BARRIERS AND DRIVERS IN COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PROJECTS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS WITH CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE NETHERLANDS

M.Y. (Marlijn) Baarveld MSc[1], dr. M. Smit[2], Prof. dr. G.P.M.R. Dewulf[3]

Abstract

Due to technological, economic and spatial developments, various inner-city industrial areas with cultural-historical valuable elements, have lost their former use and their original economic value. Governments, private parties, citizens and interest groups in urban redevelopments are often convinced of the desirability of preserving this cultural heritage. However, transformation processes are complex and especially financial agreements seem hard to attain when plans have to be made effective. Recent planning approaches argue that urban developments are shaped through the interaction of many different stakeholders. As interests conflict, negotiation is needed to reach decisions regarding long term vision, short term actions and organizational and financial settlements. At some moments in the process the actors will cooperate, while at other moments they will compete.. This paper gives insight in the interaction processes and the encountered difficulties in urban redevelopments with cultural heritage. In particular, an attempt is made to identify barriers and drivers of complex collaborative planning projects. Therefore, we conducted an explorative case study of ten urban redevelopment projects with cultural heritage in the Netherlands. Based on an analytical framework, we identified important differences and similarities between the cases, and analyzed whether and how project and interaction characteristics have implications for project performance. The results can be used for further research or for process improvements

Keywords: planning approaches, interaction, urban redevelopment, cultural heritage, barriers and drivers

1. Introduction

Present day urban development is characterized by complex and interrelated issues. To find solutions for these issues an integrated approach is needed (De Kort, 2009). Recent planning approaches acknowledge a growing interdependence and the need for adequate interaction between various

[1] University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands - m.y.baarveld@utwente.nl
[2] University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands - m.smit@utwente.nl
[3] University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands - g.p.m.r.dewulf@utwente.nl

stakeholders. However, different normative planning approaches have different ideas on how these interaction processes should evolve. A main issue is how to deal with the various conflicting interests and achieve outcomes that are favorable for individual stakeholders and at the same time take into account the common interest. Our paper explores how various urban redevelopment projects with cultural heritage buildings deal with this tension. We aim to increase insight in the barriers and drivers in this transformation process, focusing on the implications of stakeholder interaction on project performance.

1.1 Collaborative planning: learning or deal making?

In planning, mutual dependent actors make decisions about the abilities to act and commit to future actions that will satisfy their interests (Forester, 2006). However, decision-making is difficult in a network setting as actors have various (possibly conflicting) interests and resources are fragmented. This implies that negotiation is needed to reach decisions regarding the content of the plan and settlements regarding costs and benefits (Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004). From this point of view, planning is a matter of deal-making, contracting and negotiation between actors whose resources are needed for successful implementation. Negotiation also requires a certain degree of understanding about underlying values and about how to turn these into action (Albrechts, 2001). Thus, planning is a matter of deal-making on the one hand and a process of more democratic mutual learning on the other hand. Both are intertwined and actors learn from each other and make deals at the same time (Leeuwis, 2000).

Individual actors in planning processes can employ different behavior, focusing more on the deal-making aspect or on learning elements. This difference in behavior is related to the distinction between distributive and integrative negotiation processes (Leeuwis, 2000). In a distributive negotiation process actors hold on to their own perceptions and positions and basically use negotiations to divide the value that will be created by a planned physical-spatial intervention. In contrast, in integrative negotiation actors try to expand the amount of value to be divided (Thompson and Hastie, 1990). Actors are cooperative and try to develop new and often wider problem definitions. They change perceptions on the basis of a creative collective learning process, resulting in the identification of so called ‘win-win solutions’ (Sebenius, 2009).

Lax and Sebenius (1986) reconceptualised the processes of integrative and distributive negotiation as value-creating and value-claiming. They argued that creating and claiming value strategies were inseparable. At a certain point in the process, the created value has to be divided and a claim on the increased value by one party implies there will be less for the others. The actors must choose between two opposing motives: cooperate to create value or compete to claim value. For cooperative action the actor will have to share information to find a possible mutual gain and have a good relationship with other actors. However,

showing his interests and giving information makes him more vulnerable of exploitation. On the other hand, competitive moves to claim value individually often drive out cooperative moves to jointly create value (Sebenius, 2009). This puts the actor in a dilemma of strategy, the so called negotiators dilemma (Lax and Sebenius, 1986). This dilemma is related to the well-known Prisoner's Dilemma. Dealing with the tension between creating and claiming value strategies of stakeholders is a main issue in urban development. In the subsequent lines we will argue that this especially accounts for urban redevelopment projects with cultural heritage.

