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Appendices
Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 What is this research about?

“Man and corn – it all comes back to that. Cultivation and civilisation, city and country, paradise and hell: food has always shaped our lives, and it always will. Our legacy to those who inherit the earth will be determined by how we eat now – their future lies in our knives and forks and fingers” (Steel, 2008, p. 324).

This research is in the field of land use planning and management in relation to spatial issues. From this perspective the research topic was identified, which is - broadly stated - about spatial strategies towards urban foodscapes. After specification the topic has been narrowed down to understanding the concept of foodscapes as well as communicative planning strategies, and sees what foodscapes can learn from the latter, in order to create sustainable spatial strategies towards foodscapes. After understanding of the earlier mentioned concept and strategies, case studies in the Netherlands will be analysed, where after conclusions will be drawn. The research ends with recommendations for planning towards foodscapes.

1.2 Problem description and diagnosis

I will start with sketching the problem this research tries to solve, where secondly I will go deeper into it causes (the diagnosis). Thereafter I will give a short overview of what has been researched in this field so far, in order to subsequently describe where the knowledge gap lies that will be the aim of this research. Finally, I will discuss the practical and scientific relevance of the research.

What is the problem this research tries to contribute to?

Both the city and the rural surroundings are highly interdependent. However, this relation is not always clear. This is called the paradox of urban life (as described by Steel, 2008); "we inhabit cities as if that were the most natural thing in the world, yet in a deeper sense, we still dwell on the land. Cities cover just 2% of the world's surface, but consume 75% of the world's resources. Without farmers and farming, cities would not exist" (Steel, 2008, p.7). In general people are very much ignorant about the origins and systems behind the food which we consume; it's always there and available nor do we understand how it's been processed and transported before being consumed. The city and rural area seems disconnect at first sight, but are actually very much dependent, because the rural area produces the food for the growing population in cities. And this apparently contrast - the distance between food production and consumption - causes other social phenomena such as unawareness of food (types, origins, etc.) and sometimes the ignorance of food as a planning theme. The lack of attention for food in planning is striking. Food production systems can have major implications for our spatial planning.

Furthermore we suffer from a growing world food shortage whereas we (in the West) still waste lots of food. Food is no longer an irrelevant issue in spatial planning but by proper spatial addressing can help to solve the problem.
**What is the diagnosis (or cause) of this problem?**

Food, being a major theme in spatial planning if you look at spatial relations and implications, isn't proper addressed in contemporary spatial planning. "Among the basic essentials for live – air, water, shelter and food – planners have traditionally addressed them all with the conspicuous exception of food" (Morgan, 2009, p. 341). Even more, " the multifunctional character of the food system means that it has profound effects on a host of other sections" (Morgan, 2009, p.341). On the other hand, recently there is a renewed interest in food and its planning. Among this renewed interest there is strong emphasis on the societal functions of food. In this same line of reasoning several Dutch cities came up with food visions recently.

But how to reconnect (or in better words: make more explicit) the bond between the city and its rural surroundings? Also in order to solve the earlier mentioned problems such as unawareness, food waste, etc. The concept of foodscapes therefore may combine the city and its rural surroundings again. Urban foodscapes can be defined as urban landscapes which are able to produce food or deal with other forms of food processing along the food chain in an urban-rural relationship. To conclude, the diagnosis can be found in the lack of interest in the spatial character of food and its planning.

**What has been researched in this field so far?**

Looking at earlier research activities there has been quite some recent publications on planning for foodscapes. Carolyn Steel published a very complete book about food in relation to the city, called Hungry City. This book was for me the point of departure for this research since this introduces a different way of thinking towards food and cities; we have to view the city through the perspective of food. Viljoen et al wrote about sustainable food production and came up with the concept of “the city as a farm”. But looking at the history of ideas concerned food and it’s planning, Morgan argues that Ebenezer Howard some 100 years ago first started to scientifically approach cities in combination with food in his book Garden Cities of Tomorrow (Howard, 1946). The combination of town and country is not only healthful, but economic; because the co-location of producers and consumers of food would yield multiple benefits for both and do much to repair the debilitating urban-rural divide. So, the idea of scientifically approaching food and cities has been there for quite some time, although only recently – after the new food equation – with renewed interest. But how to approach or deal with the earlier mentioned observations? There are theories and strategies for communicative planning; I think foodscapes can learn from communicative planning strategies, such as participative planning or advocacy planning. The earlier mentioned authors Morgan and Sonnino published about foodscapes (in the International Planning Journal, as well as food congress Cardiff 2008) and especially started to develop the thinking of strategies and policies towards improving food planning. Morgan signalled the localism of urban foodscapes; foodscapes to be (...) small enough to control locally yet being part of something big enough to make a difference beyond the locality (Morgan, 2006). That is where the knowledge gap lies; the idea of foodscapes and the consciousness has already been forwarded recently, but there has been not so much emphasis on its spatial implementation.

**What is the aim of the research?**

Although I first will elaborate on the concept of foodscapes, I will merely focus on spatial strategies towards urban foodscapes from the perspective of current communicative planning strategies. Especially on how to overcome the local character of foodscapes; so, both combining the local connection and character as well as implementing spatial food strategies on a higher level of policy making, in order to enhance the urban-rural relationship. The aim of this thesis is to gain insight in what urban foodscapes can learn from communicative planning strategies.
What is the practical and scientific relevance of the research?
A lot of research has been done in food and planning; but this research tries to combine food and planning in spatial strategies addressing food issues. The practical relevance is stated by the aim of gaining knowledge for the purpose of helping to solve a practical societal problem (also see research objective). It aims to provide adaptable strategies for the practise of developing foodscapes. Besides we are more and more focused with small local initiatives, but how the put them on a higher political agenda? Scientific relevance can be found in the bridging between foods and planning theory as well as providing clear stepping stones for future development. The research is of a theory oriented origin. Although is applied as well, as it tries to gain knowledge for the purpose of helping to solve a practical problem (in this case, developing strategies for foodscapes).

