

KOP VAN ZUID CASE STUDY

1. CONTEXT

1.1 Overview of Regeneration Scheme

Kop van Zuid (“Southern Headland”) is a peninsula on the south bank of the River Maas directly opposite Rotterdam’s city centre. It covers some 125 ha and used to be an important port area with docks, a shipyard and a terminal for ocean-going liners, but all these activities closed down when the port moved downstream to the mouth of the river during in the 1960s and 1970s, and Kop van Zuid became abandoned. It was an isolated and largely hidden area, cut off from the river by warehouses and from surrounding areas by railway lines, and was poorly connected to the city centre. The wider area in which it lies, the ‘borough’ of Feyenoord (one of Rotterdam’s 13 sub-municipalities), consists mainly of poor residential neighbourhoods where the people who worked in the port and other riverside industries used to live. It now has a high level of immigrants among its population. It has traditionally been an area of low educational achievement and high unemployment, and it used to have a very poor image, which made it difficult to attract private investment or people with choice to live there.

There were plans to redevelop the area for social housing, but in 1986, under a masterplan commissioned by the new City Planning Director Riek Bakker, Kop van Zuid became seen as a key to unlocking huge potential for the whole city. If it was developed as a high-quality mixed-use area, with eye-catching buildings and a lively waterfront, and connected directly to the city centre, it could not only change Rotterdam’s image but also open up the entire south side of the city.

Although only the first part of the project has been completed, it is estimated that 15,000 people will be living in Kop van Zuid and 18,000 working in the area by 2010. While not everything has worked as originally intended, the masterplan (and the planning authorities have proved flexible enough to accommodate changes) Kop van Zuid has already become a successful mixed-use area with residential, commercial, educational and leisure uses. A number of its new buildings have been designed by world-famous architects, and the public realm is memorable and highly walkable. The spectacular Erasmus Bridge, and a new Metro station and a new tram line, join the area – and areas further to the south – to the city centre. Kop van Zuid is not only a successful regeneration scheme in its own right, but it has indeed also helped to change the image of Rotterdam – from an industrial port to ‘Manhattan on the Maas’ – and to attract in the new people who are needed to diversify and modernise the city’s economy.

1.2 Rotterdam

Rotterdam, situated in the delta of the Rhine and the Maas (or Meuse), is by far the largest port in Europe. Although its docks and terminals have moved a few miles away to land reclaimed from the sea, it still retains its immense national and international importance. (The port generates 10% of the GDP of the Netherlands.). The city itself has a population of 600,000 (which is now rising

again after a sharp decline in the 1970s and 1980s), and it is at the centre of a travel-to-work area of about 1.4 million inhabitants. As is often the case in the UK, there are other large towns and cities nearby (The Hague, Amsterdam, Utrecht). Together these are referred to as the Randstad ('Ring City'), an agglomeration of around 7.5 million people, or nearly half the country's population.

Traditionally Rotterdam has been a predominantly working class city, and its neighbouring cities have been seen as more attractive. Although the port and city centre were rebuilt after massive bomb damage during World War II, the subsequent relocation and modernisation of the docks left large areas of derelict land in the city and high unemployment especially among unskilled workers. At the same time there was an exodus of people to the growing suburbs and a large inflow of immigrants from former Dutch colonies and elsewhere. By 1996 22% of Rotterdam's working population and 40% of its residents were of non-Dutch origin. In 2005 unemployment in the city was 11%, with much higher rates among ethnic minorities. Thus, in spite of its enduring strategic position, Rotterdam has had to face many of the same challenges as British industrial cities in order to stay competitive in the global knowledge-based economy.

