisations are hardly involved in NPRZ's Children's Zone. A second injustice is the experimentation at the Children's Zone. It costs fortunes to just have a few years of trial and error before schools develop proper programs for extra lessons. *".... I find it dramatic! You throw so much money at it! On the one hand it is about efficiency of public means, that is one thing, but it is also about vulnerable families and children and subsequently you say: Yes, we experiment a bit, we try out a bit, with a little luck something good turns out. I think that this is no way to behave towards our vulnerable families and children. Shouldn't you just think properly with each other, what can we know that works?"*

Thuis op Straat (At home on the street) semi bottom-up

Thuis op Straat (ToS) was an initiative of an employee who worked at a Rotterdam municipality service for Wellbeing. He found that many children did not have enough facilities/toys to play in the street or outdoors. ToS provides such facilities, by having after school play-sessions where toys and other materials are provided. ToS is run by a small staff and relies on adult volunteers to assist in the after school play sessions. Furthermore, older children/teenagers provide support in the activities.

Apart from providing a safe and pleasant playing environment, ToS aims to contribute to the social-emotional, motoric and cognitive development of children. The official mission statement is: *"ToS helps youths to grow up into communicative, able and self-reliant citizens who take a full-fledged position in society. ToS takes into account the own strength of youths and enables them to explore their talents and possibilities, to develop themselves and to commit them to themselves and others."*

One interviewee indicates that in practice it goes further than just playing. They know most of the children from a very young age and notice when there are problems in their development. ToS staff will be able to contact the proper instances when this happens. In this, they act as 'eyes and ears'.

Furthermore, they can help children to develop sensitivity to other social environments than the 'street culture' of many kids in Rotterdam South. For example, some can get a small job at a museum, which is entirely out of their comfort zone, but it helps them to become aware of other social environments. Hopefully it will give them some social skills for the future. One interviewee (walk and talk) explains that they need to be neat when they apply for such a position: *"Baseball caps off, sit up straight, no slang language."*

One main problem that came up during the other interviews is that discontinuity can be a problem for neighbourhood programs and this is the main reason why the NPRZ project bureau is so persistent in keeping all partners committed.


ToS also experiences this in the new governance of the municipality. Each four years, the wellbeing services need to be tendered. ToS was a subcontractor to the main wellbeing provider in Rotterdam South. This provider lost the last bid in the neighbourhood of Feijenoord. For many children (and for ToS) this is regarded as a problem. The ToS people knew the children from a very young age and children would often turn to them for all kinds of questions/help. Children did this because they trust the staff (and volunteers). Such bonds are now discontinued, which is regarded as a setback, also by those not directly involved in ToS.

The RELOCAL Project

EU Horizon 2020 research project ‘**Resituating the local in cohesion and territorial development**’ –**RELOCAL** aims to identify factors that condition local accessibility of European policies, local abilities to articulate needs and equality claims and local capacities for exploiting European opportunity structures.

In the past, especially since the economic and financial crisis, the European Social Model has proven to be challenged by the emergence of spatially unjust results. The RELOCAL hypothesis is that **processes of localisation and place-based public policy** can make a positive contribution to spatial justice and democratic empowerment.

The research is based on **33 case studies** in **13 different European** countries that exemplify development challenges in terms of spatial justice. The cases were chosen to allow for a balanced representation of different institutional contexts. Based on case study findings, project partners will draw out the factors that influence the impact of place-based approaches or actions from a comparative perspective. The results are intended to facilitate a greater local orientation of cohesion, territorial development and other EU policies.



The RELOCAL project runs from October 2016 until September 2020.

Read more at <https://relocal.eu>

Project Coordinator:



University of Eastern Finland

Contact: Dr. Petri Kahila (petri.kahila@uef.fi)