Concluding: the city and the rural area are closely related and interdependent on each other, although this may not seem so these days, but the concept of foodscapes made a change in mind-set, but how to actually spatially achieve it? And what can we learn from communicative planning strategies?

1.3 Research set-up

General Research Question

Translating the problem description and research objective into a general research question leads to the following main question:

*How can the practise in planning for urban foodscapes learn from communicative planning strategies, in order to create suitable planning towards foodscapes?*

Therewith the general research question (GRQ) is two-folded, consisting of (1) theoretical explorations of urban foodscapes and communicative planning strategies, and (2) exploration of current practise in planning for urban foodscapes. The answer of the GRQ draws upon the comparison of both. First, this thesis aims to gain further understanding about the concept of foodscapes and communicative planning strategies. Secondly, this thesis searches for overlap in the theory of foodscapes and communicative planning strategies, in order to come up with recommendations for planning for foodscapes. Third, theory is linked to observations in practise, to link the earlier explanations to reality. Hereafter I will elaborate on the general research question by elaborating on its specific research questions, and the exact approach throughout the research.

Specific Research Questions

The general research question, as stated above, can be divided in several specific research questions to answer it correctly and thoroughly. By making a tree diagram the general research question can be divided into several parts. This resulted in the following specific research questions.

SRQ 1: How did urban foodscapes emerge over the past?

SRQ 2: What is meant by the concept of foodscapes? A clear overview of origins, definition and various sorts; this can be seen as a point of departure as well as the first part of theoretical framework.
SRQ 3: What various forms communicative planning strategies seems applicable for foodscapes? And what are their characteristics and how do they work? This can be seen as the second part of the theoretical framework.

SRQ 4: What strategies or approaches can be found in the food visions of the case studies? What seems to work and what not?

SRQ 5: What can planning for foodscapes learn from communicative planning strategies?

SRQ 6: What recommendations can be made after this research towards planning for urban foodscapes?

Research Narrative

The research narrative can be seen as a guide towards the reader. Apart from all the specific theories in each chapter, what is the bigger narrative of this research? What is linking the various chapters together?

Introduction

This research started from an historical perspective; what is the historical context of foodscapes? And can urban foodscapes be seen as new phenomena or does history tells us different? The first chapter therefore defines the context of the urban foodscapes; the framework wherein this research can be seen.

Theoretical framework

After understanding of urban food production throughout its history, a two-folded theoretical framework has been established. The first part of this theoretical framework focuses on further exploration of the concept of urban foodscapes. What is actually meant by urban foodscapes? And what is the spatial link between food and the urban space? And what are the specific characteristics of urban foodscapes?

The second part of the theoretical framework, followed sequentially after the first part concerning the understanding of urban foodscapes. Based on the characteristics of urban foodscapes, and the research perspective focusing on strategies towards urban foodscapes, three seemingly appropriate planning strategies have been selected. These three varying perspectives, generally, fit in to the larger planning philosophy of Communicative Planning Strategies. After understanding these three planning methods, the methods served as theoretical suggestions for food planning strategies. The points of interest in foodscapes will be linked to these strategies, and how the overlap with each other.

Practical research

After the two-folded theoretical framework, concerning urban foodscapes and communicative planning strategies (as theoretical suggestions), a bridge has been made with the current practise in planning for foodscapes. Recently, world-wide cities came up with their food visions, their view on the relation between food, the city and means of achieving. What happens in practise with urban foodscapes? And, even more important, what are the strategies to achieve these food visions? In other words: what is the current practise in planning for urban foodscapes?
Conclusion
Thereafter, the theoretical suggestions for food strategies will be compared to the practical reality in planning for foodscapes. Where do urban foodscapes, theoretically suggested strategies and practice overlap and can learn from each other? Once again, the points of interest in urban foodscapes, communicative planning strategies and practice will serve as milestones.

Discussion
After the conclusion, several points have been discussed in the discussion chapter. The discussion merely focuses over awareness, governmental dynamics and the spatial relevance.

Epilogue: Recommendations
At last, the research concludes with recommendations for planning for foodscapes, based upon the synthesis of all chapters. However, these are just – merely normative – suggestions for the planning of foodscapes.

Research Approach

First, this research consists of two literature studies: one literature research into the concept of foodscapes, one literature research on communicative planning strategies. Within the communicative planning strategies, three different specific methods will be analysed. The three methods – Planning for Real, Social Learning Theory and Evolutionary Governance Theory – have been selected on the findings in the research on foodscapes. In that sense, the chapters on foodscapes and communicative planning strategies are sequentially related; the characteristics of the plannability of foodscapes determined the selected methods in the communicative planning strategies. In the end, these two literature studies can be seen as theoretical framework.

What research sources have been used in the theoretical framework? The necessary literature consists of a mix of scientific articles in planning journals and books (f.e. articles about foodscapes, book about planning methods, etc.) as well as more societal sources such as books, newspapers and websites. I will search via WUR Library, Scopus and Google Scholar because their overview of scientific publications. Furthermore, expert suggestions such as references by teachers, supervisor and articles provided additional information. The literature has been analysed by reading abstracts – to get a clear view of the value and meaning of an article - and thereafter the marking of important parts throughout the article. By combining various sources, and by searching into given references, an understanding of the various concepts covered by theory was generated. By investigating literature as described above, information is being checked and compared scientifically. Besides, this approach makes me able to synthesize all the knowledge to present an understandable overview.