1.2 Creating and claiming value in cultural heritage projects

Urban redevelopment projects are generally characterized by high contextual and organizational complexity. The presence of built cultural heritage makes redevelopment for a number of reasons even more complex. First, regulations for officially registered monuments limit the possibilities for adapting heritage buildings. Second, investments needed to make re-use of built heritage possible are often high due to the costs of restoration and sanitation (Saris et al., 2008); (Bade and Smid, 2008). Third, finding appropriate new uses for built heritage which do right to the unique character and are also financially feasible appears to be difficult. Fourth, the tangible and intangible returns of investments are uncertain as the value of the heritage can rarely be expressed in financial terms alone (Linssen et al., 2009). Despite these difficulties, government, market parties, citizens and interest groups are often convinced of the desirability to preserve cultural heritage in urban redevelopments. Various studies (Ruijgrok et al., 2004); ABF Research, 2008) show that the presence of cultural heritage adds value to an area. It gives an area a specific identity, historical conscience and generally improves the satisfaction of people living in the neighborhood (Linssen et al., 2009); (Aarsen et al., 2010). Besides, cultural heritage offers opportunities for social-economic development, such as the development of tourism, leisure and cultural activities (Bizzarro and Nijkamp, 1997). Although the added value of cultural heritage for urban redevelopment is nowadays generally acknowledged, in practice settlements regarding costs and benefits seem hard to attain. A number of parties profit from investments to preserve and/or transform cultural heritage without contributing in the costs. If parties do not contribute at all, this is known as the problem of free-riders for collective goods. Parties could also choose a more competitive strategy and only claim value to fulfill their own interest, instead of employing cooperative behavior to create or add value by preserving cultural heritage. This misbalance in costs and benefits causes heritage projects to fail or leave opportunities unused. The characteristics imply that especially in heritage projects stakeholders need to deal with the tension between creating and claiming value.

In literature little is known on how value creation and value claiming processes unfold in practice. Interaction often seems like a black box to planners, while planning requires a fine grained analysis of what actually takes place (Albrechts,

2006). To learn more about how these planning processes work and how 'performance' is achieved, more research should be done on perceptions, performances, strategies and more (Forester, 2011). To obtain insight in the interaction between stakeholders in cultural heritage projects and how this effects agreements on costs and benefits and re-use of built cultural heritage, we conducted an explorative case study of ten urban redevelopment projects in the Netherlands.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces the analytical framework used in the case study. Section 3 describes the research method. Section 4 shows the empirical data. Section 5 presents the main results and shows the main barriers and drivers in urban redevelopment projects in which cultural heritage plays an important role.

2. Analytical framework

Based on insights from literature on negotiation and planning we developed an analytical framework to explore stakeholder interaction and study whether and how it effects the agreement on costs and benefits and re-use of the heritage. Use of our framework should be seen as a means to focus on specific subjects and to understand and interpret certain actions. In other words, it is a guidance for prioritizing in data-collection and data-analysis (Hutjes and van Buuren, 1992);(Yin, 2003). However, it is not meant to condition the research in any way (Eisenhardt, 1989).

Starting point is that urban redevelopments are shaped through the interaction among actors, who are aiming to get the best deal, a deal which creates added value by preserving the cultural heritage and contributes to the aims of the individual actors. Beside the characteristics of stakeholder interaction, the project characteristics are also taken into account as the setup of the interaction is partly shaped by the issues and actors involved (Lax and Sebenius, 2002).

2.1 Project characteristics

Stakeholder interaction takes place in the specific institutional and situational setting. This setting influences the interaction processes and outcomes as it complicates or simplifies possibilities for development and preservation of the cultural heritage. Therefore we described a number of relevant project characteristics. A first characteristic is *project complexity*. We used the scale of built heritage, the maintenance state of the heritage buildings and ground pollution as indicators for complexity, because these have implications for the costs and uncertainty of the redevelopment. Other characteristics we studied are who takes *initiative* and the *participation of crucial actors in planning*. To increase the likelihood of redevelopment plans to be realized, close interaction is needed with actors whose cooperation is necessary for implementation (Albrechts, 2004). The actor's resources determine whether its cooperation is

needed. There are four crucial resources: authority, finances, land ownership and specific knowledge and skills (De Kort, 2009, De Bruijn and Heuvelof, 2008, Walter and Scholz, 2007). These resources give actors power to influence the decision-making and the outcome of the process. As a main bottleneck in heritage redevelopment is assumed to be the lack of balance between the costs and benefits of stakeholders, we further focused on the *contribution in costs of those who benefit* of the re-use of the heritage. Finally, we determined the *distribution of risks* among actors as the benefits of heritage preservation are uncertain and often hard to express in financial terms.

