

Masterstudio 11–16 January 2016

The Equitable and Social City?

INFOS

Registration

For up-to-date information and registration, please visit www.urbanstudies.uva.nl/education

Costs

Institutional Participants:
per day € 200, full seminar € 1000

Private Participants:
per day € 40, full seminar € 200

Contacts

Department of Planning, Geography
and International Development Studies

Dr. Federico Savini (f.savini@uva.nl)

Ir. San Verschuuren (v.j.m.verschuuren@uva.nl)

Prof. Willem Salet (w.g.m.salet@uva.nl)

The Masterstudio Urban Planning 2016
The Just and Social City? is gratefully supported
by the EFL foundation

VAN EESTEREN-FLUCK & VAN LOHUIZEN STICHTING



PAKHUIS DE ZWIJGER*

Since 2002 the master's programme Urban and Regional Planning of the University of Amsterdam organizes yearly a course intended for masterstudents, academics and professionals in the field of urban and regional planning, urban sociology, urban design, and city and regional government.

Every year an other current topic – in the front line of disciplinary development – is placed in the centre to discover new insights, to be discussed with domestic and international scientists. These courses have acquired a special place in recent years, particularly within institutions and agencies concerned with the quality of spacial planning in the Netherlands.

It opts mainly a form in which knowledge – high quality and international level – and practice meet, complement and reinforce: a masterstudio where students and professionals learn and work together on a specific issue. Students are thus offered an unique opportunity to deepen and broaden their education. Professionals can refresh their knowledge on an international level.

The course is organized in a studio of one full week consisting of lectures in the morning, and working groups in the afternoon, resulting in policy advices to the City of Amsterdam. Furthermore cases of practice in Amsterdam will be presented in addition to the lectures. The evaluation of the course is conducted also through scientific papers to be written by participating students in the weeks following the masterstudio.

Organisations like research institutes, city departments, consulting firms and urban design offices can purchase participation for several employees on different days.

The Equitable and Social City?

Social entrepreneurialism, institutions and urban justice

Reflections on justice, space and urban change have been numerous in the last decades. In planning most of all, practitioners and scholars have been concerned with finding ways to address the major dilemma between the scarcity of spatial and economic resources and the priorities of redistributing these resources. Planning, as a practice of spatial organization of scarcity, is fundamentally characterized by dilemmas of (re)distribution. Planning organizes scarcity, institutionally manage resources, and establish goals on the base of politically defined notions of unjust spatial dynamics. Because social exclusion is threatening in many cities the social cohesion and diversity of urban societies. The issue of justice is even more today an issue of political, economic and social accessibility to the city, its governance processes and spaces.

Cities are today characterized by two main trends. First, the notion of scarcity is increasingly embedded in a discourse over strategic austerity in providing planning services and spatial policies, as a result of the last financial crisis. 'Doing more with less' is just one of the recent mottos that characterize the policy logic of today's spatial, social and economic interventions. De-growth or smart growth are similar concepts which entail the same idea. The city is today more and more identified as the space for innovation in resource management, where experiments with circularity, smartness and creative urbanism are considered to generate ground-braking solutions to address urgent problems under condition of scarce economic resources. Secondly, since the mid 2000 we see a consolidation of a discourse over 'social-entrepreneurialism' in cities. Differently from the modern definition of urban entrepreneurialism, a new connota-

tion of this term tends to emphasize the responsibility of citizens vis á vis that of governments and large organizations. The current narrative on civic engagement is oriented in enabling self-organization and re-organization among citizens, in promoting the reform of welfare institutions into more responsive providers of services through hybrid organizational models. Practices of voluntary organization, do it yourself urbanism and collectivism are becoming central as provides of social services. Also in planning, tasks are shuffling, between private and public actors, and the centrality of organized networks of citizens is increasing. The English big-society, as well as the Dutch notion of 'stadmakers', represent this new political attitude to institutional reorganization of government and markets, which emphasize the need for an entrepreneurial boost. Social entrepreneurialism emphasize the quest for new financial models, new approaches to risk and revenues in financing urban change, as well as new forms of management of large corporations to match goals of affordable housing.

