

CHANGING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ROLES IN URBAN AREA DEVELOPMENT IN THE NETHERLANDS

*Erwin Heurkens**

*Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 2600 AA, Delft, The Netherlands, e.w.t.m.heurkens@tudelft.nl

ABSTRACT: This paper addresses the current status of a PhD research on changing public and private roles in urban area development in the Netherlands. Socio-economic and organisational developments towards more Anglo Saxon principles, National spatial planning policy's emphasis on the planning development concept, and the coercive tendering procedures of European Law puts established relationships between public and private actors in urban area development under pressure. In particular, the tenability of the joint venture as a conceptual Public Private Partnership model for the future is questionable. At the same time, current practical applications of the more private sector dominated concession model, raises debates on what the actual roles of public and private actors in Dutch urban area development ought to be. In this paper I discuss the changed relationship between public and private actors based on literature research, as well as the current use of the concession model in the Netherlands through case study research.

KEYWORDS: Anglo Saxon model, concession model, public private cooperation, planning development, Rhineland model, urban area development, urban planning

1 INTRODUCTION

Urban area development in the Netherlands can be characterised as the integral development of a defined area with a mixed functional program. The way public and private actors initiate, design, realise and manage urban areas is subject to change. The public private power balance in recent years has shifted towards more private sector involvement throughout the entire development process. The main reasons and indicators for this new situation are described in section 2. As a result existing public private partnership models in urban area development no longer entirely represent current power relations.

Therefore, in practice we notice a new phenomenon in the way public and private actors organise urban area development processes – the increased use of the concession model. This model potentially is more in line with current power relations, the need for a more effective and efficient development process, and the need for more transparency of roles performed by public and private parties. One of the main characteristics of this model is the disconnection of the public and private domain; tasks, risks, responsibilities and revenues are separated. At the same time this model is characterised by a more private sector managed development process. These model characteristics implicate that governmental institutions solely facilitate and mandate urban developments, while private organisations perform a larger role in the development process.

The research problem relates to the knowledge gap in academic literature on Dutch urban planning, and in daily practice relating to the way public and private actors (should) cooperate in a model based upon the disconnection of the public and private domain and a private actor managed development process. The objective of this research is to design a cooperation model that is in line with the changed public private power relations. Therefore, we (amongst other things) analyse current concession model cases in the Netherlands on their characteristics, effects, and problems, alongside public and private actors' experiences.

This paper is divided into three main sections. Firstly, it addresses the current status of the research through Literature Findings on the societal, organisational, urban planning, and juridical indicators for a changed public private relationship. Secondly, the Empirical Case Studies section explains the current status of the application of the concession model in urban area development in the Netherlands. Finally, the Overall Conclusion section deliberates on current results and future research activities.

2 LITERATURE FINDINGS

In current urban area development in the Netherlands different changes in the way public and private actors organise and manage development processes can be noticed. This section provides insight into the main indicators for the increased influence of Anglo Saxon values in Dutch society, organisations, and urban planning, which is interesting in their impact on new roles for public and private actors in urban area development.

2.1 Socio-economic & organisational developments towards a more Anglo Saxon principle

Central to the increased influence of the private sector in urban area development is the discussion on the role of the State and the Market. On a political and economic level authors like Albert (1998), Giddens (1998), Hall and Soskice (2001), and Rifkin (2004), refer to two different types of capitalism that exist in Western countries. These are the Anglo Saxon model most applicable to the USA, UK and Canada, and the Rhineland model generally applicable to most Western European countries. These two ideal type models exist with different interpretations on the roles of the State and the Market. In short, Anglo Saxon countries have free market economies with limited government control and legislation based upon Case Law, while the Rhineland countries emphasis lies on the regulated market economy with some sort of government control and legislation based upon Civic Law. In the Netherlands the ‘established’ Rhineland model is under severe influence of the characteristics from the Anglo Saxon model. Fig.1 shows the main differences between Anglo Saxon and Rhineland model characteristics at Societal Level.