Second, after the establishing of the theoretical framework, two Dutch case studies of Amsterdam and Rotterdam have been investigated. The case studies can bridge between the research and its societal relevance, as well as giving the research more in depth practical knowledge. Each of the two case studies consists of document analysis and an interview. The document analysis focused on the understanding of each of the food visions and the interviews served for deepening the content of the document analysis. I have chosen for adding case studies to connect the literature research to the practice in planning. Besides, many cities are writing food visions at the moment. The purpose of the case studies was to get a clear view of the practise in planning for foodscapes. Thereafter, theoretical suggestions could be combined with practical observations, in order to come up with suggestions for planning for foodscapes. The next part elaborates on the specific Case Study Design.
1.4 Case Study Design

Hereafter two case studies will be further introduced; one related to the food vision of Amsterdam, the second to the food vision of Rotterdam. The case study can be typed as parallel case study since the two cases are selected at the same time. The main goal of the case study design is to get a view on how urban foodscapes are approached in practice. The data collection methods are document analysis and interviewing. After document analysis of both food visions, an interview is conducted with spatial planners who contributed to the food visions from spatial and strategic perspective, answering questions of “what” and “how” (see Research Approach). By doing so, a complete overview of food strategies in practice will be constructed.

Selection of case studies

What is the rationale behind the selection of Amsterdam and Rotterdam as case studies? First of all, both cities recently came up with their food visions or food policy documents. In that respect, both cities – as major Dutch cities – are very much concerned with the growing attention for food planning. In fact, both cities are quite ahead, in the Dutch context of planning for foodscapes. Since food is a relatively new theme in planning, as we will see later in this research, the perspective of two cities that are starting to think of food planning and strategies, seemed interesting. What is their approach towards food? Furthermore, Amsterdam and Rotterdam are the largest cities in the Netherlands, another condition which seemed relevant, since this research is about urban foodscapes. At last, Amsterdam and Rotterdam are both Randstad cities, but with different characteristics.

Case study approach

The selection of two cities was the first step in the approach towards the case studies. The case studies will be researched through document analysis and interviews. First, both visions will be studied from the perspective of foodscapes and communicative planning strategies. An overview of the main implications of the visions will be presented in the document analysis. From the understanding of the food visions, interview questions are developed. Main focus of the interview questions is to get an exact perspective on how both municipalities strategically approach food as planning theme. So, after getting the main line of thought by analysis of the documents, the interview deepens the knowledge by asking questions of “how”. In this way, a good view of food strategies in practice is constructed, which, afterwards, can be compared to theory of foodscapes and planning strategies.

Interviews

In these case studies I have chosen for the perspective of the local government, the municipalities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The municipal perspective proved interesting, since the municipalities took the initiative in several food meeting, and ultimately came up with their food visions. Nevertheless, lots of citizens and local companies are pioneering in food as well, but the municipalities tried to connect the initiatives and proposed strategies to enhance the re-emerge of food in cities. Even more, the municipalities took this connecting initiative in a time wherein planning shifts from a top-down orientation towards a more bottom-up orientation. In that respect, what is the practise of planning for foodscapes?

Among the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, and the municipal perspective, interviewees have been selected on their contribution to the foodscapes from spatial perspective. After document
analysis, some research was done into the contributors of this food vision in order to find a contributing spatial planner. Thereafter I contacted the interviewees either via telephone or e-mail to make an appointment for an interview. In the preparations towards the interview, a list of questions has been made originating from the findings in the theoretical framework.

The interviews will be held personally, on the basis of an earlier made document analysis and questionnaire. During the interview, a laptop will be used to keep up with both questions and answers. Afterwards, the researcher will look through the notes and formulates them in answers on the questions. Thereafter, the interviewee receives the proper interview minutes, and is able to read them and add comments, in order to create the most honest view on the case. The researcher works through the suggestions of the interviewee and finalizes the interview, which will be added in the appendix. In the thesis itself, an English summary will be presented under chapter 6.

**Ethical considerations**

Regarding the Ethical Principles of Belmont, especially Respect for Persons, the interviews started with an extensive introduction to the subject, purpose of the interview and way of dealing with information. During the interview, the prepared interview questions served as basis for the interview. After the interview the minutes were completed. Out of respect to the interviewees and to establish an as correct as possible view of the practise, the minutes of the interview were send back to the interviewees for review. After approval the interviews were published in the appendix of this research.

In the end – in the conclusion - the theoretical framework and the case study will be brought together, from which conclusions will be drawn about what planning for foodscapes can learn from communicative planning strategies, in order to overcome localism.
1.4 Research design

Theoretical Framework

Urban Foodscapes

Communicative Planning Strategies
Planning for Real (PFR), Social Learning Theory (SLT), Evolutionary Governance Theory (EGT)

Case Study: Food Strategies in the Netherlands

Amsterdam

Rotterdam

Conclusions
What can urban foodscapes learn from communicative planning strategies?

Discussion

Epilogue: Recommendations
Chapter 2 Origins of Urban Foodscapes

After some basic understanding of the concept of foodscapes and its identification in the first part, this part focuses on the diagnosis of the foodscapes, in order to get a better understanding of its context and emerge. Where does this concept of foodscapes come from? What are its historical backgrounds? And what has caused it recent renewed interest in them?

2.1 Historical overview: an critical perspective

Strictly, foodscapes have always been in our surroundings. When writers today call urban agriculture a "new movement," they are in error (Smith, 2011). Looking at the first definitions in the following chapter, a lot of places fit in the definition of a foodscape, to support this statement. Think of agricultural farms or urban allotments, which are in the presence of humanity for centuries. But also think of medieval herb gardens, as shown on the picture on the right (suggested by Smith, 2011).