2.2 Interaction characteristics

During interactions we can distinguish two types of processes: formal and informal processes (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994). To assure commitment of the stakeholders whose resources are needed, relationships are often formalized in cooperation agreement. Therefore, we analyzed the *type of cooperation*. The likelihood an actor will use his power, depends on his interests and objectives on specific topics (Olander and Landin, 2005). Conflicting interests on main topics may hamper the process. Therefore, *conflict topics* were analyzed. Based on their own perceptions, interests and objectives, actors will use different strategies to deal with these topics and influence planning processes (Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004). How processes unfold, depends on the interaction strategies of actors. In literature it is argued that integrative interaction more likely results in outcomes that are beneficial for both common interest as for individual interests (Innes and Booher, 2010, Fisher et al., 1991, Leeuwis, 2000, Lax and Sebenius, 2002). In our analysis we indicated the *type of interaction*. The interaction among actors can be typified as integrative negotiation or as distributive negotiation, depending on actors' behavior (Leeuwis, 2000). The contradicting behavior is summarized in table 1 (based on (Lax and Sebenius, 2002)).

Table 1. Indicators of integrative and distributive interaction

	Integrative Interaction	Distributive Interaction
Joined forces	Working together, have shared aim	Each working for themselves, focus on self interest
Perception	Willing to change perception, flexible, learning	Holding on to own perceptions, non-flexible, not willing to learn or change
Communi-cation	Open communication, share information	Communication is hard, not sharing information
Relation	Trust each other	Distrust each other

2.3 Performance

In general, urban redevelopment projects aim to improve the spatial quality of an area. As we study barriers and drivers in transformation processes, an indicator of performance is the re-use of heritage buildings. However, determining whether the re-use actually has been realized will not always be possible as urban redevelopment projects have a long time frame and some of the urban redevelopments will not be finished within the next 10 years. Therefore, the first criterion we used is *commitment of key stakeholders to the preservation of the cultural heritage buildings*. As preservation and re-use of built cultural heritage requires high investments agreement between key stakeholders on the costs and benefits is needed. The second criterion is *agreement on costs and benefits of heritage preservation between key stakeholders*. Furthermore, literature on network managements explains that evaluation of multi-actor processes should be evaluated in actor-specific or process-oriented terms. Performance measurement should pay attention both to the process and to its outcomes. An often used indicator is actor satisfaction (De Bruijn and Heuvelof, 2008, De Kort, 2009, De Graaf, 2005). Actor satisfaction is important to ensure their commitment to further actions. The problem-owner (land-owner of the area and cultural heritage) is the actor who will be most affected if agreement is not attained. In that case, this key-actor will have to invest a large amount without (total) counterbalance of his expenses or accept the decline of the cultural heritage buildings and the area. Therefore, a third criterion we use is the *satisfaction of the problem-owner on the division of costs and benefits*.

In conclusion, our analytical framework we use is shown in table 2.

Table 2. Analytical framework

Characteristic/criterion	Categories
PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS	
(Financial) complexity	high/medium/low
Initiative	1. mainly public/2. Mainly private/3. Public-private
Participation of key-stakeholders	high/medium/low
Contribution of parties who benefit from heritage preservation	high/medium/low
Financiers and risks bearers	1. mainly public/2. Mainly private/3. Joint public-private
Type of cooperation	1. traditional/2. Concession/3. Joint venture
Conflict topics	1. mainly financial/2. Other/3. No conflicts
Type of interaction	integrative / Distributive

PERFORMANCE	
Commitment to preservation of CH	High/medium/low
Agreement on costs and benefits of heritage preservation	yes/no
Satisfaction problem-owner on division of costs and benefits	high/medium/low

3. Research method

To increase insight in the barriers and drivers in cultural heritage projects, we used table 2 in a comparative evaluation of various empirical cases. To specifically study the relationship between interaction and our performance indicators we chose to vary the context in which planning takes place, as little as possible. We studied large scale urban redevelopment projects with cultural heritage in the Netherlands. The general procedure for the case study was straightforward: selection of potentially interesting cases; assessment of available information relevant for a systematic case study approach; execution of a semi structured interview with the land-/real estate owner(s); collection of relevant data from reports, and; systematic data-analysis.