Rotterdam is a municipality and is run by its City Council which is responsible for the economic, spatial and social development of the city. In recent years its main strategy has been both to build on the strength of its port and logistics sector and to diversify the city's economy and expand its facilities, so as to make it an attractive location for 'knowledge industries' and for 'knowledge workers'. This has meant repositioning Rotterdam away, in part, from its traditional roots and attracting in new people, while at the same time pursuing the Dutch aim of 'balanced development' which emphasises working together for the common good and balancing economic, social and environmental considerations in order to diminish the gaps between rich and poor.

Transport has been an important element in Rotterdam's renaissance. The Metro opened in 1968 and now stretches over 80 miles, and the city has also invested in a high quality tram system. A new tram line was built in advance of the development of Kop van Zuid to assist the area's regeneration and promote the use of public transport, and a further major investment was made in the Erasmus Bridge over the Maas. A new project is underway to upgrade the area around the city's central station, and a light rail system linking the Randstad cities is under construction. Rotterdam will also soon be joined to the European High Speed Rail system.

1.3 National and Regional Policies

The Netherlands is a small, low lying and densely populated country (population 16.3 million) which is known for being neat and tidy and relatively classless. This is often attributed to the 'polder mentality' of people having to collaborate to maintain the dykes that keep out the sea. There has been a tradition of discouraging urban sprawl, especially into the area between the four big cities through voluntary collaboration between local authorities. Concern to reduce travel by car (and to encourage walking, bicycling and the use of public transport) has reinforced the commitment to 'compact cities'. Furthermore, a national priority has been to upgrade the centres of the main cities in the belief that they act as dynamos for their wider city-regions.

Urban renewal Following the housing shortages caused by the war and the influx of immigrants, the government undertook an extensive house building programme. Quickly a need to focus on inner urban areas appeared. In Rotterdam a group of elected politicians led the way by setting up local urban renewal organisations and campaigning for government-funded ‘renewal areas’ to be created. This policy was largely successful and by 1996 more than 50% of the housing stock in the renewal areas (including parts of Feyenoord) had been modernised. However this policy did not tackle unemployment or the wider social aspects of urban living. Eventually the mayors of the four large cities collectively lobbied the national government for greater support for a broad-ranging approach to urban renewal. This led to the Major Cities Policy (*Grote Steden Beleid*) which aimed at creating a ‘complete city’ through economic, social and physical measures and had a bottom-up approach to implementation. The outcome was a five year funding agreement between the central government and the local authorities (municipalities) in each of the four cities, including Rotterdam. The first agreements were made in 1994. There have been two further 5-year agreements since, and the number of participating towns has increased to thirty. Each agreement sets out an agreed strategy and a financial commitment from the national government. The implementation programme is drawn up by the municipality concerned and includes a limited number of output targets. When agreement has been reached, the municipality accepts responsibility for the implementation of the programme and for the success of their town. This represents an important devolution of power and responsibility.

Decentralisation Historically the Netherlands used to be a decentralised state, with a strong stress on local collaboration (the so-called ‘polder mentality’). Although the autonomy of local authorities had been gradually reduced during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, they still retained significant roles. After World War II, the call for a larger welfare state, and the need for large scale provision of housing and the repair of damaged urban areas, resulted in more power, and a greater share of financial resources, being taken by the central government. However, during the 1990s there was a reduction in state intervention in welfare and housing (including, for example, the promotion of owner-occupation), and a move to give more responsibilities back to local authorities so that they could make decisions and integrate activities at a more local level. The Major Cities Policy is an example of this.

The result is that municipalities can be flexible in the way that they implement national policies. Central government sets the policy framework, and local authorities implement the policies in the way that best fits local circumstances. This flexibility allows local authorities to take a more proactive and entrepreneurial approach in both planning and policy implementation. In Rotterdam this has led to an ‘Integrated Area Approach’ which focuses on priority areas and tackles local employment and quality of life issues as well as making physical improvements. Great stress is now placed on ‘working together’ – involving residents, landowners, businesses, local politicians, local agencies such as housing associations etc – and on communication. Social inclusion is also given a high priority, especially because of the large number of immigrants in the city.