What is called “new”, the emerging of foodscapes in cities - so called urban foodscape - is actually not a new phenomenon at all. “Urban agriculture is not a new development. In the past, urban agriculture was rather obvious and self-evident, and in many metropolis around the world it still is,” as being argued on the website of greeninfrastructure. The fact that food production and consumption has significant implications on our health as well as our environment is far from new (Mikkelsen, 2011).

Nevertheless, since the first urbanisation in the past, food was generally produced in the rural area, where after it was transported and consumed in cities (Hidding, 2006). That was the general urban-rural relationship, some exceptions such as herb gardens not taking in consideration. This is also depicted by Ambrogio Lorenzetti in his Allegory of good governance (after Steel, 2008). Lorenzetti clearly depicts the countryside as food producing area, containing corn fields and other forms of agriculture, where people worked on the land or in transporting the products to the city.

Nowadays, due to rapid urbanisation, the surface of cities increases at the expense of rural areas. Moreover food production tends more to a globalising system (Sonnino, 2010). Urban foodscapes break the traditional view on cities and rural areas, by re-locating food production - originally a rural task – once again partly in the city. But more in essence, cities also emerged on places where fertile ground was available. Many early citizens were small farmers that sold their products directly in the city. But when the cities grew further and further during the industrialization at the beginning of the 20th century, and diseases, malnourishment and lack of good food started to become a problem, urban developers designed working class neighbourhoods which were self-sufficient. These self-supporting neighbourhoods with their gardens helped people survive during recession and crisis, as well as during the first and second world war. In addition, Ebenezer Howard came up with his concept of Garden
Cities. More recent foodscapes emerged by economical-societal changes. For example, due to the crisis land plots became available in American cities as Detroit and Buffalo. Or after ruining fires in the earlier ’60 or ’70’s (Food Log, 2014).

Urban agriculture was till the 00’s an important part of the urban life in Europe. For example, in 1890 one sixth of the surface of Paris was used for the production of more than 100,000 tons of vegetables per year, supported by one million of horse manure. Even additional spatial measures were taken, to generate a yearly production of three till six harvests (Hermy, 2005). Both the city and the rural surroundings are still highly interdependent on each other, although this may not seem so these days, as also argued by Carolyn Steel. This is called the paradox of urban life; we inhabit cities as if that were the most natural thing in the world, yet in a deeper sense, we still dwell on the land. Cities cover just 2% of the world's surface, but consume 75% of the world's resources. Without farmers and farming, cities would not exist (Steel, 2008).

But in this respect, what is new or different in contemporary foodscapes? What may be new is the fact that urban agriculture now attracts groups without economic interest, but for other motives such as health objectives and community building (Vriesendorp, 2014). Foodscapes bear a strong character of serendipity; it is about more than just the producing of the crops. Foodscapes are more about the societal by catch of the food production; such as health, social cohesion and awareness. Therefore, the term foodscapes very much relates to communities and their social cohesion. The production of food actually adds to building a culture of an urban community (Foodlog.nl, 2014). People who are really concerned by the production of something that is valuable for them – like food – will continue spending time on that, for seasons, for years; and will enter into relations, which are hard in quantification. The cohesion of a neighbourhood can therefore really change (Schulman, 2013). In the next chapter, the various types of foodscapes - related to their functioning - will be explained.

Secondly, contemporary foodscapes can also bear an informal (or even illegal) character; out of the official planning. Interesting, in this respect, is the relation between the emerging of foodscapes and the economical tide. Whenever there is an economic backdrop, people start using the former built spaces to produce food for people with hunger (Schulman, 2013). Hereby, foodscapes emerge as weed between the built structures of the world, by the local people, and for the people. "I have spoken to people of the lowest income classes, who just survive, and who want to produce better food for their children than they can afford or get in supermarkets" (Schulman, 2013). In this case, however, food is being produced for the sake of the food (-consumption) itself - not for some societal functions. Foodscapes can form an answer for the backdrops of society; where, due to economic stagnation, food security can be an issue. Moreover, as we've seen in the previous part of this chapter, producing food in cities is very ordinary in many third world countries. But, as this part illustrates, also in the West there can be the need for informal food production in cities to guarantee food security.

Third, food production in cities can also relate to a certain lifestyle, especially for the wealthy communities (Steel, 2008). Citizens grow crops on rooftops, for example. On the contrary of the illegal foodscapes of the previous paragraph, this new type of foodscapes has not so much to do with the harvest of the farming in the city itself. In this sense, it relates more to communal foodscapes, since both share the character of serendipity. This group, the "hipstervores", is the most visible and are very strong in spreading the message of urban foodscapes (Schulman, 2013). However, it is more important to acknowledge that they are just one of the many groups (Schulman, 2013). At last, there are groups who are not "new" but always produced their food in the city, just like the examples in the beginning of this chapter. "There are also immigrants who produce food like they
we’re also used to in other places. But, still, there are also elderly people who produce food because they are doing it all of their live” (Food Log, 2014). Although the concept of foodscapes may not be seen as “new”, we do face an increasing renewed interest in foodscapes, in various new forms, also on the strategic levels of policy making.

2.2 Renewed interest in Urban Foodscapes

A wide range of social innovations have emerged in recent years to support the rebuilding of local food systems, primarily by reconnecting urban consumers with local food producers (City Farmer News, 2014). It is the concept of foodscapes that has (re-)emerged to once again bond food and the city, as a result of two major causes. First of all we face more and more food related problems in the world, as being argued by Morgan and Sonnino in their joined article. As a result, food can have major consequences on geo-politics and therefore on the world’s stability. Food planning looks set to become an important and legitimate part of the planning agenda in developed and developing countries alike. Planners now find themselves addressing food policy for one very simple reason: their political masters have been forced to treat food policy more seriously because of the new food equation (...) which refers to a number of new and highly complex developments (Morgan and Sonnino, 2010). So, food is becoming a major political issue, because all sorts of food related problems, which could cause major destabilisation.