The 2016 masterstudio builds upon these two trends: the issue of scarcity in spatial change and a critical view on social entrepreneurialism as the new logic of urban planning.

Main leading questions:

What are the implications of social entrepreneurialism for a just and equitable change of the city?

How can we address in genuine ways the question of accessibility to the urban realm and what institutional change is required for that?

The Masterstudio is organized around five different topics, each providing a specific theme for the series of 5x2 lectures:

General introduction: Justice, equitable development and narratives of social entrepreneurialism

This theme addresses the current trends in unjust development. Geographical accounts might explain what are the main elements of exclusion in cities, access to housing, public space and political resources. These problems will be coupled with a view on the current policy approaches to achieve equitable cities. Narratives on social-entrepreneurialism, on institutional reform and welfare will be addressed in relation to spatial urban planning.

Public space: ownership and/vs. usage

These theme addresses the meaning, development, design and management of public spaces in different cities. What does it mean 'public' in times of welfare restructuring? How do public goods being provided in times of austerity policies and unscrupulous private investors? We are particularly interested in new models of public space organization and management, and in a critique of the risks that privately owned public spaces can have for cities. The role of planning is addressed with relation to regulations and the use of public space.

Restructuring of housing institutions: accessibility to housing

This theme addresses the changing systems of housing provision in different countries. We are here interested in understanding the recent developments with regards to housing development and management. Examples can regard large scale reorganization of housing corporations, private housing developers as well as new socially entrepreneurial systems to provide affordable housing. This theme focuses on the issue of institutional restructuring for affordable housing provision in cities under the pressure of market forces

12–17 January 2015

Resources of spatial redistribution: negotiating justice in urban change

We are here interested in the way risk, income, revenues and financial coverage of urban policies are organized and re-negotiated. This lesson should sensitize the students on the issue of dealing with scarcity in planning by organizing the way space is financed and produced. It will treat issues of taxation and financialization as well as redistribution. The lecture focuses on municipal fiscal policies for development projects as well as to the changing fiscality between levels of government (and the implications for planning).

Constellations for entrepreneurial governance: planning equity and political inclusion

This lesson discusses the changing landscape of power in policy making within cities. The 'how' question is how to manage the transition towards a more inclusive equitable city. We are particularly interested in a critical view of the excluded subjects from the political and urban landscape. The lectures addresses the new forms of organizing decision making across non-governmental networks, forms of social-private, hybrid forms of service delivery, public-private forms of cooperation to enable affordable services.

11–16 January 2016

Monday 11 January

Heather Campbell

Professor of Town and Regional planning,
University of Sheffield

**Delivering more just places:
planning challenges and normative implications**

What does it mean for planners to act justly? Planning (and planners) may aspire to make the world a better place, or least to intervene in such ways as to foster more just and equitable places, but what does this mean? The presentation will explore various conceptualisations of justice and their implications for debates about the theory and practice of urban planning. A critical distinction within conceptual understandings is between approaches, which place an emphasis on process, more particularly, on the importance of, more inclusive forms of democratic deliberation, and those that focus on the nature of substantive outcomes. A hypothetical case study will be used to frame consideration of the implications of this distinction for the theory and practice of planning. This discussion will highlight the tensions, challenges and opportunities at stake. Much of the literature about justice and urban policy tends to concentrate on the analysis of injustice. However for planners, the identification of injustice is merely a stepping stone on route to the identification of specific actions. The presentation will therefore include consideration of the normative implications of a concern with justice in planning: what's the scope for planning to deliver more just places?