	<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Anglo Saxon model</i>	<i>Rhineland model</i>
Societal level	Economy	Free Market	Market Regulation
	Legislation	Case or Common Law	Civic Law
	Ownership (in general)	Private sector (privatisations)	Collective sector
	Government tax policy	Low taxes on high income	High taxes on high income
	Government role	Passive	Active
	Private sector role	Economic driver	Employment & economic driver
	Leading principle	Individual success	Collective power
	Innovation driver	Technology & market	Research/Design & science
	Coordination	Rules	Shared values
	Relationship companies	Competition	Collaboration

Figure 1 Differences between Anglo Saxon and Rhineland model characteristics on Societal Level

From a Dutch historical perspective Van der Cammen and De Klerk (2003) identified that three National Government Cabinets-Lubbers (1982-1994) directed the reorganisation of the economy and the society towards more neoliberal ideologies on six different fields; reduction in financial burdens, reduction of the government’s deficit, reorganisation of the collective sector (subsidy expenditures), a mobilised work market, privatisation of government businesses, deregulation and decentralisation. These pragmatic reforms in the Netherlands during the 1980s and 1990s clearly have some sort of similarity with the instances of destruction of former socio-economical ideologies and the moments of creation of later neoliberal economical ideologies introduced by Brenner and Theodore (2002) in “Spaces of Neoliberalism”.

In a political respect, the Rhineland model in the Netherlands is gradually being replaced by values from the Anglo Saxon model (Rooy et al, 2006), which started with government retrenchments and privatisations in the Dutch economy in the 1980's (Van der Cammen and De Klerk, 2003). Furthermore, on an organisational level Brouwer and Moerman (2005), Bakker et al (2005), and Godijk (2008) also indicate that there are obvious influences of Anglo Saxon principles in the way organisations are structured and managed in the Netherlands. They argue that Anglo Saxon thinking is becoming more dominant in several organisation related activities. 'We see this in government policies, in the way firms and their managers think and act, and even in the content of current management courses' (Bakker et al, 2005). Fig. 2 shows the main differences between Anglo Saxon and Rhineland model characteristics at the Organisational Level.

	<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Anglo Saxon model</i>	<i>Rhineland model</i>
<i>Organisation & management level</i>	Business driver	Short term revenues	Continuity & trust
	Dominant thinking	Financial	Industrial
	Private sector	Stock market business models	Other business models (family)
	Company take-overs	Power to capital	Protection constructions
	Leading organisational principle	Money, power, heroism	Craftsmanship, content
	Leadership & employees	Trust on hierarchical positions	Trust on self-reliance individual
	View on people	Human utility / Mechanical	Human dignity / Humanic
	Priority relationship dimensions	Juridical - Organisation - Relation	Organisation - Relation - Juridical
	Management model	Output driven: planning & control	Input driven: strategy & flexibility
	Decision-making	Negotiating (gaming)	Consensus (debating)

Figure 2 Differences between Anglo Saxon and Rhineland model characteristics at the Organisational Level

In conclusion, it is important to mention that characteristics from both ideal types of models do coexist in Dutch societal and organisational systems. However, the main message here is that Anglo Saxon principles are now more widely accepted and applied to several domains such as healthcare, infrastructure and financial systems. But does this Anglo Saxon wind also influence the formation of urban policies in the Netherlands?

2.2 National spatial planning policy's emphasis on the planning development concept

Urban planning policy formation represents a reaction to these changes in society. Rooy et al (2006) argue that current urban planning in the Netherlands is faced with changed spatial assignments and changed relationships. The National Spatial Planning Policy's emphasis on the planning development concept instead of the formerly used permitted planning concept, can indeed be seen as a reaction to these changed circumstances. Spatial planning policy under government leadership has disappeared to a large extent. The relative simplicity of former policies is replaced by pluriformity and changeableness, with more varied actors involved and less fixed relationships. The rise of planning development can be attributed to dissatisfaction with the visible shortcomings of the classical permitted planning (Hobma, 2005). Within the latest National Spatial Planning Act (Ministerie van VROM, 2006) the shift towards increased influence from the Market and Citizens is recognised and mentioned as the management philosophy shift from government towards governance or network governance; 'Collaboration between public actors, societal organisations, citizens and companies is needed to effectively handle problems and to seize opportunities'.

