

Julian Jansen

City of Amsterdam, Department for Urban Planning and Sustainability
e-mail: j.e.jansen@amsterdam.nl

AMSTERDAM WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

An social-geographical overview

Key words: waterfront, Amsterdam

INTRODUCTION

Waterfront developments have received a lot of attention over the world in the past decades. A vast number of cities have transformed their former harbor and sea- and riverbank into mixed areas of housing and business districts and a lot of cities are still busy doing so. The city of Amsterdam, capital of the Netherlands, has always been related to waterfront activities. The port of Amsterdam is at the moment still the 4th transshipment port of Europe (Port of Amsterdam 2013). In history, port-related activities have moved to the western part of the city, while the central and eastern parts of the Amsterdam waterfront are transformed into mixed or housing areas. The north waterfront area is still in a process of transformation and already plans are being made for the most western and still active parts of the harbor. This article gives a comprehensive and global overview of Amsterdam planning history, waterfront developments and related urban design and planning processes. Also attention is given to the functions and demographic and socio-economic aspects of Amsterdam, and its waterfront developments. First, some general theoretical approaches on urban regeneration are being highlighted in relation to socio-economic aspects of waterfront developments.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Economic and demographic transitions

The regeneration of many cities and their waterfronts have widely been related to a first economic transition in the 19th and 20th century from early mercantile or power-based centers towards locations of heavy industries and manufacturing, and

a second transition in the 20th century to a globalized service- and knowledge-based economy. Although criticized, the theory of the creative economy (Florida 2002) gave another extension to the emphasis that many city governments put upon attracting human capital and a highly skilled labor force. They often try to use the transformation of abandoned former industrial sites to attract creative and knowledge based firms and/or people that can work in such palces.

From a demographic point of view, vast parts of Europe will face an aging population and a significant decline in potential labor force in the 21st century (ESPON, NIDI 2010). This is described as a result of a first and second demographic transition, where fertility rates began to fall in the late 20th century, while mortality rates already were falling since the 19th century (Kaa 1987). Many city governments see themselves as positioned in an international arena, where they battle for ‘talent’. A lot of cities market themselves and their waterfronts in such a competitive way. The proclaimed successful ones, like Amsterdam, often link their strategies to theories of attractive cities and places (Florida 2002; Jacobs 1961).

Entrepreneurial city, framing and the conceptual city

The shift from the concept of a city government, which provides services and provisions for the benefit of its inhabitants, towards a city government, which competes with other cities to attract businesses and economically viable people, is described as a shift from the ‘managerial’ city, towards the ‘entrepreneurial’ city (Harvey 1989). In the entrepreneurial urban practice, public-private partnerships are speculating on successful place-making in order to achieve a good economic climate. The benefits for the city’s society as a whole from this practice are not always evident. Inter-urban systems can become more instable and the copying of successful strategies, like waterfront developments, has its limits. Marketing strategies of cities often stress the importance of local identities, but in effect look quite similar over the world. The connection between local marketing and global investors can lead to a similar kind of ‘framing’ of city’s spaces with the same elements of experience-industries and marketing, only each time in a different decorum. In effect, the elements of diversity and interaction, which gives cities their unique qualities, can actually be lost in a rigorous entrepreneurial approach towards a ‘conceptual’ city (Zukin 1998; Harvey 1989). Positive outcomes from an entrepreneurial approach can be realized, when urban governance interacts with local interests and identities in a cooperative way (Harvey 1989).

Creative city, gentrification and the ‘just’ city

Waterfront developments are often connected to urban strategies to become ‘creative’ cities (Landry 2000; Florida 2002). However, the investments in culture and place-making that come with these strategies, are not always pointed in the right way. The creativity of a city is mostly dependent on its diversity, functional mix and interaction (Jacobs 1961). Lively streets, with a functional mix and possibilities of interaction between diverse people, and a strong local identification are

the most favorable elements for a creative and knowledge-based economy (Jacobs 1961; Zukin 1998; Gadet 2011). Favorable living and working environments for creative industries and people are based on the identified qualities of the original local physical and social environment, especially in waterfront developments (Smit 2011; Jansen 2008).

The dynamics of a diverse city with a strong local identity is often grounded in the potential to give space and opportunities for people with creative minds, who often do not have a high income and are not always part of the ‘established’ society (Florida 2002; Jansen 2008). Gentrification of neighborhoods can have an adverse effect on the dynamics of a city, when it leads to an overall unaffordability of housing prices and unavailability of space for the original population and functions in a neighborhood. In London, the Eastern Dockland’s development led to some central-business-district functions and dwellings for high income people, rather than to a creative mix with local identity and people. In Hamburg, a fierce debate is going on about the price-pushing gentrification effects of the HafenCity waterfront development on adjacent parts of the city (Sassen 2013). In the end phase of the initial success of city-upgrading through an entrepreneurial approach and gentrification, the city can become too inaccessible and ‘established’ for young creative people and the city can lose its dynamics. The next phase could then be a period of stagnation and decline. A socially inclusive and integrated approach in urban governance can be a way to prevent decline and to build upon the capacity of the diversity and the dynamics of the whole city. This concept of a ‘just’ city, can also be applied to waterfront developments, when they are focused to the needs of local residents (Fainstein 2005).

Urban revitalization and creative knowledge-based economy strategies are best conducted in a way, which is rooted in the local identity and path dependency of cities and their neighborhoods (Bontje, Musterd, Pelzer 2011). In this regard, the Amsterdam waterfront development has a long history.