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

Monday 11 January

Adri Duivesteijn

Former Senator, former Alderman
of spatial planning and housing City of Almere

**City Life, now for citizens:
A plea for a different spatial planning model
for the development of Dutch cities**

Spatial planning is in Netherlands in our gene and we are proud of it. The Dutch constitution stipulates in Articles 21 and 22 that "the concern of the government is focused on the habitability of the country and the protection of the environment" and the "promotion of adequate housing is the concern of the government." In other words, the Netherlands has a strong commitment for the role of government and its strict planning from above. Policy makers of housing and planning policies also tend to believe that what they have done since WWII has been good and will always be good. In the past two decades, however, our planning model is increasingly coming under pressure. First, because of the rise of neoliberal spatial policy. Here the role of government has become smaller and many tasks have been delegated to commercial parties. Second, we see that the many past achievements are far less durable than originally assumed. The urban model of our post-war neighbourhoods is in contradiction with more organically developed inner cities and there no gradual change seems possible. The necessary restructuring is therefore financially costly and hard to undertake. Institutions are put into question. Today, a new growing social momentum is emerging, which is worthy to be searched to get to a policy model able to promote more organic urban growth and ensure the inclusion of citizens in policy making. According to this emerging model the citizen is not a residential consumer but primarily a residential producer. Based on experiences, especially in Almere, I will discuss the desirability of a fundamentally different spatial planning models and look into the role of governments in providing adaptive spatial frameworks. I will discuss how these frameworks are able to enable a city space for the citizens and entrepreneurs and their demands.

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

abstracts

abstracts

Tuesday 12 January

Jerold S. Kayden

Professor of Urban Planning and Design, Harvard University

**Is public space really public?
Lessons from regulating private spaces
for public purposes**

Public space is increasingly produced by private institutions and money. For some, this is the death of public space at the hands of neoliberalism. For others with a less puritanical streak, public space that is privately financed and managed can be seen as one of many public space typologies, even if its performative qualities will often reflect its private origins and ongoing stewardship. A shopping mall is not a public street, or is it? An interesting hybrid of public and private, born and raised originally in New York City and now commonly produced in cities around the world, is called privately owned public space (POPS). Composed of plazas, arcades, and other outdoor and indoor spaces, these hybrids boast private and public qualities in their DNA. The spaces are privately owned, financed, and managed, but they are also required by law to be open to and usable by the public. The generative force creating such spaces is land-use regulations, especially zoning or zoning-like laws. In return for concessions such as extra bonus density or relaxations of height limits, developers of residential and office towers voluntarily agree to provide POPS at the base of their buildings. The developers make more money through the additional space or height, and the public benefits by receiving the spaces. New York City now has over 530 of such spaces, and they populate such cities worldwide as Toronto, Vancouver, Seattle, San Francisco, and Seoul. While there can be little doubt that this system of incentive zoning produces quantities of public space, it is less clear that this approach guarantees desired qualities of public space. At the end of the day, without well-delineated laws describing what is required of the developers and their spaces, and without post-occupancy monitoring and enforcement of the deal, the public gets something other than a true public space. Most recently, the very idea of what is meant by public was tested by Occupy Wall Street and its occupation of a New York City POPS known as Zuccotti Park. That occupation, and the reaction of the owner, other owners, the city, neighbors, and the general public revealed the incompleteness and tension within the very concept of privately owned public space. What lessons can we learn from recent and long-standing histories?

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

Tuesday 12 January

Arnold Reijndorp

Professor in Urban Sociology,
University of Amsterdam

Public space as a stage for public life

To answer questions about privatization or commercialization of public space we need to understand the nature of public space as the domain of the public, or better, of different publics. The public domain as the realm of cultural exchange is not restricted to public space owned and managed by city government. Private spaces, like cafe's, shops and collective spaces like parks, museums and libraries all add to the public domain of cities. Moreover cultural exchange in the city asks for a profiling of urban spaces dominated in a symbolic way by specific groups. In urban sociology this is called parochialization, which is often understood in a negative way as appropriation by one group excluding others. However parochialization shows the diversity of city life and makes the city readable, intriguing and in the end understandable. Public domain is the experience of the diversity by entering parochial domains of other groups. The co-existence or overlapping of parochial realms in public spaces generates public domain. Problems arise when the parochial realm of one specific group is more dominant, both in urban space as in urban policies than others, as is the case with the realm of the creative class, which by mistake is understood as urbanity as such. One of the well-known metaphors of the city is the city as theatre, in which citizens are actors and audiences at the same time. The city as theatre includes different stage sets designed for specific dramatic forms, the tragedy, the comedy and the satire. A distinction found in old books on the architecture of the city. They throw a surprising light on the symbolic meaning of different spaces in the city.