Working together Another important characteristic of the ‘Dutch approach’ is the ability and willingness to work through informal networks. As in Sweden and Northern France (which is

Flemish in origin) the concept of working together, across professions and sectors, towards the common good is widely accepted. This appears mainly to take place in a voluntary way. Although there are many formal partnerships (as in the UK), it is not just the structures that are important but the attitudes of the parties involved and their ability to be flexible and co-operate at a practical level.

The Netherlands, however, does not have a formal ‘city-region’ layer of government. An experimental Rijnmond Region around Rotterdam was tried, but it failed – partly because of confusion over its role in co-ordinating policies among municipalities, and partly because it would create a fourth tier of government. A referendum was held on whether there should be a formal city-region, but this was rejected. However, the municipalities recognise that they need to co-operate in order to promote economic competitiveness and so informal city-regions (in which the individual municipalities keep their independent identities) have in fact developed around the major cities. There is also increasing collaboration across the Randstad (‘Regio Randstad’) with a view to increasing its overall international competitiveness too.

However, in the case of Kop van Zuid the development has been controlled by the City Council of Rotterdam which had a clear idea of the way that the city should develop and the contribution that Kop van Zuid could make.

2. REGENERATION OF KOP VAN ZUID

2.1 Aims and Scope of the Scheme

The scheme to regenerate Kop van Zuid that was set out in the 1986 masterplan was both complex and ambitious. It aimed to change Rotterdam as a whole, not just to transform an abandoned port area. It had strong social as well as economic and physical goals, and above all it aimed not only to change the image of the city to outsiders (particularly business investors and enterprising people) but also to change the image of a large part of the city to existing residents of Rotterdam. Before the Kop van Zuid scheme the River Maas had been seen as a barrier, and the South Bank beyond it ‘one of the most repelling parts of the city’. But if it were to continue to prosper and grow, Rotterdam would need a larger city centre and areas with the quality and excitement to attract the types of people who drive the ‘knowledge economy’. Furthermore, in spite of previous housing renovation programmes, there were parts of the South Bank where high unemployment and social exclusion needed to be tackled. The Kop van Zuid scheme was intended to address all these issues, by:

- linking Kop van Zuid, and the suburbs to the south of it, directly to the city centre (Erasmus Bridge, new Metro station and the extension of Tramplus)
- creating a lively and attractive mixed-use district (offices, residential, leisure, education) in Kop van Zuid
- insisting on high quality of design in all buildings and throughout the public realm

- re-using existing landmark buildings wherever possible
- developing a programme of 'Mutual Benefit' to ensure that residents of poor areas alongside Kop van Zuid benefited from the scheme.

2.2 Organisation of the Scheme

The scheme is run directly by Rotterdam City Council, which is responsible to its electorate for all aspects of the development of the city. Many different council departments are involved (Rotterdam City Development Corporation, which owned the land, the Planning and Housing Department, the Rotterdam Transport Company, the Public Works Department, and the Port Authorities). The project is co-ordinated by a dedicated Project Team which includes a Communications Team and a Mutual Benefit Team. The Project Manager reports to a Council Steering Committee which also oversees the external Quality Team which vets development proposals and advises on all aspects of design.

In the beginning the main task was to persuade leading people in the city, the national government and other public agencies to support the scheme, and to provide funding for the infrastructure required to get the project off the ground. It was essential to do this in order to demonstrate the public sector's commitment to an area that private investors were reluctant to invest in. From the start the regeneration of Kop van Zuid had to be seen as a project that was for the good of the country as whole, and the role of the Mayor of Rotterdam – a Crown appointment – was important in building such a shared vision.