AMSTERDAM PLANNING HISTORY

Middle Ages and the ‘Golden Age’

The name Amsterdam originates from a dam built in the river ‘Amstel’ in the late Middle Ages (‘Amstelredam’). The dam cut the river ‘Amstel’ from an estuary called the ‘IJ’, which was connected to the North Sea by the inland sea ‘Zuyderzee’. This connection to the open sea was used for trading and harbor activities, which flourished during the 17th century, Amsterdam’s ‘Golden Age’. During the 80-years war for independence against the Spanish rule, refugees from southern parts of the Netherlands and Flanders came to Amsterdam, where they could live in relative freedom. This immigration led to a concentration of trade, innovations and an early capitalist civil society. Population grew rapidly and in these times, the city constructed its famous ‘canal belt’, where rich mercantile citizens could build

their houses. The city had an open waterfront, dominated by numerous shipping activities and warehouses. In the east part of the city, hand-craft manufacturing and poorer neighborhoods were situated.

18th and 19th century

During the 18th century Amsterdam development stagnated, but due to overseas colonies the city remained relatively prosperous. In the 19th century, industrialization gave another expansion boost to the city and population grew explosively. The city expanded its canal belt by a surrounding concentric plan of Kalff in 1887, filled in by privately developed houses for laborers: the 19th century belt. In the late 19th century, the old city was cut off from the waterfront of the 'IJ'. The national government decided to construct the main railway at the waterfront and Amsterdam's Central Station was built there in 1885 by architect Cuypers. In the east part of the city, a new harbor area was built for machine ships and ship building, the 'Eastern Docklands'. In the meanwhile, new land was made in the shallow north bank of the 'IJ'-estuary, by which the estuary of the 'IJ' looked more like a river. On this north bank, first agriculture was planned, but was soon filled up by industries, heavy ship building and village-like laborer neighborhoods. In the 19th century, population grew from 180.000 to 510.000 and most of them were living in poor conditions (Wintershoven 2001).

20th century modernism

With the end of the 19th century the authorities of Amsterdam and the state government aimed to manage the urban conditions more directly as a response to the poor living conditions, which endangered public sanity. In 1934, Van Eesteren made the Amsterdam extension plan (AUP), with finger-formed extensions of the city, green wedges and a modernist separation of functions. Housing corporations became responsible for the building of vast numbers of public housing.

In the 1930's, the open access to the sea from the east side of the city was closed by waterworks and dikes in the 'Zuyderzee'. Instead, a big canal was dug directly from the west part of 'IJ' to the North Sea. New harbor activities were planned in the western part of the city and gradually, existing heavy harbor activities in the 'Eastern Docklands' and the North bank of the 'IJ' shifted there, disappeared or moved to other countries.

Suburbanization and urban renewal

In 1959 Amsterdam's population peaked at 872.000. A few years later, a period of urban decline started which lasted until 1985, when population has dropped to its 20th century low of 675.000. Suburbanization was enhanced by rising mobility of people and work, and the need for urban renewal of deteriorated houses, especially in the city center and in the 19th century belt. The national government was afraid of uncontrolled urban sprawl in the relatively small and scarce open landscape of the Netherlands. National spatial policy was directed at appointing

regional 'growth cities' and suburban new towns for the people that wanted to leave the city. This policy was called 'concentrated de-concentration'. It further stimulated the suburbanization and Amsterdam's central districts became dominated by empty and boarded houses. The remaining population of the city mainly consisted of poor and often unemployed elderly Amsterdam born people and low-skilled immigrants from Turkey, Morocco and Surinam. Young people squatted empty houses and with support of neighborhood people an urban revolt started to renew the city without big demolitions and plans. Instead, smaller scale renewal of neighborhoods and new public housing were demanded. In the 1980's, the national and city governments responded by funding the renewal of city neighborhoods and vast numbers of public houses were built.

The Eastern Docklands, central waterfront and north bank former industrial areas became deserted wastelands in the 80's, occupied by squatters, boat dwellers and city nomads. Some areas developed into spontaneous creative and cultural attractions. Some of them looked like 'no-go' areas.

Revitalization, gentrification, mixed housing development

The urban revolt in Amsterdam of the 70's and 80's lay the foundation of the later revival and gentrification of the city (Jansen, Slot 2011). Urban renewal was conducted in a less massive, modernistic and functionally divided way. The slogan was 'building for the neighborhood'. After the urban renewal in the 80's, almost 80% of Amsterdam housing stock consisted of public rental housing, owned by housing corporates and the municipality. The urban decline had stopped, though the population of the city was predominantly poor. In the 90's, housing corporates were semi-privatized and a mixed housing policy was put into practice. Newly built areas should consist of 70% market and 30% social housing. The goal was to provide more attractive houses and environments for people who wanted to make a housing career in the city.

The Eastern Docklands were successfully transformed into a predominantly housing district. This was followed by the making of new land at the eastern part of the city in 2004: the first phase of the 'IJburg' district. The central waterfront is transformed into a mixed use area with important cultural premises. The north bank of the 'IJ' is still in a transformation process, with cultural functions and creative industries playing an important role. Future plans are in progress for transformation towards the more western part of the waterfront and now still active harbor areas.

Gentrification in Amsterdam has not occurred in an extreme spatially separate form, like it happened in some cities with a fully market-dominated housing stock and urban development practice. At the moment 35% of Amsterdam houses has a home-ownership, 15% has a free market-rent and 60% has a regulated-rent by rules of the national state and the municipality. 45% of the housing stock is owned by the housing corporates for the purpose of public and social housing.

Through a consecutive policy of urban renewal, mixed housing, investments in offices, public space, public security and livability, Amsterdam became attractive and economically viable again and is recently growing at a pace of 10.000 inhabitants a year. Amsterdam always had a strong knowledge- and service-based economy, besides logistics and trade. Employment rose as the service sector became economically predominant. The diverse economy of Amsterdam and the functionally mixed attractive urban fabric turned out to be resilient after the crisis of the 70's and 80's (Gadet 2011). The democratic tradition of civil involvement played a decisive role. The economy and society of Amsterdam is yet again facing a challenge, while the impact of the credit crisis from 2008 is still going on.