Case selection

We selected ten projects. Eisenhardt (1989) indicates that linkages between qualitative variables or indicators in a framework model can be achieved using a cross-case analysis of 5-10 cases. Case selection was based on the following criteria: 1) redevelopment of an entire area instead of a single object; 2) development of multiple new functions; 3) one or more buildings in the area are considered to be of cultural-historical value and transformation of these buildings is considered desirable; 4) urban located area, and 5) the project is at the end of the planning stage or in the realization stage.

Data collection

For each case, we conducted a semi structured face-to-face interview. The interviewees were the project managers of the owners of the built heritage. Also, a document analysis was executed. Among others, master plans, official decision documents of the city council, studies of the cultural-historical elements and progress reports were studied. For each case the systematic information was put in a data matrix. This information was qualitative in nature.

Data analysis

The comparative purpose of our study calls for a description of the various attributes of the individual cases. A comparison of the interaction in urban heritage projects leads to the need for systematic insight in the situational and organizational characteristics. We used cross-case analysis to deepen our understanding and explanation of conditions by finding similarities and

differences across cases (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Such analysis can show the specific conditions under which a finding will occur and it also helps to form more general categories of how conditions may be related (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The qualitative information about the cases will be used in the discussion and conclusions to derive barriers and drivers.

4. Project Data

4.1 Project description

Strijp S is part of a former industrial area (27 ha) in the city of Eindhoven (215.000 residents). The area consists of mainly large industrial complexes, formerly used for the manufacturing of radios and televisions. Seven of the buildings (build around 1928) are listed cultural heritage. In 2001 Philips sold the area to a private developer. From that moment plans are made to transform the area to a "new dynamic and creative urban quarter to live, work and play'. Several heritage buildings are already (temporarily) in use for cultural activities and (small) working offices. In two other buildings they recently started the transformation to lofts and working space.

Enka Ede is located between the city center of Ede (110.000 residents) and nature reserve "de Veluwe". The area of 42 ha was formerly used by the artificial silk manufacturer. In 2002 the manufacturer closed down, leaving the heritage buildings disused and the ground heavily polluted. Several buildings (build around 1922) are listed, others are protected by a covenant between the developer and the municipality. Ambition is to realize a residential area of 1400 houses, including public and commercial uses.

De Hallen is located in the western part of the city of Amsterdam (790.000 residents) and consists of the transformation of the former tram depot and maintenance place, and the realization of 400 houses. In total, the area is 16 ha. The tram depot is characterized by large halls of around 100 meter long and sawtooth roofs. In 1996 the area was abandoned and several plans were made by various actors. In 2011 the municipality selected a developer, who has the ambition to re-use the heritage buildings as lively meetings place in which handicraft plays an important role.

Scheldekwartier (KSG) is a former shipbuilding yard of 32 ha between the city center of Vlissingen (35.000 residents) and the harbor. Since 2000 the activities were replaced to the eastern part of Vlissingen and the yard became disused. Several large buildings are demolished, but four buildings, the docks and a crane are appointed as heritage. Plan-making started in 2003, when the municipality bought the area. The ambition is to create a new city quarter with a unique waterfront, mondain character and mixed use, including cultural activities in the heritage buildings.

Dru Industriepark is located in Ulft (10.000 residents), a village surrounded by green, Till 2003 the area of 14 ha was used as an iron foundry for bathtubs, stoves and casseroles. Main aim of the redevelopment is to preserve the seven heritage buildings and realize an area to live, work and play. Two buildings are already transformed; one is used for living, the other for cultural activities and accommodates a library, theatre and a stage. For the four other buildings plans are currently made.

The **Roerdelta (ECI)** project is 54 hectares and located between the city center of Roermond (56.000) and the river Maas. In the center of this area, a large complex of "Electro Chemical Industry (ECI)", including a hydro-electric power station, was used for chemical industry. Since 1970 the building is disused and the area lost its value for industry. The ECI complex is considered to be of cultural-historical value. Just around 2011 transformation of the ECI complex and pre-selling of the houses started. The ambition is to realize a green residential area, with a large park and a cultural and creative meeting point in the ECI Complex.