The City Council approved the masterplan for Kop van Zuid in 1991 and it was approved by the national government in 1994. Meanwhile the government had agreed to pay over 300 million guilders (150 million euros) for the Erasmus Bridge over the Maas, which was completed in 1996, and which has now become a highly-recognised symbol of Rotterdam. A new boulevard from the bridge runs through to the southern ring road, and greatly improves access to and from the south side of the city. Significantly the politicians were persuaded to support the most expensive of the three options for the bridge, as well as the move of several government departments (including the Customs and Tax Office and the Court of Justice) to the area.

3. ACTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

The plan for Kop van Zuid aimed to create a series of distinctive buildings and quarters in order to broaden the population and create new jobs in the area. Two university colleges with 10,000 students were built. The plan provided for 5,300 residential units and 400,000 sq.m. of offices, but it was flexible enough to accommodate changes in the mix as the housing market gained in strength. The redevelopment has been carried out under a phased strategy spread over several years. Although only the first part of the scheme has been completed, it has already had a dramatic impact on the area and on Rotterdam.

3.1 Reuniting a Divided City

The Erasmus Bridge, the new Metro station in Kop van Zuid and extension of the tram system have linked the north and south sides of the city much more closely. By putting the main railway lines underground, the pedestrian links with the adjoining residential areas have been greatly improved, and new suburban stations have helped improve local accessibility. There is also a popular system of water taxis which cross the river and link up with various visitor attractions. Kop van Zuid is now only a few minutes from the city centre which is also now well-connected to the rest of south Rotterdam. People from the north of the river now visit the South Bank, and many of the new residents of Kop van Zuid have come from across the river as well as from the wider region. The high quality of the public realm, with direct pedestrian routes and high quality surfaces, has helped to attract people with higher incomes to live in the area, thus helping to rebalance the demographic profile, and rising property values are encouraging existing residents to stay, as the whole area is definitely ‘on the up’.

3.2 Changing the City’s Image

Apart from the bridge, Kop van Zuid now has a number of stunning buildings. Many were designed by leading architects such as Renzo Piano, Norman Foster and Rem Koolhaas. Historic older buildings too have been restored and re-used. For example, the former Holland America line terminal has been converted into the atmospheric Hotel New York, and the oldest dock in the area has been turned into an industrial museum. The Entrepot building became a supermarket and a series of restaurants with food from around the world, so as to retain some of its previous character. Although the restaurants failed as insufficient demand had yet built up, the scheme succeeded in changing the area’s image and in attracting private investment in high quality housing.

High quality urban design has also been a notable feature (supported by Dutch planning policy in general and by Kop van Zuid’s Quality Team). Public art is used imaginatively to interpret the area’s history. The waterside has been opened up to people on foot. There is good lighting, a minimum of street clutter, and imaginative use of shared surfaces, with ample street parking in most residential areas combined with wide tree-lined pavements. The streets are kept scrupulously clean by gangs of cleaners and by the use of large receptacles into which rubbish has to be put.

Although the area is densely developed, with higher density activities concentrated around transport nodes, residential space standards are generous by British standards. (Three room flats built by a housing corporation provide 92 sq.m.). There is also a greater variety of residential styles, with different architects working on each block within an overall design framework which includes, for example, a requirement that each home should have its own outdoor space and encourages the provision of larger windows. Even though public transport is good, car parking is provided for at one space per dwelling. This can mean using several of the lower floors of a building like the 43-storey Montevideo Tower for car parking – but the ground floor perimeter is always kept for retail or other public use to give an active street frontage.