Land-ownership, land-lease and ground bank practices

In recent Amsterdam urban development, the transformation of the waterfront into a mixed area of housing, cultural and business functions, played an important role. This process started in the 80's and is ongoing. In order to understand this process, some explanation of the Amsterdam development practice of the last decades is useful.

An important notice in Amsterdam's city development is the ownership of land. At the end of the 19th century, the Amsterdam City Council decided to buy the land and hire it in land-lease to private developers and housing corporations. The aim was to protect the scarce land from speculation and to keep control over the city's development. The City of Amsterdam is until now owner of most of the city's ground and operates as a ground bank. A quite unique situation, also compared to other Dutch cities.

The common procedure in urban development is until now, that in places where the City of Amsterdam owns or buys the ground, the City provides the necessary infrastructure and ready-to-build land and then hires the ground in land-lease contracts to private developers or semi-privatized housing corporates. The latter became therefore more and more like mixed developers, building social houses, market houses, offices and societal buildings. At the moment national policy is aimed at restricting the role of the housing corporates, also in relation to EU-guidelines. The City of Amsterdam has a traditionally strong steering role in the overall city's development. Instruments are financing, master plans, zoning plans, aesthetic commissions, project supervision and a lot of negotiations. Not only between private developers and the City, but also between the City's different departments, City Districts and project offices.

The City's land-lease contracts are based on a 'residual' ground price: the calculated market-selling price of the ground minus the construction costs of the development. The City of Amsterdam's ground bank compensates financial losses on urban development projects through profits on ground sales and land-lease contracts. Losses are being made through costs of social housing demands, infrastructure, soil cleaning and environmental protection. Profits are being made through office developments and historical land price developments. After the credit crisis of 2008

and the breakdown of office developments, a lot of pre-calculated profits had to be removed from the balance sheet of the City's ground bank. As a result, the city is now playing a less active role in urban development as it used to do.

Metropolization

The relation of Amsterdam and its surrounding region has changed since 2008. The national concept of the 'Randstad Delta-metropolis' was loosened in favor of separate development concepts for the daily urban systems of the northern and southern parts of the Randstad agglomeration. Since then, a voluntary and governance-based cooperation started, called the Amsterdam Metropolitan Area. The City of Amsterdam, together with the regional government of the Province of North-Holland and surrounding municipalities, drew a 'Development Perspective 2040' with shared spatial objectives (Metropoolregio Amsterdam 2008). Challenges on housing, environment, infrastructure and economy are regionally discussed, to look for common ambitions, also in relation to national investments. The newest municipal spatial development plan 'Amsterdam Structural Vision 2040' now has a regional outlook. Waterfront developments are an important part of this 'Structural Vision' and are stretched to a regional perspective. Discussions and negotiations are ongoing, to balance the interests of different regional stakeholders in - again - shared visions about the future of the active industrial western harbor areas. In these complex situations, Amsterdam has shifted from the practice of drawing old-fashioned plans, towards orchestrating processes of communication around documents with shared visions, in order to create commitment among regional stakeholders.

AMSTERDAM WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

Changing harbor locations

The open waterfront of the historical city center of Amsterdam was closed by the construction of the railway and Central Station in the 19th century. A discussion about a location of the central railway station at the south or north part of the historical city center was ended by the decision of the national government for a construction at the north part in the waterfront. Industrialized harbor activities shifted to the east part of the city, where man-made islands were built, and to the north bank of the 'IJ' estuary. In the 20th century, the harbor moved to the western edge of the city. The transformation of the waterfront of Amsterdam consists of three parts: the 'Central IJ-zone', the 'Eastern Docklands' and the North bank of the 'IJ'. As a result of the success of these waterfront developments, plans are being made to gradually transform the western part of the waterfront into mixed use zones. Existing harbor activities are gradually moving more to the west, outside of the urban structure.

Morphology of the waterfront

In the central zone of the south bank of the 'IJ' estuary, three islands were built in the 19th century: an eastern and a western dock island and a central island for the railway station. The main entrance of the central railway station faced the south, towards the historical city center. The backside of the station was positioned at the water of the 'IJ'. A long quay connects the islands and another long quay connects the central zone with the Eastern Docklands. The Eastern Docklands consists of long parallel islands with deep water in between. The islands are connected by dams and quays.

The south bank of the Amsterdam waterfront has an unfavourable position for sunlight, the shadow-side of the waterfront. The north bank is the sunny-side. Until recently, most parts of the north bank was inaccessible for public. Man-made land was initially dominated by large industries, but in the second half of the 20th century the industries gradually disappeared. However, some smaller industries are still left.

In the most eastern part of the city, new land is made in open water for the construction of the 'IJburg' residential district from 2004. In the most western part, harbour industries are still very active and plans are being made for a gradual transformation process in the 21st century.

Initial planning approach

The City of Amsterdam made the first decision for transformation of the waterfront areas in 1975 (Schram et al. 2012). The deserted Eastern Docklands had to be redeveloped into a new residential district. At that point, the Dutch and Amsterdam planning approach towards urban development and financing was predominantly state-led (Cammen, de Klerk 1993). When it came to practice in the 80's, the formerly strong position of the City Development department of Amsterdam was weakened. The modernist and utopian development of a new 'Bijlmer' district became widely regarded as a failure. Also the protest against the construction of a subway line and the civil movement for a smaller scale housing renewal, influenced politics. The City's department for Public Housing led urban development in the 80's. At the waterfront, the first parts of the transformation of the Eastern Docklands and the north bank of the 'IJ' were conducted in sober design, and solely consisted of public housing.