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

abstracts

abstracts

Wednesday 13 January

David Mullins

Professor of Housing Policy,
Director of Housing and Communities Research Group,
University of Birmingham

**Tackling housing injustice through social enterprise
– the role of ‘self-help housing’ in England –**

The theme of the third day of the Master Studio will focus on civil society based responses to the social injustice of 600,000 empty privately owned houses in a time of housing crisis in England. Social enterprise models mixing trading income with Government grants underpin participating projects. We will use evidence from a series of research projects to tell the story of the ‘self-help-housing’ movement which now comprises over 100 locally based groups who negotiate access with private property owners, undertake the repairs necessary to bring the properties into use and provide homes for people in housing need. The story of self-help housing is also a story of the relationship between civil society groups/social enterprises and the state. The lecture will trace the policy influencing process that resulted in £50million of public funding (2011-15) being allocated for the first time to community-led groups rather than through large registered housing associations in a time of Government spending cuts and ‘austerity’. To do this it will draw on theories of policy streams, garbage cans and policy games. We will consider the added value provided by allocating funding to small local groups over large scale procurement. 6 main benefits are traced supported by case study evidence on how projects made a difference by being local, tackled wicked social issues such as training and employment gaps and neighborhood abandonment and offered good value for money through leverage and volunteer input. We also consider the impact and legacy of the programme for the individual organizations and sector sustainability.

**Stadgenoot (Amsterdam, main office) / until 11.30
University of Amsterdam (room G.S.14) / 11.45-12.30**

Wednesday 13 January

Marja Elsinga

Professor of Housing Institutions and Governance
Delft University of Technology

**Changing housing systems
and the impact on cities**

Housing systems across Europe are changing due to the global financial crisis and its aftermath, but also due to changing ideologies on the role of housing in welfare states. These changes impact on urban planning and the social fabric of cities. This contribution describes the variety of housing systems in Europe and also depicts similar current trends across Europe and possible impacts on the urban agenda. How do housing systems change? Since the 1990's the main trends in housing were: emphasis on privatisation which implied encouraging home ownership and reforming social housing into more privatised organisations. All countries in Europe encourage home ownership in their policy documents. Home ownership is believed to be the preferred tenure in housing markets. However, the attractiveness and accessibility of home ownership changed in most European countries due to the GFC and recession in many countries. Moreover, social and public housing are debated already before 2008, but even more since then. The debate concerns the high costs and the inefficiency of social and public housing and less societal support with a decrease of social and public rental housing as a result. The private rental sector on the contrary regained much attention as a solution for the shortage of affordable housing for in particular the middle income groups. Many policies by several governments to attract private investors are being developed. At the same time there is a renewed interest for bottom up initiatives such as cooperatives. At the moment these two trends are found in several countries often not (yet) large scale and the question is how governments, citizens and investors respond to these trends and how these will impact the urban agenda. How do these changes impact on planning and cities? Building on research on the link between housing systems, quality of neighbourhoods, segregation and homelessness, I will speculate on the possible long term impacts of current changes in housing systems.

**Stadgenoot (Amsterdam, main office) / until 11.30
University of Amsterdam (room G.S.14) / 11.45-12.30**

abstracts

abstracts

Thursday 14 January

Rachel Weber

Associate Professor in Urban Planning and Policy,
University of Illinois at Chicago