3.3 Repositioning Rotterdam

The redevelopment of Kop van Zuid as a high quality mixed-use area close to the city centre is playing an important part in repositioning Rotterdam's economy by making the city attractive to modern industries and to the people who work in them. Back in the 1980s the city feared that it could never compete with Amsterdam or The Hague as an office centre, let alone as a place for creative businesses. However this has now started to happen. Rotterdam was cited as one of the examples of urban renaissance by the Urban Task Force, and it won recognition as European Capital of Culture in 2001. Unemployment has fallen from 17% in 1991 to 6% in 2005 and the population of the city is slowly rising again. Much of the new employment has been created in the north west of the city (towards the airport) and many of the jobs in Kop van Zuid are in organisations that have relocated there from other parts of the city. What has succeeded in a big way is the new housing, and it has helped in attracting people with good jobs to live in the city. 40% of the residents of the area come from outside the region. These people are attracted by the prestige and convenience of the location. Furthermore, as Amsterdam is becoming more expensive and less accommodating of unconventional behaviour, so Rotterdam with its new image is becoming the place for creative people to be. This is exactly what is required to reposition Rotterdam as not just a port but also a dynamic city for the 21st century.

3.4 Spreading the Benefits

In the Netherlands a high priority is given to social programmes. The growth in immigration of people with low skills, combined with the changing labour market, put major pressures on Rotterdam, particularly in areas like Feyenoord. While the redevelopment of Kop van Zuid was aimed at repositioning Rotterdam for the future, there was a danger that it might leave the poorer communities right next to it largely unaffected. When the plans for Kop van Zuid were first made public, there was concern in the City Council and among the local neighbourhood associations over the problems that might be caused by putting luxurious development next door to deprived areas. It was therefore agreed that a concerted effort would be made to ensure that the project also created benefits for local people. The neighbourhood associations were included in the project organisation, and a Mutual Benefit programme was developed to help channel as many as possible of the jobs generated by the development to local people and to improve the economies of the surrounding areas (see next section).

In addition, the new transport connections that are an integral part of the project have made it easier for people in Feyenoord, and indeed the whole of the south side, to access the rest of the city. What is more, the successful redevelopment of Kop van Zuid has encouraged new investment in other parts of the south of the city, which almost certainly would not have gone ahead without it, and this is likely to continue in the future. For example, local Housing Corporations (which have recently been allowed to operate in the private, as well as the social, market) are now developing higher quality housing in poorer neighbourhoods, which means that local people can move to better housing without leaving the area altogether. This not only helps to promote a sense of 'belonging' to an area, but will over time also help to create the more 'balanced' communities that Dutch policy favours. The high quality of the environment created in Kop van

Zuid has also prompted Housing Corporations in neighbouring areas to pay more attention to the quality of the public realm. The positive influence of Kop van Zuid is therefore starting to spread outwards. The new schools and vocational college in Kop van Zuid provide another set of benefits and opportunities for people from the wider area, because the better-off parents require high standards for their children who go to the same schools. It is also emphasised that the schools help pupils – and parents – from different backgrounds to get to know each other, which reduces barriers between the old and new communities and helps tackle some aspects of social exclusion.

4. BENEFITS FOR VULNERABLE GROUPS

4.1 Mutual Benefit Programme

The people who were most affected by the demise of the port activities in Kop van Zuid were those who worked there or who lived nearby. The area itself had been abandoned for many years before the regeneration project got underway, and many of those who had lived in Feyenoord when the port was there will have moved away by then. Nevertheless Feyenoord remained a poor district with many ‘inner city’ problems – high unemployment, low educational attainment, high crime rate, poor reputation etc. – and a high proportion of immigrants. While there had been a considerable amount of investment in improving the housing stock in the 1970s and 1980s, other aspects of urban regeneration had not been addressed. Therefore one aim of the Kop van Zuid project was to use the project to create more jobs for local people. The Dutch approach to combating poverty and social exclusion is based on bringing people back to work or into a ‘social activation programme’, and ensuring that all stakeholders can participate in policy development and implementation. It was for these reasons that the Kop van Zuid project contained a Mutual Benefit programme (run by the Mutual Benefit Team and funded initially by the City Development Corporation) which started as far back as 1991.