Thus, we can state that the policy shift from restrictive to planning development concepts has impacted the way public and private organisations cooperate in urban area development processes. Indeed, as a result of policy changes we see that Public Private Partnerships (PPP) gained ground as an organisational and legal instrument for organisations to cooperate on spatial developments. In the Netherlands, most profoundly we notice an evolution in the existence of PPP models towards more private sector involvement. This is due to several reasons related to the financial position, the availability of resources, and the status of competencies (amongst others) of the public and private sector. The evolution of Dutch PPP models is characterised by a gradual shift from a publicly managed development processes (building claim model) towards public-private managed development processes (joint venture model) into privately managed development processes (concession model).

As a consequence, the role of public and private actors in urban area development processes is changing as well. On the one hand market parties are operating more often and further into the classic government domain in urban planning, due to the increased number of private initiatives and investments – something referred to as ‘the forward integration of the market sector’ (De Zeeuw, 2007). The role of the private sector becomes more active. On the other hand, local governments more often retrench themselves from the development decision-making and urban design processes, focusing on formulating conditions for plans and authorising them through public law procedures. The role of lower governments becomes more reactive. Fig. 3 shows the main differences between Anglo Saxon and Rhineland model characteristics at the Urban Planning Level. Some Anglo Saxon characteristics are already applicable to Dutch urban planning policy and practice.

	<i>Aspects</i>	<i>Anglo Saxon model</i>	<i>Rhineland model</i>
<i>Urban planning level</i>	Role central government	Few regulations & investment	Regulations, visions & investment
	Role local government	Reactive: authorization	Active: authorization & investment
	Role private sector	Active: initiative & investment	Reactive: realisation
	Urban planning principle	Development-led	Restrictive & permitted
	Decision-making process	Negotiating (gaming)	Consensus (debating)
	Organisation	Project oriented	Collaboration model oriented
	Management	Project oriented	Process & Product oriented

Figure 3 Differences between Anglo Saxon and Rhineland model characteristics at the Urban Planning Level

Investments, and with that risk taking in urban area development, thus becomes more and more a private sector affair, which can only be secured by market parties when something is gained in return; the manageability of the process. As a consequence PPP models are also evolving into private sector management development processes. The increased use of the concession model in urban area development practice can be considered as the interorganisational translation of the new public private reality in urban planning.

Therefore, although urban planning in the Netherlands since the 1950’s can be regarded as State led, we have put forward several indicators for a more Market led urban planning practice. This situation however is not something the Netherlands is totally unfamiliar with. Historically urban planning in the Netherlands always has been a country in which private initiatives went along with public spatial guidelines. In this respect, the period from 1950’s until approximately the year 2000 can be regarded as an exception. The current economic crisis might cause a new PPP, but nevertheless will not change the need for a closer look at

the roles public and private parties have in a private sector managed development process, it will only influence the features of the roles themselves.

2.3 Coercive tendering procedures of European Law

There is another development that changes the way public and private actors cooperate in urban area development in the Netherlands; the application of European tendering procedures for PPPs in urban planning. This phenomenon is a reoccurring issue in the Dutch planning debate and in practice. In particular, the often used joint venture model (an institutionalised PPP with a single corporate body commonly jointly owned by a public and private organisation) is under pressure from Brussels for several reasons related to European Law (EU) principles.

The first reason is that the single corporate body in joint ventures in the Netherlands in the initiative phase of a development is often formed without clear competition among private parties. Private parties are selected based upon their coincidental interest or involvement in a development and thus obtain a favored position in relation to other private parties, by which the EU competition principle can be violated.

The second reason why the joint venture form of public private cooperation in relation to the selection of private parties is dubious is the unclear definition of the subject of the tender by the public organisation in the early stage of an urban area development. The European Commission (2004) has frequently diagnosed that the tasks appointed to public and private parties within the single corporate body are defined inaccurately and in some cases are totally absent in the contract. This leads to problems with EU transparency and equality principles and the detriment of the objectives of common interest by public parties.

The third reason is that in the realisation phase, the hybrid role of both public and private parties in urban developments within the single corporate body creates the so-called 'double hat problem' (Wolting, 2006). This problem occurs when public parties gain financial profits out of a development under private law, but at the same time are acting as the guardian of common interest. They have specific qualitative wishes which in their turn are disadvantageous for the exploitation of the single corporate entity. This threatens the EU public legitimacy principle and brings along unnecessary financial risks for the public parties.