Eastern Docklands housing development

In the second half of the 80's and the 90's, the national planning approach became more orientated towards market developments, 'Public-Private Partnerships' (PPP) and economic competitiveness. Densification of housing and economy in urban cores became an objective of national spatial policy (Cammen, de Klerk 1993). The development of the new Eastern Docklands residential district changed in three ways at the end of the 80's. First, the proposed density went up to 100 dwellings per hectare. This became possible by using the existing spatial pattern

of islands, quays and open water. The ‘blue’ open water could replace the ‘green’ open spaces, which are normally planned in residential developments. Second, the share of public housing was reduced to 30%. The City’s planning practice was government-orientated and was now forced to cooperate with private parties. Third, the master-plan for the Eastern Docklands had to be revised and phased, because parts of the islands were not yet ready to be redeveloped.

The design of the redevelopment of the Eastern Docklands integrated existing landscape structure and buildings with modern architecture in high densities. Historical characteristics of Amsterdam were used in the new design, like small canals and composed building blocks. This was the result of a process of gradual transformation into distinct neighborhood islands, according to a master-plan, which was more like a document of ‘initial elements’, based on landscape architecture and the definition of a new ‘unity of place’ (Schaap 2008). Distinct architecture and urban design by prominent Dutch architects and overall high-quality public space, based on historical elements, gave the residential area a feeling of robustness. Investments of the City and the national government in infrastructure and land development led to one of the most successful residential areas in Amsterdam. Housing prices are among the highest in the city, but the island’s neighborhoods are still mixed as a result of 30% public housing. The Amsterdam Eastern Docklands have achieved international fame in the world of architecture and urban design. The long term revenues for the city’s overall economy probably will outweigh the initial cost by far.

In the Eastern Docklands about 8.000 new dwellings have been built. After the development of the Eastern Docklands, the residential area of IJburg was developed from 2004 on newly made land in the open water east from the city. IJburg offered the same kind of living environment like the Eastern Docklands, but was developed for city-orientated families. A lot of them came from the Eastern Docklands. It is more remote from the city center, the houses are bigger and there is more space for children. But it is still the suburb with highest density of the Netherlands. The IJburg district will be finalized with a second phase of land making in the next decade.

Central waterfront and business district locations

Finding ideas for the transformation of the central waterfront area, ‘Central IJ-zone’, started with a symposium in 1982, followed by an architecture competition in 1984 (Schram et al. 2012). The City looked at waterfront transformation examples in the USA, like Baltimore and Boston. Around the central railway station, the emphasis was more on mixed use developments in comparison to the Eastern Docklands. Also the land-ownership situation was more complex and big infrastructure investments and civil engineering works were needed. A long political and public discussion started, about the idea of a central business and leisure district at the central waterfront. The national government was willing to invest heavily in the transformation of the central waterfront, if the plans could be labeled as

a 'key' project to enforce the competitiveness of the national economy. A condition for being labeled as a 'key' project, was the installment of a Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) development authority. In the meantime, the main financial banks and offices preferred a location at the south part of Amsterdam, near the airport and the main highway infrastructure. The debate, about the location of national and City's investments in a central business location in the waterfront of the 'IJ'-axis or in the 'South'-axis, continued until the late 90's.

South bank planning

The development strategy of the Eastern Docklands influenced the planning approach of the Central 'IJ'-zone. The first attempt for a municipal master plan for the entire 'IJ'-axis was in 1987 (Schram et al. 2012). The plan tried to respect the existing structure of long quays and open water. It paid special attention to the connection between the old city and the waterfront and accessibility. A boulevard and a new urban rail system were part of the plan. The barrier of the railway dike between the old city and the new had to be bridged by tall visible buildings over the railway dike.

The attempts for the central waterfront development were obstructed by the lack of support from Amsterdam population for new big developments and local action groups, led by squatters, artists, boat dwellers and people, who wanted to preserve existing buildings and land or water use. Also internal debates between the municipal departments, harbor authorities and politicians slowed down the planning process. In 1991, a Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) was established, as a result of a political shift in the city and pressure from the national government. The PPP hired the most prominent Dutch architect Rem Koolhaas for a new master-plan. He presented an ambitious plan for huge business and leisure developments around the central railway station in 1992. But in 1993 the PPP collapsed. The plan was too big. The whole central waterfront area had to be developed in one phase with huge investments, while the southern part of Amsterdam was getting more attractive as a location for financial businesses. Also the cooperation between public and private was lacking trust and the private partners did not want to take the risk.

After the turmoil of the collapse of the PPP, the City of Amsterdam drew the central waterfront development away from the public attention and started assessing and looking back. This resulted in the concept of 'Anchors in the IJ' in 1995. From there, a new strategy was conceived, which was less ambitious and tried to take the lessons and the good things of the previous plans and processes. It turned out to be successful in the end (Combé 2008). Some new landmark buildings with cultural functions were developed on strategic locations to bring the public to the waterfront and also cultural festivals were organized. Personal involvement of cultural entrepreneurs was important in this regard (Schram et al. 2012). The different areas were to be developed in separate project. The overall supervision was concentrated within the municipality under one politician/alderman and an overall project supervisor. The plan for the public space and its investments played an important role.

It was made for the entire area, so it would give a sense of unity and a high-end quality. Existing historical structures of quays and open water and some historical buildings, like warehouses, were preserved and integrated in new developments. In this way, the area became more and more attractive. Private investors were attracted and willing to participate in the developments as a result of these quality investments of the City. Head offices of Philips, Ahold, and Vodafone Netherlands among others came to the 'Central IJ-zone'. The national government participated in the development through a big financial investment in the new north-south metro line. This line will be completed in 2017, connecting the north and central parts of the city with the southern financial business district of the 'South-axis'. The complex civil works on the island of the central railway station will be finished in the coming two years. The transformation of the central waterfront area will then be completed, after a planning process of 30 years.