The main thrust of the Mutual Benefit programme was economic:

- Acting as a broker, or employment agency, which tries to match local job-seekers to employment opportunities in Kop van Zuid, for example in construction work, or in the Hotel New York, or in the new supermarket. Apart from seeking out and publishing job opportunities locally, the team also organises ‘recruitment fairs’ and funds training programmes for those who need to develop a particular skill in order to get a job.
- Assisting existing local businesses and in particular local retailers, for example by establishing a shopkeepers’ association and several initiatives to improve the quality of the shops in the surrounding areas, so that they would provide a better service for existing residents and attract some of the new residents of Kop van Zuid to use them. This would in turn create more jobs, and shopping is seen as an activity that can bring people of different backgrounds together.
- Promoting new businesses and new business ideas, for example by establishing, in collaboration with a bank and a local college, a local Enterprise Centre with space and support for new firms.

The initial budget for the Mutual Benefits programme was 5 million guilders (2.3 million euros) over five years, and it later received funding through the European Regional Development Fund. The programme is continuing under the management of the Feyenoord Sub-municipality.

In the event, fewer direct jobs for local residents were generated by the project than originally anticipated. In particular very few construction jobs were filled locally. In part this was due to the oversupply of labour at the time and to the lack of relevant skills among the people of Feyenoord. Thus the old and the new communities in Feyenoord are still very different economically, and statistics based on averages are likely to be misleading. However the Mutual Benefit programme proved to be an effective mechanism for engaging with the local communities and for showing that there were benefits potentially available to them.

4.2 'Opzoomeren' Programme

As well as trying to help poorer neighbourhoods through social and economic programmes, the Dutch have also emphasised that all communities have a responsibility to help look after their own neighbourhoods, for the good of the whole city as well as for their own benefit. Rotterdam has developed the Opzoomeren programme for Cleaner, Safer, Greener streets and has so far applied it in over one third of the streets of the city. The initiative focuses on individual streets and the basic idea is to challenge residents to take responsibility for their own environment (in places where they are not doing so). The programme has three well-defined stages and uses local facilitators, backed up if necessary by social workers and the police.

The programme starts with a diagnostic phase aimed at undertaking who lives in the street and then encouraging them, through activities (like street parties) that help people to get to know each other, to take care of their environment. The second stage (called 'urban etiquette') is to get people to develop and agree rules regarding the environment of their street (for example that football can be played in the street but not after 8 p.m. or that rubbish may only be put out on the street on the day it is to be collected). In the final stage the agreements are included in a formal social contract, and activities in the street are monitored. The aim is to secure long lasting cooperation among the residents and between the residents and the providers of public services. If the rules are broken, particularly if this is done by difficult or aggressive individuals or families, the people concerned are visited and spoken to, if necessary they can be threatened with sanctions, and social workers – and ultimately the police – will become involved.

However, a social contract is not just a one-sided agreement. It involves step-by-step negotiations between the residents and service providers, so that it is clear what each party will do. In order to encourage the groups to conclude a contract, a reward of around 2,500 euros is paid to those streets that do so, to be spent in ways that help to improve the street. Needless to say the City Council takes care to see that its side of the agreement is kept, and finds that the Opzoomeren programme does help ensure that residents also take responsibility for their street, and take pride in a clearer, safer, greener environment for the city.

4.3 Social Reordering and Housing Management

The Dutch housing system has traditionally allowed a much wider range of people to occupy rented housing, and the Housing Corporations, which are subsidiaries of the Municipality, play an important role in regeneration. Rents are linked to incomes, and this encourages a wider social mix. For example, most of the people who provide municipal and social services will live near the city centre, thus minimising travel times and expenses. The huge expansion of new suburbs has encouraged an urban exodus (as in the UK), and apartment blocks, particularly those that are privately owned, are often occupied by immigrant groups, many of whom find it difficult to secure employment outside the 'black economy'. The government has therefore been promoting a policy of 'reordering', in an attempt to rebalance the social profile of neighbourhoods, and the attraction of people earning higher incomes to Kop van Zuid is seen as a success for the policy. Previous research has suggested that lessons could be learned from the Dutch approach to housing management, and, for example, many English authorities are now adopting 'Choice Based Letting' policies. However, in Britain, with such a shortage of social housing, and with concerns about security and the quality of local schools, those on lower incomes have tended to be forced to look to the outer suburbs for places to live, which leads to increasing polarisation.