The message from Brussels can be regarded as a message for the disconnection of the public and private domain. This means that public private cooperation should be based on clear description of public and private roles. Public private cooperation models in urban area development in the Netherlands thus face the challenge of separating tasks, responsibilities, risks, and revenues instead of the sharing them. In order to achieve the best possible solution to this problem, we first need to understand the characteristics, experiences, effects, and problems of current applications of the concession model used in Dutch urban area development projects, a model based upon the disconnection principle.

3 EMPIRICAL CASE STUDIES

This section provides insight into the current status of the concession model as a public private cooperation model. The main characteristics of this model are the disconnection of the public and private domain and a private sector managed development process. These characteristics are not representative of the way public and private actors have cooperated in urban planning in the Netherlands in recent years. However, seen in the light of the indicators mentioned in section 2, we can state that this way of cooperating will not be an exception in the future. Within academic and professional literature little empirical research is conducted on the current status of the concession model. Through qualitative data analysis we want to determine what the characteristics, effects, experiences and problems related to the use of the concession model at this moment are. This provides us with the necessary information to determine which aspects of this new public private cooperation model are in need of solutions. In successive order, the Literature Review Concession Model, the Case Study Methodology, and the Case Study Den Haag Ypenburg Deelplan 20 are presented.

3.1 Literature Review Concession Model

The concession model in urban area development has been subject to debates and professional and academic literature writing for some years now. In practice the concession model is more and more used as a new form of public private cooperation. However, until recently, no clear definition for this phenomenon was

provided in literature. The definition used by Gijzen (2009) is the most proper one and will also be used for this research;

'A concession in urban area development is a contract form with clear preconditioned agreements between public and private parties, in which a conscious choice from the public parties has been made to transfer risks, revenues, and responsibilities for development planning, preparation, realisation and in some cases exploitation for the whole urban area development towards private parties, within the previously defined public spatial requirement framework in which the objective is to create an effective and efficient role and task division and a clear separation of public and private responsibilities.'

The concession model is presented as a new public private cooperation instrument for urban area development. The promising aspects of the concession model put forward by the Commission Dekker (2008) is that 'public and private parties both are doing what they are good at: determining and legitimising frameworks respectively innovating and enterprising'. Van Rooy (2007) declares that current urban planning and urban area development practice is confronted with several problems. Some of the solutions can be found in a simplification of public and private sector's roles. Van Rooy argues that the hybrid character of the Rhineland and Anglo Saxon management model in Dutch decision-making processes creates (unnecessary) hybrid roles of public and private actors. The concession model in his opinion can be a solution for a clarification of roles which results in clear tasks and responsibilities appointed to public and private actors.

Klundert (2008) adds some other advantages of the concession model; the increase of competition, transparency, creativity and innovation, the increased manageability of political discontinuity and complex decision-making and procedures, and the decrease of project delays and budget overruns. De Zeeuw (in Heurkens et al, 2008) claims that the development of an area based upon the concession model has several advantages compared to other public private cooperation models employed; an optimal task and risk division between public and private actors, an effective use of private land ownership, and the compliance with European tendering procedures. De Graaf (2009) formulates other advantages or expectations of the concession model; a possible end to the extensive number of negotiations common in PPP joint ventures, and a possible end to the hybrid role of governments in PPPs.

In conclusion, we can state that all these promising aspects can be narrowed down to four advantages;

- More effective; objectives are achieved easily
- More efficient; reduces project delays and budget overruns
- More transparent; clarifies public and private roles
- More spatial quality; supports innovation and creativity

However, some disadvantages of the concession model exist as well. For governmental institutions for instance there is a lack of management and control possibilities after the concession agreement has been signed. Other disadvantages can be seen as conditions for the application of the concession model. For instance, the concession model is considered unsuitable for complex urban area projects. Within complex projects contract formation and risk management is too difficult. The conditions for a successful application of the concession model in urban area development projects are mentioned in Heurkens et al (2008);

- Manageable scale and functional program
- Minimal complexity and political risk profile
- Manageable duration and phasing of the project
- Maximum freedom to act as a private actor within the public actor's defined boundaries

Thus in literature many advantages and conditions for the application of the concession model can be found. However, these presumptions are not supported by solid empirical research results. In other words, the concession model is presented as a possible new public private cooperation model for several different problems. A cross case analysis of urban area developments based upon the concession model could reveal if the advantages are met and if the conditions are also applicable.