1. The food price surge of 2007-2008 when global wheat prices nearly doubled and rice prices nearly tripled, forcing hitherto secure social classes into food insecurity, a condition which already affects some 2 billion people;
2. Food security has become a national security issue after the food price surge triggered food riots in more than sixty countries around the world, forcing the G8 leaders to convene their first ever food summit in 2008.
3. Climate change effects in the form of water and heat stress, damaged eco-systems and rising sea levels for example, are expected to be worse in the poorest countries, the very countries that have done least to cause the problem of global warming.
4. Land conflicts are escalating as rich but food-stressed countries (like Saudi Arabia and South Korea) seek to buy up fertile land in Africa and Asia to ensure their own food security, fuelling charges of new colonialism
5. Rapid urbanisation means that cities are becoming more conscious about how they feed themselves because, given their sensitivity to food shortages, they are the most politically combustible areas in every country.

*the new food equation, by Morgan and Sonnino (2011)*

Secondly, we are becoming more and more conscious of themes as food and health, which leads in an increasing interest in food. Especially because food seems to relate to more topics; food is related to health, social participation, sustainability, economy and education (Food vision Amsterdam, 2014). But why are we becoming more conscious of food and health? Well, this has to do with the relation between welfare and health: the more wealth, the more attention for health (for example food). This relationship is very context-dependent. Nowadays we (in the West) don’t have to worry about our daily bread, or shelter or basic safety. But this attention is always relative; because the current circumstances are now set as the baseline; we think of them as things that have always been there, and are without dispute. And it is exactly this human characteristic that makes our concerns shift to the next issue on the ladder to pure welfare.
2.3 The emerge of Food Planning

As explained in the previous part, only recently there is a renewed interest in food and it’s planning as well as its societal (and political) functions. What caused the developing of the food as planning issue? Food, which is a really important theme in planning if you look at spatial relations and implications, hasn’t been proper addressed in contemporary spatial planning. Among the basic essentials for live — air, water, shelter and food — planners have traditionally addressed them all with the conspicuous exception of food. Although (...) the multifunctional character of the food system means that it has profound effects on a host of other sections (Morgan, 2009). In this context – and after the earlier mentioned issues in food - it is not at all surprising that cities around the world have been taking initiatives to re-design food provisioning (Sonnino, 2010).

Food planners are professionals who are striving to integrate food policy into the mainstream planning agenda (Morgan, 2010). Food planners are anyone who is working in, or engaged with, the food system with the aim of rendering it more sustainable with respect to its social, economic and ecological effects. The last decade’s rapid urban extension has produced an equally rapid loss of agricultural land in peri-urban areas; disconnecting cities form the natural resource-base of their surroundings and form the productive systems that were associated with it. As urban-rural linkages have weakened or even disappeared, cities have become increasingly dependent on the global industrialized food system (Sonnino, 2010). Several cities have been pioneering in the field of urban food planning. Besides, more and more cities (in the Netherlands) produce food visions, which contain lots of spatial implications.

2.4 Points of interest

What does this historical analysis of urban foodscape, teaches us about the planning strategies towards modern urban foodscape?

- Urban foodscape are not that new at all, as history shows that historical cities dealt with various form of urban food production as well. Even more, in most developing countries, food production in the city is at the very essence of its existence;
- However, we do face a renewed interest in producing food in cities, both on local, governmental and even worldwide geo-political levels;
- Although, modern urban foodscape vary from historical urban foodscape, since the modern foodscape have a broader focus than the economic rationale, bearing strong health wise, communal and even illegal characteristics;
- This renewed interest in more and more approach from the planning perspective, as the emerging of food planning shows, and therefore asks for clear rationales, methods and strategies.

Although urban foodscape have proven to be more than a contemporary trend, this renewed interest asks for further introduction. On various political and strategic levels food is now addressed as planning theme. In that sense, the fact that food is now being seen as relevant topic provides the rationale for the striving for spatial food strategies. But in this respect, what is actually meant by this modern form of urban foodscape? The next chapter builds upon a contemporary understanding of the concept of urban foodscape. What are the characteristics of the urban foodscape, that need to be taken in consideration whilst strategically planning for them?
Chapter 3 Theoretical Exploration: Urban Foodscapes

This chapter is the first part of the Theoretical Exploration. What is meant by the concept of foodscapes? After the historical perspective in the previous chapter, this chapter provides a clear overview of its definitions and spatial configuration. The chapter concludes with the relevance of foodscapes for spatial planning.

3.1 The Concept of Foodscapes

The concept of foodscapes seems to have multiple meanings, looking at the scientific literature. Especially because it is being approached as a relatively new concept, as well as its interdisciplinary nature: many research fields study foodscapes, but all from a different perspective. In this research its spatial component is most important and distinctive. This part starts with definitions from this spatial perspective and will gradually specify the concept of foodscapes.

The most straightforward definition of foodscapes can be “any landscape with a spatial connection with food”. Wherein the part “-scapes” clarifies its spatial connotation, within its concern with food. To concretize the earlier definition, we can elaborate on it by stating that foodscapes are “food producing or processing landscapes” (own definition).