5. KEY ELEMENTS OF THE SCHEME

5.1 Approach to Urban Regeneration

- Rotterdam City Council saw itself as fully responsible for the continuing success of the city and for the consequent need to re-orient its economy (and change the types of businesses and residents that it attracted). It was firmly in charge of urban regeneration
- The redevelopment of Kop van Zuid, and the linking of the two sides of the river that this required, was seen (in the mid 1980s) as a crucial opportunity for transforming the city.
- The changes were so far reaching that it was necessary to take the time to develop a sound (but flexible) plan and to persuade the key players (local, provincial and national) that it was good for the whole country as well as good for Rotterdam. Vision and communication were all important

5.2 Strategy, Organisation and Funding

- While the masterplan showed how the area would be redeveloped, it was recognised that the strategy also depended on making sure that the development changed the city's whole image and on convincing the private sector to invest in the area.
- This meant creating eye-catching, and highly visible, structures early on in the development, and committing sufficient public resources to transport and other infrastructure, public facilities and the environment to attract in private investors.
- Rotterdam City Development Corporation, the key implementation agency, is a permanent arm of the City Council – not a central government quango. This reflects where responsibility

for and commitment to urban regeneration lies – and that regeneration in a city is likely to be a continuing process, in response to changing economic and other circumstances.

- In Rotterdam, as in the Netherlands in general, there is an accepted tradition of working together for a common goal. Many parts of the City Council and other agencies were required to work together to implement the Kop van Zuid strategy – and were able to do so.
- Rotterdam City Council was able to be highly proactive in getting the development of Kop van Zuid off the ground in accordance with its strategy because it owned most of the land (through its subsidiary the Port Authority) and because it had organised the finance (from central government and its own resources) for the initial investments required (transport infrastructure etc).
- Funding for the Erasmus Bridge and the new Metro station came largely from central government. The City Development Corporation and Rotterdam's Transport Company also had substantial capital that they could invest as they are able to borrow against the prospects of future income.
- The successful development of Kop van Zuid will generate substantial extra revenues from property tax for the City Council, which will make it a good investment for the city, in addition to the money generated by rising property values when disposals are made.

5.3 Mechanisms for Overcoming Obstacles

- The masterplan was designed to be reasonably flexible which allowed the mix of housing and commercial space to be varied when the demand for housing in the area proved to be so strong.
- Since high quality development was seen as the key to changing the image of the city, the independent Quality Team had a crucial role to play,

5.4 Spreading the Benefits

- Although the essence of the Kop van Zuid project was its role in repositioning Rotterdam as a city, it was accepted from the start that efforts needed to be made to ensure that benefits, particularly economic benefits, also flowed into the poor residential areas that surround it. It was recognised that these would not 'trickle down' automatically.
- Involving local people in devising and implementing the Mutual Benefit programme, and in planning other aspects of the development, helped ensure acceptance of the project.
- While the direct spin-offs from the project (in terms of jobs) were less than originally hoped for, there have been many other benefits, including changing perceptions about the whole of the south side of Rotterdam and increasing local confidence.

5.5 Future Profing

- Rotterdam's port guarantees a certain level of future success, but city of its size also needs to diversify its economy to ensure prosperity for all its residents. Therefore so long as Rotterdam in general, and Kop van Zuid in particular, are able to attract enterprising people who will drive forward a range of modern businesses, the future of Rotterdam seems assured.

6. UK PARTNER CITY'S REACTION

The UK Partner for the Kop van Zuid case study is the London Borough of Southwark in London, and officers from the authority took part in the Workshop in Kop van Zuid.