**Swaps, sweeps, and long-term leases:
how infrastructure finance techniques
reconfigure state power**

My presentation will focus on financialization as a policy project, particularly the increasing use of complex financial instruments by municipalities to underwrite new infrastructure projects. Examining two cases from the City of Chicago (one of infrastructure privatization, the other of interest rate swaps to construct new school facilities), I will demonstrate how localities construct the powers, networks, and contractual frameworks to work with, through, or against finance (Weber 2010; Ashton, Doussard, and Weber 2014). In Chicago as well as elsewhere in North America financial rationality has become deeply entrenched as the logic and conceptual frame through which the concept of urban governance is understood. Financial returns are both the goal and the means of accomplishing policy objectives (Lake, 2015). The income streams from assets can only be realized over time and depend on an extensive set of positive spillovers in order for yields to flow to investors. Financialization, therefore, is best thought of as a recursive process wherein individual transactions, contract negotiations, and bond offerings are moments in a longer chain of state transformation. Each transaction entangles the state and a broad range of investors, creditors, and counterparties in generating value and in managing uncertainty within the transaction. These deals provide local governments with new powers and enable them to undertake building projects that might otherwise be off-limits. However, they also expose local governments and service-dependent citizens to risks and liabilities not accounted for in the instruments and contracts that govern them. When crises arise, cities are “locked in” and predisposed to managing the collateral effects of financialization with yet more financialization.

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

Thursday 14 January

Willem F. Korthals Altes

Professor of Land Development
Delft University of Technology

Redistribution: resources and spatial effects

Local authorities play a vital role in providing services for people in urban areas. Local provided services are essential for the quality of life in urban areas. These services may relate to the quality of public spaces, but also to issues of transport, schools, recreation, health and safety. Over the last decades, the provision of many services has been devolved from national levels to local levels. After all, why should service provision being based on national decision making far away from the actual delivery of services? Giving the users of services a say in the provision of services, may help to tailor-made services to people’s requirements. However, devolution of service provision involves that also resources to provide these services must be made available locally. If need for services and resources are uneven distributed, issues of equity are at the table. Moreover, for many services not only devolution, but also allocation through market mechanisms plays a larger role, which involves that allocation is not grounded on need, based on norms, but provided on demand, based on the ability to pay. Differences in service provision may result in spatial differences in the attractiveness of areas, which may have an impact on who moves to what area. A more wealthy local population may result in having more resources to provide for services, which may further enlarge differences between spatial areas. This lecture will discuss the instruments of governance that may help to counter these differences in service provision and the ability to acquire resources. A specific emphasis will be on instruments related to land values and development.

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

abstracts

abstracts

Friday 15 January

Yvonne Rydin

Professor of Planning, Environment and Public Policy,
Bartlett School of Planning – University College London

Visions of a more socially just planning system

There is a growing debate in the UK about the need for urban planning to take social issues on board in a more integrated and comprehensive way. This is in response to the growing dependence on economic growth to drive urban change, which leads to market pressures being given precedence. Environmental concerns have certain statutory protection due to European and national legislation but social issues seem to be slipping off the agenda. This lecture will consider how a more socially just planning system can be constructed. It will compare and contrast alternative visions including: the national government guidance on promoting equality and diversity through planning; the emerging views of the Royal Town Planning Institute (the professional body) and the Town and Country Planning Association (a lobby group and 'holder' of the Garden City vision); the Five Radical Ideas put forward by colleagues at the Bartlett School of Planning and my proposals in *The Future of Planning* (2013; Policy Press). The emphasis will be on the need to develop new tools of implementation including community landownership and management; some examples from London will be considered in this light. The key questions considered will include: Does community ownership and management empower or burden? Will social capital be built through these means? Can inequalities be tackled through these means? Does planning regulation need to change to protect assets of importance for local communities?

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

Friday 15 January

Jurgen Hoogendoorn

Policy advisor at City of Amsterdam
Lecturer at University of Applied Sciences of Amsterdam

Constellations for entrepreneurial social governance; the position and influence of social entrepreneurs during and after the crisis

In 2008, after the beginning of the financial crisis, the (re)development of cities was dramatically changed in the Netherlands. Usual players such as housing associations and real-estate developers (financed by banks) disappeared rapidly. In the city of Amsterdam, where the land is owned by the local administration, huge amounts of wastelands appeared. In this vacuum a group of new players raised: the social entrepreneur. In the period 2008 - 2014 social entrepreneurs were welcomed by the local administration. In Amsterdam we nowadays are confronted with a fast economic recovery in Amsterdam. There was an influx of more than 10.000 new inhabitants 2014. In 2015 more than 5.000 houses will be build (on former wastelands). The question is: what was and is nowadays the position and influence of the social entrepreneur? The situation in Amsterdam (810.000 inhabitants) will be compared with the situation of a nearby city Utrecht (330.000 inhabitants 4th city of the Netherlands) where the situation, from the point of view of social entrepreneurs, is slightly different.