North bank planning

The transformation of the north bank waterfront is in full progress and goes more gradually than the transformation of the south bank (Klomp, van Heusden 2011). A master-plan for the north bank was made in 2003 (BVR/DRO). After the financial crisis of 2008, the City of Amsterdam cannot financially invest and steer the planning process any more, like it did in the south bank developments. Also the area has a different geographical character with all kinds of land use and industrial activities, however, environmental protection laws prevent building of residential areas (Kovács 2011). Industrial plants are slowly moving out and spontaneous developments of transformation are stimulated by the city.

Cultural functions, festivals and creative industries play an important role in the transformation of the north bank. The rough character of the abandoned ship wharf NDSM is preserved in new developments. Former squatters and artists are established in formal cultural 'breeding places' and cultural festivals are being organized on a regularly basis. Creative businesses, like the MTV European headquarters, came to this area, because of this character. The City provided a new ferry line, to connect the new activities on the NDSM wharf with the city center. In the future, a part of the area will be built with high density apartment blocks. Until then, temporary student dwellings are placed on this site.

Shell's research unit on the central part of the north bank moved to a new smaller building in the area. Now this sunny side of the waterfront is accessible for the public. A mixed area is developed in a gradual way, with dwellings, a park, a new Film Museum and other cultural functions and businesses in the creative sector. In the adjacent area, where industrial sites are slowly getting mixed with private issues (Bosman 2011; Kovács 2011).

The connection of the waterfront developments with the existing residential areas in the north part of Amsterdam need special attention. These areas are originally built for harbor and industry workers. For a long time, it was not seen as a fully functional part of Amsterdam. The 'other' side of the 'IJ' was unknown by many

and looked upon as being a kind of backward part of the city. It has an interesting identity and in a way an attractive character though. As the city's population is growing fast again, more people are discovering the amenities of living in the north part of the city. After the completion of the new north-south metro line in 2017, the accessibility of the area will further be improved. The relations of the existing parts of the north part of Amsterdam with the waterfront developments are influencing the urban design. Residential blocks in the central part of the north bank are angled towards the existing residential areas.

Future plans

In the west part of the waterfront on the south bank, a new area for mixed functions of housing and small enterprises is now ready for development. More to the west, heavy industries are located. This hampers further transformation into mixed zones of development and housing. The City is discussing with the Port authority about the gradual relocations of heavy industries towards the more western parts of the harbor area. The same discussions are going on for the north-western areas, also in the neighboring municipality of Zaanstad. In the east, the new land making for the IJburg district is waiting for its second phase. Also plans are discussed with the national government for investments in a metro connection to the east polders, crossing the water towards the new town of Almere. The future strategies for waterfront developments are more and more regional. Stretching from the North Sea in the west, towards the new town of Almere in the east.

Functions, economic and demographic characteristics

The Eastern Docklands have been developed into a predominantly residential area with 8.000 dwellings. Still there are some 1.300 companies in the area, mostly small creative entrepreneurs (Combé 2008). The Central 'IJ'-zone became a mixed area with main business offices, knowledge institutes, a cruise ship terminal, hotels, housing, a concert hall, public library, shops, restaurants and the infrastructure of the central railway station. The north bank is a mixed area of industries, housing, cultural functions, creative entrepreneurs, restaurants and temporary student dwellings.

Since the mid 1990's the Amsterdam population grew with 80.000 people to a total number of 800.000 in 2013. 20.000 people are now living in the waterfront areas and another 20.000 in the new district of IJburg. The average income and education levels are higher than the city's total average. Housing prices are among the highest in the city. Still the new waterfront areas are relatively mixed, because of 30% social housing. The Eastern Docklands were originally built for single and two-person household, who wanted to make a housing career in the city. Because of the open space of the water, high density housing areas could be built at the waterfronts. The quality of the living environment is so high, that many people stayed in the area and in the city, even when they started a family. Previously they would have left the city for suburban live. After some time, more schools had to be build

for the new families in the Eastern Docklands. IJburg was developed ten years later for families, who wanted to stay in the city, but were looking for bigger houses. The design of the IJburg extension of the city also used the successful qualities of Amsterdam waterfront developments.

A feature of the success of the Eastern Docklands is the slowly aging population. The area was developed in a relatively short period of time and quickly became established. Nowadays, there is little dynamics in the housing and population in-migration. Population projections show that the area will become a predominantly senior neighborhood in the future, compared to other parts of Amsterdam.

RESULTS AND DILEMMAS OF AMSTERDAM WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

Planning and process

The Amsterdam waterfront development of the last decades was a process of trial and error. The whole planning process lasted around 30 years and is ongoing. For the most complex south bank development, a series of plans were made. The municipality had a steering role all the time, but the planning approach shifted from a big master-plan and PPP-constructions towards a more modest but strategic approach with targeted municipal investments in separate areas, bounded by an overall vision of seducement of private investments, ‘anchoring’ cultural functions and an overall high-quality public-space plan. Future transformation plans are more gradually implemented, in an ongoing communicative approach towards different stakeholders. The instrument of mapping functions and developments and communicating about the results, often turned out to be useful for these processes.

Functions and design

An integrated landscape design, based on the historical elements of the waterfront, robust architecture and public space, turned out to be attractive. Not only for residential functions, which are situated at the waterfront, but also smaller and bigger business and creative industry functions. The open space of the water made it possible to mix high density attractive housing with working areas. Still, the uniformity of the overall urban design is not always successful in making lively neighborhoods, connected to the diversity of the Amsterdam city center and 19th century city belt. The now ongoing transformation process of the north bank has a less massive approach in comparison with the south bank waterfront development. Cultural functions that originated from spontaneous occupations of deserted harbor sites, now turn out to be an attractive element for creative business firms. The possibilities for new spontaneous developments and connections with local identities are a constant issue of debate. Transformation of waterfront areas into established areas, mostly turn out not to be in favor of new spontaneous developments.