The **Indiëterrein** in Almelo (73.000 residents) is an area of 23 ha located near the city center. It was formerly used for textile industry of Ten Cate. Some of the buildings are still used by textile related companies, other buildings are temporarily used for artists to create liveliness in the area. The ambition is to transform the area slowly to a new green city quarter with housing and working possibilities. The former industrial buildings of cultural-historical value, like the water tower, arched buildings and sawtooth roof buildings, will be re-used.

The **NDSM** yard (43 ha land and 25 ha water) at the Northern IJ-bank in Amsterdam (790.000 residents) is the location of the former shipbuilding company "Nederlanse Droogdok en Scheepsbouw Maatschappij" (NDSM). In 1984 NDSM went bankrupt and the area lost its use. Only in 2003 a first plan was presented for the redevelopment. The ensemble of large halls (build between 1920 and 1957), cranes, slips and docks are listed as cultural-historical valuable. The aim is to create a creative and cultural hotspot, with mixed uses, giving opportunities to all kind of (private) initiatives. In 2007 MTV Networks was the first company who moved into one of the heritage buildings. Other buildings are (temporarily) used for indoor-skating, bars and small offices for creative entrepreneurs.

Stadhouderspark Vught (38 ha) is located in the northern part of Vught (26.000 residents) on former barracks, sport fields of the barracks and private land in between. As the barracks closed down, the municipality bought the area. The area will be transformed to a residential area of 650 houses, including various facilities as a school, bar and health center. Various buildings of the barracks, build around 1900, are considered to be cultural-historical valuable.

Two barracks formerly used to quarter troops, are already transformed into rental apartments.

Overhoeks is an area of 27 ha located at the Northern IJ-bank in Amsterdam (790.000 residents). Shell uses 7 ha for their Shell Technology Centre Amsterdam (STCA) and the municipality bought 20 ha, which is mainly rented by the bank ING. The aim is to create a mixed use area with (rental) housing, office space, shops, restaurants and bars. The cultural heritage is a large tower. The new use of this tower is yet unknown.

4.2 Differences and similarities in the cases

Based on the analytical framework we analyzed the project characteristics, interaction characteristics and performance. The results are summarized in table 3. The important differences and similarities are highlighted in this paragraph to give insight in the process and performance.

Project performance
Commitment of key stakeholders to preserve the cultural heritage is generally high. Often heritage buildings are listed as a (state) monument, and preservation is a precondition for the redevelopment. In many projects the key stakeholders commit themselves also to the non-listed cultural-historical valuable buildings. These buildings are embedded in plans to contribute to the unique character of the area. Only in two projects (Enka Ede and Stadshouderspark Vught) some buildings are demolished and elaborate discussion took place on whether or not to preserve the cultural heritage buildings. The latter also applies to Scheldekwartier.

In all projects, except one, there is agreement between key actors on costs and benefits. In most cases, the costs and benefits of the redevelopment are not equally shared, but divided among the actors, depending on their responsibilities for a specific redevelopment component (housing, cultural heritage, public spaces). Only in one project (Strijp S) costs and benefits are shared among the key actors and the components of the plan.

The satisfaction on the agreement on costs and benefits of the problem-owner is medium to high. In many projects the problem-owner needs to invest without fully counterbalancing their expenses. However, they are willing to invest as they are convinced of the desirability to preserve and re-use the heritage buildings. Municipalities may be willing as they assume preservation contributes to the public interests, while private parties are motivated as preservation may positively contribute to sales of their real estate. When asked, most interviewees expect that the project will generally succeed in the long term. Almost all of them indicate that it will not be an easy process to achieve the aims. One interviewee indicates: "*Yes, the project will be successful. It will not*

be easy, especially not in these economic times, but we will finally put up a unique performance".

Table 3. Comparison of the urban redevelopment projects

	Project characteristics					Interaction characteristics			Performance		
	Complexity of the project	Initiative	Participation of key-stakeholders	Contribution of parties who benefit from heritage	Financiers and risks bearers	Type of cooperation	Conflict topics	Type of interaction	Commitment to preserving CH	Agreement costs and benefits	Satisfaction problem owner on division of costs and benefits
Strijp S	Low	3	High	High	3	3	1	Distrib.	High	Yes-shared	High
Enka	High	2	Med	Low	2	2	2	Distrib.	Med	Yes	Med
De Hallen	Low	1	Med	High	3	1	1	Distrib.	High	Yes	High
KSG	Med	1	Med	Low	3	1	1	Integr.	Med	Yes	Med
Dru	High	1	High	High	3	3	1	Integr.	High	Yes	Med
ECI	Med	3	Med	Med	2	2	1	Integr.	High	Yes	High
Indie	Med	2	Low	Low	2	2	2	Neither	High	no	High
NDSM	High	1	Med	Low	3	1	3	Integr.	High	Yes	Med
Vught	Low	1	Low	Low	3	1	1	Distrib.	Med	Yes	High
Over-hoeks	Med	1	Med	Low	3	1	3	Integr.	High	yes	Med