Bent Egberg Mikkelsen published his “Images of foodscapes”, in which he investigates the emerging of the concept of foodscapes as well as its various forms and perspectives. In line with the previous definitions, Mikkelsen states that the most simple and straightforward definition of a foodscape is suggested by “the actual sites where we find food” (Freidberg, 2010). Along with shopping daily for food, meeting foods in different forms seems to create a ‘landscape of foods’ (Mikkelsen, 2011). "When this association between a place and a food item is abstracted, high-lighted, and promoted, the communal landscape becomes a foodscape” (Adema, 2009, p.4). The suffix ‘-scape’ is traditionally used to denote spatially arranged artefacts in our surroundings (...) and most of them can be assumed to have been constructed under the influence of landscape – a specific view of a space or scenery from a given perspective (Mikkelson, 2011). Besides, the notion of a –scape offers advantages when it comes to studying phenomena that are “unevenly distributed in space and appear in a variety of shapes and contexts” (Brembeck and Johansson, 2010).

But this seems a rather broad definition; it is about food and its spatial relationship, because this research focuses on urban foodscapes. Johnston et al. (2010) narrowed down on this urban thinking by underlining the importance of the built environment as well as the urban and institutional food service settings; therefore foodscapes can be defined as “the spatial distribution of food across urban spaces and institutional settings.” Hereby both the spatial aspect as well as the urban character is included. Besides Johnston makes an interesting note on institutional settings, referring to the spatial strategies and food policy related to the theme of food. This definition comes closer to the perspective of this research.

Besides its strategic and policy aspect, foodscapes can also be approached from a more cultural-geographical perspective, focusing on its site dependent social construction and multiple – sometimes contested – meanings and interpretations. "Foodscapes may not be limited to the physical appearance of food in the environment and a number of scholars have suggested a more abstract meaning of the
Mikkelsen suggests the concept of mental foodscapes, which contains all the social aspects of foodscapes which are shaped in the minds of people or shape the foodscape in their turn. “Foodscapes represent a marriage between food and landscape, both the conceptual notion of landscape and the actual, physical landscapes” (Adema, 2009, p.5). This conceptual notion, as Adema argues, is constructed by many factors. “A foodscape is the dynamic culinary culture of a community, as influenced by the wide variety of factors, such as region, tradition, history, social organization, and science and technology,” as King argued. King makes an interesting notion of the “culture of a community”, stressing the bond between social factors, the community and food. “The foodscape of a community refers to the ways in which food is produced, purchased or obtained, prepared, and consumed, and the relationship between food and the individuals of the community. Put another way, it can be understood as the food landscape of a community” (King, 2009, p.11). Therefore foodscapes can be seen as related to a community, which is constructed by a wide range of factors. In post-modernist terms, foodscapes can be seen as an site specific or spatial construction, and is therefore very much location dependent.

Therewith Johnston and Baumann define foodscapes as “a dynamic social construction that relates food to specific places and meanings. Just as a landscape painting has a mediated, indirect relationship to place, a foodscape may variously capture or obscure ecological origins and social implications of food and consumption.” Once again, a very important note on the three key words of foodscapes: places, people and food. It is the people (and their culture) who shape certain places, which express their interpretation and vision on food. In geographical terms, foodscapes function as a palimpsest; as a means of how places can express values and ideas from the people who have moulded the place or contest it. Overall, the most complete definition is given by King, who defines foodscapes as a “social construction that captures and constitutes cultural ideas of how food relates to specific places, people and food systems” (King, 2010).

Besides the more geographical perspective, King also adds a sustainable perspective on foodscapes, which seems relevant in the light of the contemporary discussion on sustainability. Besides, foodscapes and urban agriculture (...)which is re-appearing in the more sustainable cities of the global north, where urban designers are re-imaging the city as a farm (Viljoen, 2005). But what does it mean, “Sustainability”, in the light of foodscapes? Since sustainability is a rather broad a much-used term. Well, King defines a sustainable foodscapes as “one that promotes community health and sustainable food security by fostering socio-ecological sustainability and resiliency within the food system”. King suggests four essential requirements as features of a sustainable foodscape (Mikkelsen, 2011). First it should be embedded in a healthy community in which both human and ecological values are recognized; food production should take place in a way that promotes human and ecological health and food consumption should encourage community dietary health. Second, the foodscape should be ecologically and socio-ecologically sustainable and should foster environmental health and livelihood sufficiency and opportunity. Third, the sustainable foodscape should exert resiliency by encouraging diversity, modularity and tight feedback loops in the production and consumption of food. Finally, the sustainable foodscape should support sustainable food security, providing nutritional and culturally appropriate food that also fosters ecological health (Mikkelsen, 2011, after King).
3.2 Types of urban foodscapes

Urban agriculture is one of the purest forms of urban foodscapes. Among this concept various discourses can be recognised. But, as earlier mentioned in the part of the origins of foodscapes, contemporary foodscapes – although not new – can have more functions than just food production.

New types, new purposes

We are witnessing today the emergence of a mix of urban food strategies that try to do more than just feed the city. They contribute to individual and communal health by responding to the differing food and nutritious needs of socially and culturally diverse populations. And they are beginning to redesign the urban and peri-urban environments, with important gains for the general quality of life of the millions of people who live in and around fast growing cities (Sonnino, 2010).

This new - more societal – benefits of foodscapes, are also recognized by Robin Schulman in her book Eat the City (about New York). In an interview, she explains on the various types of urban agriculture, which are mostly dominated by lifestyle-projects. “The “hipstervores” are enthusiast; they spread the message of urban agriculture. It is more important to acknowledge that they are just one of the many groups. I have spoken to many people, who only recently came in touch with the idea of urban agriculture or other ways to produce food in cities. I have spoken to people out of the lowest income classes, who just survive, and who want to produce better food for their children than they can afford or get in supermarkets. And there are also immigrants who produce food like they’re also used to in other places, or elderly people who still produce food because they are doing it all of their lives. Those hipstervoers are just the most visible, that’s all” (Schulman, 2013).