UvA Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)

abstracts

abstracts

Masterstudio Urban Planning

DAY 1: MONDAY 11 JANUARY

Social Mapping Amsterdam

by Jeroen Slot,
head of section Research & Statistics

Excursion

guided by Igor Roover,
projectmanager City of Amsterdam

DAY 2: TUESDAY 12 JANUARY

De Hallen

by Martien Kuitenbrouwer,
former district mayor Amsterdam-West

DAY 3: WEDNESDAY 13 JANUARY

Self-building

by Marije Raap,
self-building team City of Amsterdam

DAY 4: THURSDAY 14 JANUARY

Ground Lease

by Michiel Boesveld,
policy advisor City of Amsterdam

DAY 5: FRIDAY 15 JANUARY

Buiksloterham

by Els Daems,
projectmanager City of Amsterdam

11–16 January 2016

LOCATIONS

Day 1 & Day 2: Monday 11, Tuesday 12

University of Amsterdam,
Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)
Nieuwe Doelenstraat 16, Amsterdam

Day 3: Wednesday 13

9.00-11.30

Stadgenoot (main office),
Sarphatistraat 370, Amsterdam

11.45-12.30

University of Amsterdam (room G.S.14),
Nieuwe Prinsengracht 130, Amsterdam

Day 4 & 5: Thursday 15, Friday 16

University of Amsterdam,
Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)
Nieuwe Doelenstraat 16, Amsterdam

Day	Time	Activity	Topics & Location	Speakers
Mon. 11	09.00–12.30	Lectures	General introduction The Just and Social City? Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)	Heather Campbell Professor of Town and Regional planning, University of Sheffield Adri Duivesteijn Former Senator and, Alderman of spatial planning and housing City of Almere
	12.30–13.30	Lunch		
	13.30–17.00	Excursion		
Tue. 12	09.00–12.30	Lectures	Public space: ownership and usage Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)	Jeroel S. Kayden Professor of Urban Planning and Design, Harvard University Arnold Reijndorp Professor in Urban Sociology, University of Amsterdam
	12.30–13.30	Lunch		
	13.30–17.00	Workshops		
Wed. 13	09.00–12.30	Lectures	Restructuring of housing institutions till 11.30 Stadgenoot (main office) 11.45–12.30 REC G.S.14	David Mullins Professor of Housing Policy, Director of Housing and Communities Research Group, University of Birmingham Marja Elsinga Professor of Housing Institutions and Governance, TU Delft
	12.30–13.30	Lunch		
	13.30–17.00	Workshops		
	19.30–22.00	Seminar	The Just and Social City? Pakhuis De Zwijger	David Mullins, Marja Elsinga, Reinier van Dantzig, Max van Engen, and others
Thu. 14	09.00–12.30	Lectures	Resources of spatial redistribution Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)	Rachel Weber Associate Professor in Urban Planning and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago Willem F. Korthals Altes Professor of Land Development, TU Delft
	12.30–13.30	Lunch		
	13.30–17.00	Workshops		
Fri. 15	09.00–12.30	Lectures	Constellations of entrepreneurial governance Universiteitstheater (room 3.01)	Yvonne Rydin Professor of Planning, Bartlett School of Planning - UCL Jurgen Hoogendoorn Policy advisor City of Amsterdam, Lecturer at University of Applied Sciences of Amsterdam
	12.30–13.30	Lunch		
	13.30–17.00	Workshops		
Sat. 16	10.00–12.00	Presentation	Results of workshops Policy advises	