

Grond voor Wonen

Arend Jonkman

Rick Meijer

Elin Nieland

Thomas Hartmann

Wageningen University & Research

Verbinden van Duurzame Steden



The project

How can sufficient supply of housing be guaranteed in the coming 15 years?

Research on:

- the role of municipal land companies ('grondbedrijven')
- the way in which they use the available instruments for housing

through:

- case Den Bosch
- case Zwolle
- survey among all Dutch municipalities



Den Bosch

Active use of land policy:

- develops strategic land positions that are already owned
- if possible, enters into public-private partnerships with market parties if they cannot control the land positions

Explanation:

- long history of active land policy, no adjustments even after the crisis
- ability to absorb the consequences of the economic crisis



Zwolle

Use of platform 'Concilium':

- collaboration between corporations, municipalities and market parties focusing on the realization of housing objectives

Explanation:

- Zwolle had to write off the land business in the crisis >> cautious attitude towards active land policy (organizational & political)



Den Bosch & Zwolle

Motive for strategy largely the same:

- wanting to have a grip on development tasks (which goes beyond the role of public law)

‘Regie’ makes it possible to:

- monitor housing development as a whole and adjust where
- necessary introduce desired goals within the relevant development



Observation

Municipalities hold on to quality requirements

Municipal land companies are confronted with many – and sometimes contradictory – objectives:

- they have to act fast, but the accumulation of ambitions leads to delays
- this accumulation also leads to financial claims >> choices have to be made



Recommendations (1)

Take a more comprehensive (íntegraal') perspective in land policy

When formulating the sectoral requirements, the significance for other policy sectors is not taken into account. But the land company has to deal with this.

It is recommended that choices are not made sectorally, but viewed in relation to other objectives in a project.



Recommendations (2)

Facilitate initiatives by others

Municipalities act less risk-bearing >> what contributions from other (private?) parties are possible?

To enhance 'active facilitation' answer questions such as:

- What choices do we as a municipality make at which locations?
- How can we remove obstacles for market parties?
- If it is not an active land policy, what instruments do we use and at what point in the process?



Recommendations (3)

Makes choices in ambitions

- Social & sustainable & inner-city & well planned etc... >> realistic with own land positions, but...
- In a more private setting: business case is leading, other goals are second >> how to influence this as a municipality in the long run (with the economy going down again)?
- Question to answer: if not all ambitions can be realized in one project, which priority order do we use if we have to make a forced choice?
- Clear prioritization can also speed up the negotiation and internal coordination process



Recommendations (4)

Avoid opportunism

- Accelerating housing production is not realistic at the moment, due to lack of political will and fast dynamics
- Risk: decisions about long-term development and long-term effects are prompted by short-term considerations and motivations
- Municipal land company: bring 'reality' into the feasibility of spatial plans and municipal ambitions. Emphasize the long-term effects of proposed variants. Be critical towards **political** opportunism and **financial** opportunism as well.



Meer informatie

Arend Jonkman | WUR | arend.jonkman@wur.nl

Thomas Hartmann | WUR | thomas.hartmann@wur.nl