There are strong similarities between the history and physical nature of the former port areas of Southwark and Rotterdam. Rotherhithe is a peninsula of a similar size to Kop van Zuid and unusually the public sector has an extensive land ownership. It, too, has undergone a major physical and social transformation, following war-time destruction, the filling in of the docks, and the development of new housing on a major scale. Its population has grown from 6,000 to 16,000. When regeneration was first considered, the priority of the London Docklands Development Corporation, which took over both land ownership and responsibility for planning, was to attract private housing developers. Luxury flats were developed along the edge of the river, unlike in Kop van Zuid where there is public access to the entire waterfront and where more active use has been made of the water areas. The central part of Rotherhithe was developed as a modern suburb with relatively low-density family housing, unlike Kop van Zuid where stylish new neighbourhoods of modern high-density apartments were constructed. As a result there is a marked division between 'them and us' in Rotherhithe, whereas in Kop van Zuid there is a greater social mix at the neighbourhood level, in part due to the way in which rented housing is made accessible to people on different incomes.

However the greatest difference between the two areas is in the way that in Kop van Zuid higher density and higher quality development has been concentrated around transport nodes, with for example, a new college and a major entertainment complex located above the Metro station, and with some iconic housing schemes overlooking the enclosed docks. In Rotherhithe, the extension of the Jubilee Line came as a surprise (due to contributions from the developers of Canary Wharf). As a consequence, the shopping centre at Canada Water is to be redeveloped after only a couple of decades, and there is a major conflict between Southwark Council and the existing residents, and the Mayor of London on the densities that should be sought in the rest of the peninsula.

Although Southwark Council and the Greater London Council had acquired the main land holdings in Rotherhithe (the former Surrey Docks) and started to prepare it for development, the land was taken over by a government appointed development agency, the London Docklands Development Corporation, whose brief was to develop the sites as rapidly as possible, and with the maximum level of leverage of private investment. Little attempt was made in the early days of the Development Corporation to take account of local needs and feelings. There was no proper masterplan, and developers were encouraged to do whatever they thought was appropriate. Only a limited amount of public investment was made in providing landscaped urban spaces, with an ecology park in the centre and a wide distributor road round the peninsula. As a result walking around is seen by many as unattractive and unsafe, and cars are used even for quite short journeys, which creates problems of congestion in getting on and off the peninsula.

Rotherhithe's rich history has been largely ignored, and there is little public art or attempt to interpret the area's roots. While there are hotels and Conservation Areas on the peninsula, they tend to be isolated from the surrounding attractions. There is a river boat service from the main hotel to Canary Wharf, but without a new bridge or a system of water taxis, most people in Rotherhithe are cut off from the North Bank. A major issue is how to build a greater sense of community when most of the people living in the private apartments only stay in the area for a short time. With limited social housing, the numbers of Black and Minority Ethnic groups are below the average for the surrounding area, although this is likely to change as new housing is developed. Latterly a public realm investment strategy has been drawn up, and the Council is negotiating with the developers of land in and around Canada Water to try to secure benefits through a Community Project Bank.

7. POTENTIAL MESSAGES FOR UK POLICY

Although Rotterdam is underpinned by its port, it still faced (and will continue to face) the same types of issues as many British industrial towns do in needing to reposition itself in a highly competitive world. There are therefore several aspects of what is being done in Rotterdam that should be relevant to current UK policy debates, especially:

- The role of the **City Council** (which has responsibility for transport as well as planning, and which owns all development land) in developing and carrying out a large urban regeneration project with wide strategic implications
- The ability of the Project Team to get a whole range of **public and private partners to work together** and create results that are far above a 'lowest common denominator'
- The efforts to **spread the benefits** of the urban regeneration to the surrounding areas, through programmes like Mutual Benefit and 'Opzoomeren'
- The importance of image and the quality of the **public realm** in changing attitudes towards once unpopular sections of a city.