Types of Urban Agriculture:

In order to make some distinctions between types of foodscapes, Carolyn Steel came up with four forms of urban agriculture, on which I will elaborate:

**Urban agriculture to survive**

This form of urban agriculture is the most basic one, since the emerging of this form of urban agriculture is related to the basic need of food. Therefore urban agriculture to survive emerges in areas with food shortages. “In many cities in Asia, Africa and Latin-America, urban agriculture is still an essential part of food production” (Groenblauwenetwerken.com)

**Urban agriculture as lifestyle**

This form deals with urban agriculture as a lifestyle; think of diets, health, aesthetics, personal well-being and sustainability. It can be seen as innovative and problem-oriented urban agriculture. Nevertheless it is most of the time a project for wealthy people. The New York Rooftop Farming is a good example.

Figure 3: Rooftop Farming in New York. Source: New York Times.
Urban agriculture for the (world-) market

This form is about urban agriculture as producer for the increasingly needed food supplies; so it adds to the food security. These foodscapes can be seen as "urban farms" (Viljoen, 2010) - urban food production for the market - which actually help rural farms in producing food. Some examples are vertical farms, agro parks and indoor plant production. By organizing this form of urban agriculture more food production can be achieved for the growing world population, but also transportation costs (and pollution) can be reduced, and the urban agriculture can add to the liveable green character of the city.

Urban agriculture for the community

Urban agriculture for the community is being used for social project, for example in education or community building. It is not so much about the production of the food; it focuses more on the social aspects of urban agriculture (serendipity). Think of creating a feel of security, enlarging the social cohesion and improve the consciousness and understanding of food. All sort of in material community goals which you can't harvest from a field, but which you can create via urban agriculture.

Figure 4: Farming and Gardening with the Community. Source: Austin Post.

Spatial configuration

But how to these urban agricultural activities translate in spatial patterns and activities? Or in other words: what is the spatial configuration of an urban agriculture in order to create so called urban foodscapes? Urban foodscapes can have various forms, some tradition, some new, some large, some small. An overview, based on several examples from literature:

Backyard gardening is the simplest form of urban farming, by personal growing of crops in backyards. For example, people can have small herb- and crops gardens in their backyard, or sometimes even small greenhouses. In the same sense, urban livestock farms can exist. Livestock farms can be seen as farming by farming by raising animals, such as cows, for the use of their products. Urban livestock farms for children, for example. Also think of urban fishing ponds. Besides private gardening, allotments provide some of the earliest forms of public gardening. Allotments can be seen as urban gardens, which emerged due to the fact the working-class neighbourhoods were too small for substantial gardens (during industrialisation, urbanisation). The allotments were often located at the edge of cities, providing some sort of garden for everyone without a private garden.

In the same sense of the allotments, community gardens emerged. Community gardens are local gardens in neighbourhoods, freely accessible for all the inhabitants of that neighbourhood, wherein
crops are grown for local use. In fact, it can be seen as a sort of allotment, but community gardens are often located in the neighbourhood itself. Besides, community gardens bear a strong communal aspect (think of social cohesion, awareness of food, etc.). This form can also be seen as multicultural gardening.

The next three spatial forms of foodscape are related to other levels of height, since urban foodscape are not restricted to the surface of the earth only. The first one, rooftop farming, can be seen as urban farming on rooftops of building block and office buildings. Rooftop farming is literally farming on the city. Secondly, vertical farms emerge more and more. Vertical farms, or "farming flats", are high building (flats) with farming opportunities on each level. Since farming is always bounded to some surface, vertical farms, with many "surfaces" on each other, are very efficient. But, besides farming in the skies, basement gardens offer possibilities as well. Basement gardening can defined as gardening (and farming) in basements, under the city, for crops that can grow without sunlight (such as mushrooms). In some cases, some sort of urban greenhouses can emerge if the basements gardens produce light-needed crops growing in artificial light. Of course, this energy can also be generated by solar panels on top of the building (since urban foodscape can be seen as a sustainable concept).

In line with the earlier mentioned "informal urban foodscape", another spatial form of foodscape is the guerilla gardening (or wasteland gardening). Guerilla gardening is some sort of temporary gardening, wherein gardeners - illegally - claim free office space or empty building sites for gardening. In fact, guerilla gardening is the same as informal gardening.

Urban foodscape can also bear an economical aspect in the form of spatial urban farm shops or farm parks. Urban farm shops are shops wherein the products being sold are directly related to the land close by the shop. For example organic greengrocer, where you can buy crops which are produced around the shop or you can directly harvest hem yourself. On larger scale, agro parks emerge; sort of large farming fabric producing food for the city.

To conclude, foodscape are very much about food production, in the direct surroundings of people, so it affects and connects to people. Not only because of the fact that the production and delivery of products and food but also because of its effects on the direct environment of people. Therefore the spatial aspect of foodscape, and its planning and changes, is very important. Therefore, in the following chapters this spatial aspect - and its strategies - will be further elaborated. The strategies will focus on the interplay between people, their interpretation of the environment and its planning.

3.3 Issues in Planning for Foodscape:

On the other hand, the presence and character of foodscape also consists of issues related to their existence, as also signalled in planning literature. This part offers an overview of some issues in foodscape, which should be taken into consideration when planning for foodscape, since these aspects could affect the way in which urban foodscape should be approached. These specific characteristics can determine the approach towards urban foodscape.