3.2 Case Study Methodology

The study uses qualitative research methods to collect and analyse empirical data. In order to obtain the empirical data on the concession model in urban area development we use case studies. Case study

methodology is often used in qualitative research paradigms, especially in applied academic fields like urban planning and management. But why use qualitative data methodology for this research in particular?

First of all, qualitative research is interested in the comprehension of the ‘meaning of action’ (Miles and Huberman, 1994). In this research we want to comprehend the way public and private actors cooperate in urban area developments based upon the concession model.

Secondly, qualitative data refers to ‘essences of people, objects or situations’ (Miles and Huberman, 1994). In this research it is clear that the objects of study are urban area developments, delivered on the basis of a concession model (certain situation), by public and private actors (certain people).

The main objective of the case studies is to describe the experiences of public and private parties with the application of the concession model and to determine the characteristics and effects of the development process. Furthermore, current problems occurring in practice and possible improvements are also discussed. The identification of currently unsolved issues in private sector managed development processes is based on the data collection activities in this research which include;

- Interviews; with the involved public and private actors in the applicable case
- Document reviews; analysis of contracts and cooperation agreements of the cases
- Observations; location visits for the applicable case

Through literature research 22 concession cases have been identified. Because the list was determined at a certain period in time (April 2009), several other new concession model project examples might be carried out in practice. At that time this was the most accurate list, and therefore the basis from which to formulate selection criteria.

The selection of case studies is based on criteria which relate to conditions formulated in section 3.1:

- Definition; case should meet the concession model definition of Gijzen (2009)
- Urban areas: both urban fringe and inner city developments
- Urban assignment: both regeneration and new developments
- Functional program: mixed use developments
- Project status: realisation phase in progress
- Actors: presence of both public and private actors
- Pragmatics: network contact and literature access
- Experiences: both positive and negative experiences (if applicable)

Furthermore, in qualitative research methods like case studies we have the issue of scope versus depth. As it is undoable to analyse all cases within a time span of six months, we need to decide what a reasonable number of cases is. As we are interested in cross case analysis we want to compare cases. Kantor and Savitch (2005) argue that ‘determining a sizeable number of cities (aka cases) can be tricky but, comparisons should contain substantial variation allowing the researcher an adequate range of subjects of comparison’. With this it is possible to distinguish what is incidental and what is inexorable. Thus, a sizeable number of cases is in fact a choice made by the researcher. For this research we decided that the analysis of 12 cases constituted a sizeable number of cases. It allows the researcher to find an optimum between an adequate range of subjects of comparison and thorough substantial variations, along with the possibility of in depth study of a single case. Eventually this provides a solid basis for the cross cases analysis and drawing conclusions.

With the selection criteria and the scope versus depth issue resolved, the following 12 urban area development projects based upon the concession model are selected for case study analysis in this research: Amsterdam Park de Meer, Den Haag Ypenburg Deelplan 20, Enschede De Laares, Maassluis Het Balkon, Middelburg Mortiere, Naaldwijk Woerdblok, Rotterdam Nieuw Crooswijk, Tilburg Koolhoven, Tilburg Stappegoor, Tilburg Wagnerplein, Utrecht De Woerd, Velsen Oud-IJmuiden.

3.3 Case Study Den Haag, Ypenburg Deelplan 20

Because the cross case analysis at the time of writing this paper has not taken place yet, we here present the findings from a single case study, Den Haag Ypenburg Deelplan 20 (Fig. 4).



Figure 4 Urban plan Den Haag Ypenburg Deelplan 20 (ING Real Estate)

Deelplan 20 is located in The Hague; it is an urban fringe project and therefore a new urban area development. The total area surface is five acres, with a functional program that contains the development of 470 dwellings, in a range of affordable and owner-occupied units. In this concession the public actor involved is the Municipality Den Haag, the private actor involved is ING Real Estate. The objective for the Municipality is to speed up the production of housing in Ypenburg. For the development of Deelplan 20 the Municipality carried out a public tender competition with predefined qualitative public conditions among six preselected developers in 2006. Furthermore, they formulated that the development should take place on the basis of the concession model. Out of the competition three parties were selected from which ING Real Estate was selected as the winner on the basis of their bid, planning, and enthusiasm.