Project characteristics

The analysis showed that all projects had to deal with quite similar difficulties although the level of complexity varied. Finding new uses for the cultural heritage, high initially needed financial investments and ground pollution that puts pressure on the optional financial benefits, are indicated as main difficulties. In most projects, the initiative for the heritage redevelopment is taken by the municipality. Although in all projects other key stakeholders are also involved in planning, only in two projects their participation is considered 'high'. Planning for the heritage redevelopment is mainly done by the land and real estate owner. Depending on their specific tasks and responsibilities other key stakeholders invest and bear risks. However, in none of the cases,

stakeholders outside the project scope who benefit from the re-use of cultural heritage (for example, residents of neighborhoods) contribute to the costs.

Interaction characteristics
In two projects the public and private parties formalized their cooperation in a joint venture. Five projects have a traditional form of cooperation, in which the municipality owns the land, prepares the site for building and sells it to another party. In three projects the cooperation can be typified as concession, as private parties own the land, plan and realize the development.

In most cases the interviewees indicate that financing heritage preservation is conflict topic between stakeholders. They experience difficulties in coming to an agreement on costs and benefits, as it is hard to negotiate the amount of investments, who captures the benefits, and what the added value is. A second topic of conflict appears to be related to the lack of inflexibility in plans. During the planning stage– which often takes more than 10 years - political and economic circumstances changed. For example, former expectations on sales and prices did not match the changed reality and already made plans and closed agreements were disputed. One interviewee indicates: "*the plans are translated to the current situation, but slightly different than previously meant. That gives discussion.*" Third, the ambitions in plans are often described vaguely. When actors need to specify these ambitions, they do this differently. Perceptions on the suitable new uses for the cultural heritage, housing density or public spaces conflicted in some cases. Related is the indicated difficulty to handle ambiguous preconditions or starting points. For example, in one project the cultural-historical valuable building were only listed after a private developer bought the area with the intention to demolish the old buildings and build new houses.

How actors deal with the various conflict topics in interaction varies in each project. In half of the projects, the interaction can be indicated as integrative, in the other projects as distributive. An example of integrative interaction is given by an interviewee: "*Most decisions and ideas are not written down, but all actors keep their promise and are committed. […] They are willing to change their perceptions and slightly change the plan if needed. They come up with new ideas: I saw this somewhere else; maybe it could work here too? It's not laughed at, but elaborated on, and others will offer their help*." In a project with mainly distributive interaction, an interviewee describes: "*Some people search for new opportunities, but many hold on to their own ideas and perceptions. Especially in the discussion towards finding new uses for the heritage*." In most projects there were both distributive of integrative characteristics. One interviewee indicates: "*everybody was directed on working together. However, at the same time it was very clear what the individual interests were. And that's a barrier, but it also makes sense*." Especially when dealing with conflicting topics, behavior changes. One interviewee says: *"If plans change, you see individual interests manifest themselves in the discussion"*. In some of the projects behavior also changes

during time: "*If the crisis didn't occur, I wonder what would have happened. I guess we would still be working separately, fighting each other on specific issues, and being afraid that some would gain at the expense of others*."

4.3 The impact of interaction on performance

We used the case ordered predictor outcome matrix as a first step in our search for patterns between stakeholder interaction and project performance. Therefore we analysed the separate or combined effect of the variables in table 3. This analysis did not show uniform results regarding the impact of interaction characteristics on the performance of the projects. Projects with integrative interaction as well as distributive interaction, score high as well as low on the performance indicators. Four out of ten projects have integrative interaction and high commitment to re-use of cultural heritage. However, also distributive interactions result in high commitment. Furthermore, in most cases an agreement on costs in benefits is achieved, irrespective of integrative or distributive interaction and cooperation type.