Social and economic characteristics

Amsterdam waterfront developments were successful in giving the city an economic boost and gave residents the possibility for housing careers in attractive living environments within their own city. Housing prices in the waterfront residential areas are among the highest in the city, but still a relatively mixed neighborhoods were possible through a substantial amount of public housing. Amsterdam political tradition is not in favor of socially segregated areas and the concept of the 'undivided' city still holds strong. Spatial income patterns do not correlate with geographical housing prices patterns, due to government policies. Amsterdam's population is growing at a rapid pace in the recent years and the pressure on the most favorable city center is very high. Since the financial crisis of 2008, government steering policies on the housing market are lessened. The preservation of the balance of the spatial income mix of Amsterdam is now coming under pressure with debates on the housing market and gentrification going on. The municipality is seeking for solutions in favor of more mid-priced private rental housing in the city. Also transformation of empty office buildings into residential and mixed functions and temporary housing solutions for young people are being sought.

CONCLUSION

Amsterdam waterfront developments turned out to be successful after a long period of looking for the right planning approach. The transformations and debates are still going on. Finding a way, which fits the path dependency of a city's development, is one of the key issues in successful urban revitalization. An integrated planning approach seems to be necessary. Waterfront developments can be successful, if they benefit the whole of the city. Integrated landscape design, public space and attractive environment for the population of the city and neighborhoods are important elements, which can bring private investments to the city and stimulate the city's economy. The city's government should take a steering role, but the planning process is best integrated, strategic and communicative, with space for adjustments and phasing. The values of the local physical environment and socio-economical identities can be most helpful in finding the right planning approach for a city's waterfront development.

AUTHOR AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Julian Jansen works for the City of Amsterdam at the Department for Urban Planning and Sustainability as a senior urban planner and a demographer. He holds a Master degree in Social Geography at the University of Amsterdam. For this article he used input from his colleagues Nicole Kirchberger, Flora Nycolaas, Koos van Zanen, Toine van Goethem, Ton Schaap, Maurits de Hoog and Hans van der Made.

Reference

- Bontje, M &. Musterd, S. & Pelzer, P. (2011) *Inventive City Regions*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Bosman, F. (2011) *Buiksloterham 2.0*. Plan Amsterdam 2011-2.
- BVR/DRO (2003) *Masterplan Noordelijke IJ-oever*. Amsterdam: BVR/DRO.
- Cammen, H. van der & Klerk, L.A. de (1993) *Ruimtelijke Ordening*. Utrecht: Het Spectrum
- Combé, C. (2008) *Amsterdam terug aan het IJ*. Plan Amsterdam 2008-3.
- ESPO & NIDI (2010) *DEMIFER*. Luxembourg: ESPON.
- Fainstein, S. (2005) *Cities and Diversity: Should We Want It? Can We Plan For It?* *Urban Affairs Review* 2005; 41; 3.
- Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class and how it's transforming leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gadet, J. (2011) *Terug naar de stad*. Amsterdam: Sun.
- Harvey, D. (1989) *From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism*. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, Vol. 71, No.1 pp.3-17.
- Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Jansen, J. & Slot, J. (2011) *The city as a magnet*. Plan Amsterdam 2011-5.
- Jansen, J. (2008) *Parkhof, de parel van Alkmaar*. University of Amsterdam.
- Kaa, D. J. van de (1987). *Europe's Second Demographic Transition*. *Population Bulletin*, 42 (1).
- Klomp, P. & Heusden, R. van (2011) *Nieuwe manieren van transformatie*. Plan Amsterdam 2011-2.
- Kovács, R. (2011) *Juridische oplossingen*. Plan Amsterdam 2011-2.
- Landry, C. (2000) *The Creative City: a toolkit for urban innovators*. Londen: Earthscan.
- Metropoolregio Amsterdam (2008) *Metropoolregio Amsterdam: Ontwikkelingsbeeld Noordvleugel 2040*. Amsterdam: Metropoolregio Amsterdam..
- Port of Amsterdam (2013) *Port of partnerships*. Factsheet Edition 3.
- Sassen, S. (2013) *Response to open letter by Saskia Sassen (New York July 26, 2013)* <<http://saskiasassen.com/to-aku.php>> (accessed 1 August 2013).
- Schaap, T. (2008) *Amsterdam*. Rotterdam: 010.
- Schram, A. & Ruyen, K. van & Made, H. van der & Hoog, M. de & Schaap, T. & Broesi, R. (2012) *Amsterdam terug aan het IJ*. Amsterdam: Sun.
- Smit, A. J. (2011) *The Influence of District Visual Quality on Location Decisions of Creative Entrepreneurs*. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 77: 2, 167 — 184
- Wintershoven, L. (2001) *Demografisch eeuwboek Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: DRO.
- Zukin, S. (1998) *Urban Lifestyles: Diversity and Standardisation in Spaces of Consumption*, *Urban Studies*, 35(5-6): 825-839.

Streszczenie

Rozwój Amsterdamu związany był od zawsze z jego nadwodnym położeniem i funkcją portową. Port w Amsterdamie jest współcześnie czwartym co do znaczenia portem przeladunkowym w Europie. Zarówno sam port jak i tereny nadwodne

czyli waterfront są postrzegane przez władze miasta jako ważne zasoby mające wpływ na rozwój. Amsterdam doświadczył w swej historii podobnych faz rozwoju jak wiele miast europejskich podobnej wielkości. Wśród doświadczeń tych są także sub-urbanizacja i rozlewania się miasta (urban sprawl). Problemy te były przedmiotem interwencji władz krajowych, które w ramach polityki przestrzennej wyznaczyły „miasta wzrostu” i tzw. „nowe miasta” w strefie sub-urbanizacji, w których miały zamieszkać osoby wyprowadzające się z Amsterdamu. Ta polityka przestrzenna nazywana była polityką „skoncentrowanej de-koncentracji”. W praktyce stymulowała ona bardziej niż ograniczała sub-urbanizację. Skutkiem postępującej sub-urbanizacji było m.in. wyludnianie się coraz mniej atrakcyjnego centrum Amsterdamu. W centrum pozostali mieszkańcy starsi i biedniejsi oraz imigranci o niskim statusie ekonomicznym. Inne części miasta też podległy degradacji. Przyczyną była deindustrializacja, która doprowadziła do upadku terenów Eastern Docklands, centralnej części waterfront oraz terenów przemysłowych. Tereny te zajęli nielegalni mieszkańcy opuszczonych i zdewastowanych budynków, mieszkańcy zacumowanych w porcie i na przyległych terenach łodzi oraz inni „miejscy nomadzi”.