The tasks performed by the public actor include; determining a global program, setting spatial conditions, making financial agreements, making land available, judging plans on spatial conditions, taking care of permit allotments and zoning plan procedures. The tasks performed by the private actor are; determining a detailed program, making of a image quality plan, designing a spatial plan and zoning plan, buying land for development, and realising real estate and public space. The tasks performed by actors on paper are completely in line with the (principle) tasks divided within the concession model described by Heurkens et al (2008). However, in practice we notice that the Municipality has a lot of influence in the design decision-making process. Designs made by ING Real Estate are not only judged on the agreed spatial conditions. Several wishes of the public actor not defined in advance are incorporated during the design process of ING Real Estate. The reason for this is a passage within the contract which explains that it is the right of the Municipality to refuse designs by the private actor for reasons not incorporated within the agreement. The intensive involvement of the public actor with the design process on the basis of this agreement can be seen as one of the major problems for the efficiency of the process.

The risks involved for the private actor can be linked with the feasibility and realisation phase of the development process. Each time the Municipality Den Haag makes adjustments to plan proposals from ING Real Estate the costs involved for the approval of plans totally lies with the private actor. The development risks also are taken by ING Real Estate relating to the feasibility of the plan. The municipality bares only the risks of the procedural cost in relation to their obligation to determine a zoning plan for Deelplan 20.

The revenues (or losses) of the land and real estate development are linked with ING Real Estate. The Municipality Den Haag has the benefit of a free land purchase of the public space, which they will manage in the period after project delivery by ING Real Estate.

The responsibilities of both actors are well described within the realisation agreement. Matters like the

sale and purchase of land are explained formally. Furthermore, agreements on process related issues like the on-time judgment of plans and control of the delivered product are described alongside procedural matters. For ING Real Estate the responsibilities are related to the on-time and 'within the agreed conditions' delivery of Deelplan 20. There is a penalty of a perscribed amount of money for each housing unit not delivered on time (before 2010). The Municipality's responsibility is to ensure public law procedures run smoothly.

The Municipality Den Haag made the conscious choice to choose the concession model as a means to realise the project. The most important motives to do so were the lack of labour capacity and transferring risks to the private actor. Other motives such as the lack of financial means, unsolicited proposals by private actors, and private sector land ownership, often involved with the choice for the concession model are not applicable to this case.

When we look at the interviewees' experiences with this cooperation based upon the concession model we notice the following. The Municipality Den Haag declares that the communication with ING Real Estate is not optimal because of the disconnective character of the concession model. The performing of tasks and the decisions made by each partner are not made in cooperation. For instance, during the process several unforeseen circumstances (an example of which is the currently unfavourable market condition) caused adjustments to designs and the housing program made by ING Real Estate. Because this type of decision is solely made by ING Real Estate and no explanation is provided alongside new plan proposals delivered to the Municipality, misconceptions arise. This is further affirmed by the project leader of ING Real Estate who explains that there is situation of distrust among both parties caused by the clear task division which is characteristic for the concession model. There is no cooperative sphere between the actors, but a sphere of 'us against them'. Furthermore they mention that there is no common ground for cooperation because the financial sense of urgency is not felt in the pockets of the public actor.

Both actors argue that the concession model applied to this case in this form is does not meet its intended effects. It is not an effective tool to realise objectives, it is not beneficial for the efficiency of the process, roles are not performed in a transparent manner (although they exist on paper), and spatial quality is not obtained easily because of the lack of cooperation on design which does not evolve into a commonly supported urban plan. Here, we must state that these single case study findings are not representative for the overall case study findings which have yet to be obtained through the cross case analysis of all 12 projects.

4 OVERALL CONCLUSION

With this paper we tried support the fact that in the Netherlands urban area development is more and more characterised by private sector managed development processes. This has been done on the basis of literature reviews on the socio-economic, organizational, and urban planning level. We have seen that Anglo Saxon or neoliberal thinking and acting has entered into several domains in the Netherlands. The fact that the latest urban planning policy in the Netherlands underlines the necessity of private investments and initiatives for the delivery of urban projects makes it particularly clear that the public sector no longer holds the mandate in urban decision-making processes in the Netherlands. Another sign of increased private sector influence is the birth of a new interorganisational relationship, namely the concession model. From the concession case study Den Haag Ypenburg Deelplan 20 we can conclude that the current use of the concession model has many drawbacks that are not yet resolved. This model potentially acts as the organisational translation of the new public private relationship in the Netherlands. The advantages ascribed to this model on the basis of the single case study however are not met. But, here we must state that a provisional analysis of five other concession cases rejects the fact that the advantages are not met.