To increase validity of the research and in search for other variables, we also asked the project managers directly what they thought to be important drivers for coming to agreement on costs and benefits and re-use of cultural heritage. It appeared that the drivers the interviewees mentioned are partly related to integrative interaction. For example, knowing each other's interests, respect them and act accordingly, willingness to cooperate, having a shared frame and commitment of actors to the plan and ambition are mentioned as drivers. Furthermore, having clear and unambiguous starting points, being flexible and decisive to adjust plans, and having high ambitions for the area were considered to be important. In conclusion, although no direct relations can be analysed from table 3, interaction appears to be relevant for performance.

5. Conclusion and discussion

Based on an explorative comparison of ten projects in the Netherlands this research tried to identify barriers and drivers of urban redevelopment projects with cultural heritage. The characteristics of these projects cause (financial) complexity due to high preservation costs, difficulty to find suitable new uses and in some cases ground pollution. These issues complicate the process to come to an agreement on costs and benefits and the re-use of cultural heritage. Actors have to deal with conflicts which are mainly financial issues and in some cases the changing of plans or ambiguousness of plans. Despite these similarities, project and interaction characteristics vary strongly. Participation of key stakeholders, contribution to costs, cooperation and type of interaction varies and there appears to be no pattern in these findings. Furthermore, the comparative case analysis did not show a uniform relation between the characteristics of interaction processes and project performance. This research finding does not match with literature on negotiation processes which indicates

that integrative interaction more likely results in a win-win situation. Although the empirical results of the cross case analysis did not support this, interviewees did indicate that aspects that could be related to integrative interaction were drivers in the redevelopment process when asked directly. Some limitations and choices made in the research design might underlie this ambiguity in the findings.

First, in our analytical framework we used three indicators for project performance. Against the background of the research problem we argued that commitment to preserve heritage, agreement on costs and benefits and satisfaction of the problem owner on the division of costs and benefits, are relevant indicators for project performance. We choose to specify these indicators ourselves, as we assumed that more clear and uniform indicators would reduce the chance of different interpretations. For determining the score on these indicators we used an objective approach for the first two indicators, referring to the fact that the score is determined by the researcher, and a subjective approach for problem owners satisfaction, which means we asked the project managers how satisfied they were with the division of costs and benefits of heritage preservation. However, a wider understanding of project performance would also be relevant. Although the problem-owner is most affected by the agreement on costs and benefits of heritage preservation, satisfaction of other stakeholders on the process and outcome is also important to determine whether or not the division of costs and benefits is mutual beneficial. Therefore it is suggested to also take into account their opinions on performance in future research.

Second, we also used a framework to describe interaction characteristics. We argued that interaction consists of both deal-making and learning aspects and typified the interaction between key stakeholders in the cases as integrative or distributive. The indicators we used for this classification were based on literature. To prevent bias or socially acceptable answers we asked project managers to describe the overall interaction process and the behavior of various actors. Afterwards the data was coded to link their stories to the indicators used. In using this approach two important research dilemma's came forward: process dynamics and describing interaction.

Inherent to our view of interaction is that processes are dynamic. Actors learn and may change their perceptions and behavior, which affects the interaction. During the process several deals are made, which may steer the involvement or exclusion of actors and influences interaction. Moreover, as the project has a long time frame, the setting of the project changes and actors have to act. But what comes first? This sequence of events is essential in understanding the interaction process in detail. As the process is dynamic, the type of interaction is hard to define. In each situation and moment in time actors may act differently. On their actions and behavior, other actors will react. Actors will interact

differently with various actors, depending on the personal relation. In this study we focused on the agreement on costs and benefits in multiple-cases on one moment, from the perspective of the problem-owner. However, to overcome the dilemma's and understand the interaction dynamics even better, further in-depth research is suggested.

Finally, to find the barriers and drivers in the urban redevelopment projects we executed a cross-case analysis. The analysis helped to give insight in the general characteristics of the projects. However, to compare the projects we needed to focus, give short description and thicken the data. In the data handling, specific details may be lost. To overcome this problem– in a next step of the research -, we will conduct a longitudinal case study. In this in-depth case study we will be able to study interaction in the relation to the sequence of events. Also, the interrelation of the variables can be studied in more detail.

We hope that this paper contributes to a more profound discussion on the interaction in planning processes and the transformation of cultural heritage in urban redevelopment. We welcome feedback on this paper and suggestion to cope with the presented dilemmas for further research.

6. References

AARSEN, A., et al. 2010. Cultuur als confrontatie: De ruimtelijke agenda na Belvedere. *In:* AARSEN, A. & BRONS, R. (eds.). Rotterdam: Stimuleringgsfonds voor Architectuur.