Rozwój terenów waterfront w Amsterdamie związany był zawsze z rozwojem przemysłu i działalności portowej. Zmiany w organizacji terenów waterfront były związane z lokalizacją linii kolejowej i dworca centralnego w północnej części waterfront. Długie dyskusje na temat przebiegu linii kolejowej i lokalizacji dworca zakończył rząd krajowy podejmując decyzję o lokalizacji, która wyznaczyła kierunki zagospodarowania terenów na przyszłe lata. Działalności przemysłowe przesunięto na tereny wschodnie, na których znajdowały się sztuczne wyspy. W XX wieku działalności portowe skoncentrowały się w zachodniej części miasta. Zmiany na terenach waterfront następowały w wyniku transformacji Amsterdamu od miasta handlowego do metropolii, której oferta usług ma charakter globalny a gospodarka jest oparta na wiedzy.

Zmiany jakie zachodziły w Amsterdamie związane były też z postrzeganiem roli i oczekiwaniami wobec władz publicznych odpowiedzialnych za planowanie i rozwój. Zaspokajanie potrzeb mieszkańców przestało być główną i jedyną rolą władz; ich głównym zadaniem stało się tworzenie odpowiednich warunków do konkurowania miasta z innymi w skali regionalnej, krajowej i międzynarodowej. Celem konkurencji jest przyciąganie inwestycji i kreatywnych jednostek, które są współcześnie kluczowe dla stymulowania rozwoju. Amsterdam postrzega obszary waterfront jako atrakcyjny zasób, który może przyciągać zarówno firmy jak i mieszkańców. Odnowa opuszczonych terenów po-przemysłowych ma służyć przyciąganiu firm z sektora kreatywnego. Rozwój waterfront idzie w kierunku wykreowania obszaru wielofunkcyjnego, gdzie znajdują się funkcje mieszkaniowe, kulturalne i biznesowe.

W sposobach i tempie rozwoju waterfront dużą rolę odgrywały stosowane podejścia planistyczne. Od początku lat 90-tych stosowane podejście jest podejściem zorientowanym na współpracę z sektorem prywatnym i wciąganie w działania

projektowania odnowy waterfront różnych aktorów. Jednocześnie zwraca się szczególną uwagę na koszty planowanych przedsięwzięć, ich wykonalność i znaczenie dla rozwoju samego terenu jak i całego miasta w długiej perspektywie czasowej. Efektem takiego podejścia jest m.in. zwiększenie gęstości zabudowy mieszkaniowej, co jest także celem polityki prowadzonej na szczeblu krajowym. Planiści miejscy zostali zmuszeni do współpracy z sektorem prywatnym w ramach partnerstwa publiczno-prywatnego. Plan Eastern Docklands został zaktualizowany i podzielony na fazy realizacyjne, ponieważ nie wszystkie obszary gotowe były do zagospodarowania. W dalszym ciągu występują różne bariery na drodze do zagospodarowania całego waterfront. Jedną z nich jest lokalizacja w części zachodniej zakładów przemysłu ciężkiego. Władze miasta i władze portu szukają możliwości stopniowego przenoszenia tych zakładów w bardziej zachodnie części obszaru. Z rządem centralnym dyskutowana jest zaś kwestia inwestycji w połączenie metrem terenów waterfront i wschodnich polderów, gdzie zlokalizowane jest nowe miasto Almere. Tak więc strategia dla rozwoju waterfront nabiera coraz bardziej charakteru strategii regionalnej.

Doświadczenia z zagospodarowaniem waterfront Amsterdamu nasuwają kilka spostrzeżeń. Po pierwsze trzeba stwierdzić, że proces planistyczny, który rozpoczął się 30 lat temu, realizowany był metodą prób i błędów. Dla południowej części waterfront przygotowano zestaw planów zagospodarowania przestrzennego. Władze miasta miały w tamtym czasie wiodącą rolę jeśli chodzi o program do realizacji na danym obszarze, obszar objęty planem i zawartość planu. Problemy z realizacją planowanych zamierzeń sprawiły, że planiści przeszli z dużego master-plan (planu struktury) i działań w formule partnerstwa publiczno-prywatnego (PPP) do skali planów mniejszych i podejścia skromniejszego ale strategicznie ważnego. Podejście to dotyczyło wybranych, strategicznych inwestycji w różnych lokalizacjach waterfront, ale mieszczących się w jednej wizji rozwoju wypracowanej dla całego obszaru. W podejściu tym przewidziano rolę dla prywatnych inwestorów, trwałość i mocne „zakotwiczenie” funkcji kulturalnych oraz kreowanie atrakcyjnych przestrzeni publicznych. Zgodnie z nowym podejściem plany na przyszłość mają być realizowane etapami a ich przygotowanie czy modyfikacja realizowane z interesariuszami.