However, the most interesting assignment for this research relates to the current discrepancy between the Rhineland planning culture in the Netherlands and the Anglo Saxon characteristics based concession model. The first one is characterised by a high level of public and private cooperation through the common performing of tasks, while the latter is based upon the disconnection of tasks and responsibilities. As it is not the researcher's intention to change Dutch planning culture, it is necessary to determine how the new reality of a changed public private relationship can be translated into a new cooperation model that still matches the Dutch 'polder' planning culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Hereby I would like to acknowledge my promoter Hans de Jonge and daily supervisor Fred Hobma for their academic contribution to this research thus far. Furthermore, I would like to give my special appreciation to all interviewees for their contribution to this research with empirical data.

REFERENCES

- Bakker, P., Evers, S., Hovens, N., Snelder, H. and Weggeman, M. "Het Rijnlands model als inspiratiebron", *Holland Management Review*, Vol.103, (2005), pp.72-81.
- Brenner, N. and Theodore, N., "Spaces of Neoliberalism, Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe", Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Malden, 2002.
- Brouwer, J.J. and Moerman, P., "Angelsaksen versus Rijnlanders: zoektocht naar overeenkomsten en verschillen in Europees en Amerikaans denken", Garant-Uitgevers nv, Antwerpen, 2005.
- Cammern, H. van der and Klerk, L. De., "Ruimtelijke ordening: Van grachtengordel tot Vinex-wijk", Het Spectrum, Utrecht, 2003.
- Commissie Fundamentele Verkenning Bouw, "Privaat wat kan, publiek wat moet: vertrouwen en verantwoordelijkheid in het bouwproces", Den Haag, 2008.
- European Commission 'Green Paper', article 60, (2004), p.20.
- Gijzen, M.H.M., "Zonder loslaten geen concessie", Master City Developer, Rotterdam, 2009.
- Giddens, A., "The Third Way, the Renewal of Social Democracy", Polity Press, Cambridge, 1998.
- Graaf, K. De, "Kansen voor gebiedsconcessies verkent: Komt het einde van de PPS in zicht?", *Building Business*, no.5, (2009), pp.44-49.
- Hall, P. A. and Soskice, D., "Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage", Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001.
- Godijk, R., "Herwaardering van de Rijnlandse principes, over governance, overleg en engagement", Koninklijke Van Gorcum bv, Assen, 2008.
- Heurkens, E., Hobma, F. and Zeeuw, F. De., "Gebiedsconcessie: een omstreden nieuwkomer", *Ruimtelijke Ontwikkeling Magazine*, no.10, (2008), pp.12-15.
- Hobma, F., "Risico van ruimtelijk ontwikkelingsbeleid", *Openbaar Bestuur*, Vol.12. (2005).
- Kantor, P. and Savitch, H.V., "How to Study Comparative Urban Development Politics: A Research Note", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29.1, (2005), pp. 135-151.
- Klundert, A.F. van der , "Ruimte tussen overheid en markt, Met concessies naar transparantie en effectiviteit", Habiforum, Rijswijk, 2008.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M., "Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook", Sage, Thousand Oaks, 1994.
- Ministerie van VROM, "Nota Ruimte: ruimte voor ontwikkeling", Den Haag, 2006.
- Rifkin, J., "The European Dream, How Europe's Vision of the Future Is Quietly Eclipsing the American Dream", Penguin Group, New York, 2004.
- Rooy, P. van, Luijn, A. Van and Dil, E., "Nederland Boven Water: praktijkboek gebiedsontwikkeling", Habiforum, Gouda, 2006.
- Wolting, B., "PPS en gebiedsontwikkeling", Sdu Uitgevers, Den Haag, 2006.
- Zeeuw, F. De. "De engel uit het marmer: reflecties op gebiedsontwikkeling", TU Delft, Delft, 2007.