ABF Research. 2008. Wijken van waarde, Waardemakers in de wijk. Delft

ALBRECHTS, L. 2001. In pursuit of new approaches to strategic spatial planning. A European perspective. *International Planning Studies,* 6**,** 293-310.

ALBRECHTS, L. 2004. Strategic (spatial) planning reexamined. *Environment and Planning B,* 31**,** 743-758.

ALBRECHTS, L. 2006. Bridge the gap: From spatial planning to strategic projects. *European Planning Studies,* 14**,** 1487-1500.

BADE, T. & SMID, G. 2008. *Eigen haard is goud waard: Over de economische baten van cultuurhistorisch erfgoed,* Utrecht, Projectbureau Belvedere.

BIZZARRO, F. & NIJKAMP, P. 1997. Integrated conservation of cultural built heritage. *In:* BRANDON, P. S., LOMBARDI, P. L. & BENTIVEGNA, V. (eds.) *Evaluation of the Built Environment for Sustainability.* London, UK: E&FN Spon.

DE BRUIJN, H. & HEUVELOF, T. 2008. *Management in Networks: On multi-actor decision making*, Routledge.

DE GRAAF, R. S. 2005. *Strategic Urban Planning–industrial area development in the Netherlands, to direct or to interact?* , University of Twente.

DE KORT, I. 2009. *Designing a strategic plan development approach for integrated area development projects.* University of Twente.

EISENHARDT, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review***,** 532-550.

FISHER, R., URY, W. & PATTON, B. 1991. *Getting to YES,* New York, USA, Penguin Books.

FORESTER, J. 2006. Making participation work when interests conflict: moving from facilitating dialogue and moderating debate to mediating negotiations. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 72**,** 447-456.

FORESTER, J. 2011. Editorial. *Planning Theory & Practice,* 12**,** 325-328.

HUTJES, J. M. & VAN BUUREN, H. 1992. *De gevalsstudie: Strategie van kwalitatief onderzoek*, Boom.

INNES, J. E. & BOOHER, D. E. 2010. *Planning with complexity: an introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy,* London and New York, Taylor & Francis.

KOPPENJAN, J. F. M. & KLIJN, E. H. 2004. *Managing uncertainties in networks: a network approach to problem solving and decision making,* London and New York, Routledge.

LAX, D. A. & SEBENIUS, J. K. 1986. *The manager as negotiator: Bargaining for cooperation and competitive gain*, Free Pr.

LAX, D. A. & SEBENIUS, J. K. 2002. Dealcrafting: The Substance of Three Dimensional Negotiations. *Negotiation Journal,* 18**,** 5-28.

LEEUWIS, C. 2000. Reconceptualizing participation for sustainable rural development: towards a negotiation approach. *Development and change,* 31**,** 931-959.

LINSSEN, M., KLAMER, A., DUINEVELD, M., VAN ASSCHE, K., RUIJGROK, E. & BAZELMANS, J. 2009. *Het cultuurhistorisch argument,* Utrecht, Projectbureau Belvedere.

MILES, M. B. & HUBERMAN, A. M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*, SAGE publications, Inc.

OLANDER, S. & LANDIN, A. 2005. Evaluation of stakeholder influence in the implementation of construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management,* 23**,** 321-328.

RING, P. S. & VAN DE VEN, A. H. 1994. Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *Academy of management review***,** 90-118.

RUIJGROK, E., NILLESEN, E. & ATMAN, R. 2004. Economische waardering van cultuurhistorie. Een case-studie in de Tieler-en Culemborgerwaard. Projectbureau Belvedere, Utrecht.

SARIS, J., DOMMELEN, S. & METZE, T. 2008. *Nieuwe ideeën voor oude gebouwen: creatieve economie en stedelijke herontwikkeling,* Rotterdam, NAI.

SEBENIUS, J. K. 2009. Negotiation Analysis: From Games to Inferences to Decisions to Deals. *Negotiation Journal,* 25**,** 449-465.

THOMPSON, L. & HASTIE, R. 1990. Social perception in negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 47**,** 98-123.

WALTER, A. & SCHOLZ, R. 2007. Critical success conditions of collaborative methods: a comparative evaluation of transport planning projects. *Transportation,* 34**,** 195-212.

YIN, R. K. 2003. *Case study research: Design and methods,* California, United States, Sage Publications, Inc.