Doświadczeni Amsterdamu dowiodły również przydatności i zintegrowanego podejścia do planowania, w tym planowania krajobrazu miejskiego. Dotyczy to nie tylko obszarów z funkcjami mieszkaniowymi ulokowanymi bezpośrednio nad wodą, ale także obszarów gdzie zlokalizowane są funkcje biznesowe, w tym firmy kreatywne. Otwarte przestrzenie nad wodą powodują, że stosunkowo proste jest wymieszanie funkcji mieszkaniowych z produkcyjno-usługowymi. Prowadzone obecnie prace mają zdecydowanie mniejszą skalę niż kilkanaście lat temu. Funkcje kulturalne, które zostały zlokalizowane w czasie spontanicznego i nielegalnego zagospodarowywania opuszczonych terenów portowych stają się teraz atrakcyjnym elementem krajobrazu i częścią środowiska kreatywnego.

Rozwój waterfront w Amsterdamie uznać można za sukces. Nawet odnowiony częściowo przyczynił się do rozwoju ekonomicznego miasta i zwiększył ofertę mieszkaniową. Ceny mieszkań na terenach waterfront są na poziomie najwyższych cen w mieście. Jednak obszary pozostają w dalszym ciągu zróżnicowane społecznie. Jest to efekt regulacji planistycznych, narzucających konieczność budowy mieszkań komunalnych na terenach rewitalizowanych. Koncepcja “niepodzielonego miasta” jest w Holandii bardzo silna a tradycja polityczna zabrania tworzenia warunków sprzyjających segregacji. Sukces waterfront nie przyszedł łatwo i nastąpił po latach szukania odpowiedniego podejścia planistycznego. Transformacja i debaty na jej temat trwają nadal. Znalezienie ścieżek rozwoju pasujących do warunków i potrzeb jest kluczem dla skutecznej rewitalizacji.

Summary

Development of the city of Amsterdam, capital of the Netherlands, has always been related to waterfront activities. The port of Amsterdam is still the 4th transshipment port of Europe and the city authorities see both the port and the waterfront as important components of economic base for the city development. Amsterdam has experienced similar development trends as many other European cities of this size. Among them were suburbanization and urban sprawl. These problems were addressed by national spatial policy, which led to identifying regional ‘growth cities’ and suburban new towns that were supposed to accommodate those who wanted to move to suburbs. This policy called ‘concentrated de-concentration’ further stimulated the suburbanization and Amsterdam’s central districts became dominated by empty houses. The remaining population of the city mainly consisted of poor and often unemployed elderly Amsterdam born people and low-skilled immigrants. Other parts of the city also experienced degradation. Because of the deindustrialization of the city’s economy the Eastern Docklands, central waterfront and north bank former industrial areas became deserted wastelands in the 80’s, occupied by squatters, boat dwellers and city nomads. Some of them looked like ‘no-go’ areas. Development paths of the Amsterdam waterfront have been shaped by industrial development of the city and changing role of the port. The open waterfront of the historical city center of Amsterdam was closed by the construction of the railway and Central Station in the 19th century. A discussion about a location of the central railway station at the south or north part of the historical city center was ended by the decision of the national government for a construction at the north part in the waterfront. Industrialized harbor activities shifted to the east part of the city, where man-made islands were built. In the 20th century, the harbor moved to the western edge of the city. The regeneration of the waterfront has been related to evolution of the city’s economy and transition from mercantile center to metropolitan city – center of services offered at the global scale and characterized by well-developed knowledge-based economy.

The transition experienced by the Amsterdam is closely connected with the shift from the concept of a city government, which provides services and provisions for the benefit of its inhabitants, towards a city government, which competes with other cities to attract businesses and well qualified and creative people. Amsterdam sees its waterfront as a component that might help to build its attractiveness. City authorities use the transformation of abandoned former industrial sites to attract creative and knowledge based firms. In recent Amsterdam urban development the waterfront is being developed as a mixed area of housing, cultural and business functions.

The planning approach is also an important factor that has impact on transformation of the waterfront. Since the 90's the national planning approach became more market oriented. Densification of housing and economy in urban cores became an objective of national spatial policy. The city's planners were forced to cooperate with private parties under Private Public Partnership framework. The master-plan for the Eastern Docklands had to be revised and phased, because parts of the area were not yet ready to be redeveloped. There are some other obstacles in transformation of the waterfront. In the west part of the waterfront heavy industries are located. The City Authorities are discussing with the Port authority about the gradual relocations of heavy industries towards the more western parts of the harbor area. Also plans are discussed with the national government for investments in a metro connection to the east polders, crossing the water towards the new town of Almere. Thus the future strategies for waterfront developments are becoming more and more regional.

Development of the Amsterdam waterfront has brought some important lessons. The process of development (which is still going on) has been a process of trial and error. The planning process started 30 years ago. For the most complex south bank development, a series of plans were made. The municipality had a steering role all the time, but the planning approach shifted from a big master-plan and PPP-constructions towards a more modest but strategic approach with targeted municipal investments in separate areas, bounded by an overall vision of seducement of private investments, 'anchoring' cultural functions and an overall high-quality public-space plan. Future transformation plans are more gradually implemented, in an ongoing communicative approach towards different stakeholders.

Experience from Amsterdam also proved efficiency and attractiveness of an integrated landscape design. Not only for residential functions, which are situated at the waterfront, but also smaller and bigger business and creative industry functions. The open space of the water made it possible to mix high density attractive housing with working areas. The now ongoing transformation process of the north bank has a less massive approach in comparison with the south bank waterfront development. Cultural functions that originated from spontaneous occupations of deserted harbor sites, now turn out to be an attractive element for creative business firms.

Amsterdam waterfront developments were successful in giving the city an economic boost and gave residents the possibility for housing careers in attractive living environments within their own city. Housing prices in the waterfront residential areas are among the highest in the city, but still a relatively mixed neighborhoods were possible through a substantial amount of public housing. Amsterdam political tradition is not in favor of socially segregated areas and the concept of the ‘undivided’ city still holds strong. Amsterdam waterfront developments turned out to be successful after a long period of looking for the right planning approach. The transformations and debates are still going on. Finding a way, which fits the path dependency of a city’s development, is one of the key issues in successful urban revitalization.