Localism

The development of many foodscape is actually the result of local ideas and initiatives. The concept of foodscape is a good example of bottom-up processes. Sometimes planners are confronted with the fact that “you can’t plan everything; it is the people who make the change”. Also Roberta Sonnino
acknowledges this; how can these inherently promising urban food strategies be consolidated and scaled-up (Sonnino, 2010). There is a challenge to track and embrace local initiatives and put them into practise. Or even to connect initiatives to improve the impact.

**Ethical foodscapes**

The availability of food opportunities can obviously be looked at from an ethical point of view and it seems that the notion of foodscapes is well suited to capture the different change agendas related to healthier and more sustainable production and consumption.

A way of conceptualizing and engaging critically with the processes, politics, spaces and places of the praxis of ethical rationalities embedded and produced in and through the provisioning of food (Goodman, 2010). The ethical foodscape actually consists of a wide spectrum of products, each of which espouses a set of values that claims to make a positive contribution to one or more of the following causes: human health, the environment, the local economy, poor primary producers in the global south, animal welfare and biodiversity (Morgan, 2009).

But – from John Rawls’ perspective on fairness (1971) – how are the chances distributed among the population? From an ethical perspective, dealing with local food initiatives raises lots of ethical questions. Are all the initiatives equally easy to trace or to connect with policy agenda’s? And which initiatives do you, as municipality embrace and support, and which not? And what is more important; foodscapes as lifestyle (such as New York Rooftop Farming) or foodscapes for the community and food security?

**Temporary foodscapes**

The third issue in the development of foodscapes, it is time scale. Although foodscapes can exist over many years, part of the foodscapes bear a temporary character. In this respect, referring back to guerrilla-farming and its economic sensitivity, illustrates this temporariness very well. Another example; due to economic recession an office building is abandoned. Local citizens use the place in a different way; by farming crops in the former office building. This goes without governmental influence, referring back to the localism of foodscapes. And indeed, after three months, a new company has been found to use the office space, and the foodscape, which has emerged through the people, stops to exist. And this perspective is shared in more practises, wherein foodscapes for other goals than continuing food production.

**Solving the world food problem versus serendipity of foodscapes?**

Referring back to the issues in foodscapes – localism, ethics and temporariness – the overall issue could be seen as various perspectives and beliefs in the use of foodscapes. After reviewing planning practise, foodscapes seems to emerge indeed as local, often temporary initiatives, as organic development. And indeed, as described in the discourses of foodscapes, the municipality often values the additional effects of urban foodscapes, its serendipity (such as awareness, social cohesion). In this respect, food (and the developing of foodscapes) serves as an indirect tool to, actually, achieve other goals. It is even written in some food visions; urban foodscapes will not solve the world problem, but can add to aspects. Indeed, there is something in it, but on the other hand, comparing the food visions, there is no sense of broadening the scope of foodscapes to a larger and more continuous scale.
3.4 Understanding Foodscapes

This part highlights the main points being forwarded in the analysis of the concept of urban foodscapes. In fact, it states the perspective through which the rest of the research has been done.

First of all, the spatial perspective – and especially urban perspective - is very important and distinctive, since the thinking of food and the city creates physical urban foodscapes. The landscape is the actual way in which the concept is shaped, communicated and used. Foodscapes link people to food to places. This threefold perspective includes the most important words among foodscapes as well as their integrated relation. Overall, foodscapes bear cultural, social, geographical, sustainable and political perspectives. In that sense, foodscapes can be seen as a spatial construction, build upon various site specific conditions, as a kind of palimpsest. At the same time, this gives foodscapes a very local character, although tries to function at larger scales. And once again, this strongly links back to the people and the culture, which make a place rather than a space. So, foodscapes are more than a physical food-oriented phenomenon; actually, it is more of a social construction, from a post-modernist view.

Foodscapes are about food production, in the direct surroundings of people, so it affects or connects to people. Not only because of the fact that the production and delivery of products and food but also because of its effects on the direct environment of people. Therefore the spatial aspect of foodscapes, and its planning and changes, is very important.

Taking all these notes into consideration, has led to the following research definition on foodscapes, combining definitions of Johnston, King and own perspectives. Urban foodscapes can be defined as socially constructed urban landscapes or places which are able to produce food or deal with other forms of food processing along the food chain, including institutional settings, and which relate people and food to places, especially on a local or community scale.

3.5 Points of interest

But what are the main points of interest in this conclusion? After exploring the concept of urban foodscapes, what are the most striking points in urban foodscapes to be taken into account whilst planning for them? Or in other words, what points are highlighted from the perspective of this research?

- The majority of urban foodscapes bears a strong temporary character – how to enhance more structural urban foodscapes?
- Urban foodscapes are very much dependent of initiatives from citizens, and therefore very much carry a participatory character; how to support and enhance these initiatives?
- Urban foodscapes often depend on one or two individuals, in coming up with the initiative, bringing it to practise and maintain it; Urban foodscapes can be distinguished in a) self-reliant individual projects or b) guided, communal projects, depending on the community;
- Urban foodscapes can have multiple spatial configurations, varying from backyard gardening to guerrilla gardening and rooftop farming, depending on the community;
• The dependence on the community and local site (as well as the initiatives), give urban foodscapes a very local character. Urban foodscapes can be seen as a site-specific spatial construction, build upon various site specific conditions, as a kind of palimpsest.

• The actual urban foodscape itself is the translation of thinking about food in to its spatial organisation, relating food to places and people. The landscape is the actual way in which the concept is shaped, communicated and used.

In the next chapter this spatial aspect – and its strategies – will be further elaborated. The approaches, which are all in the field of communicative planning strategies, will focus on the interplay between people, their interpretation of the environment and its planning. Point of departure for these strategies, are the above described points of interest in urban foodscapes.
Chapter 4  Theoretical Exploration: Communicative Planning Strategies

4.1  Introduction

How to come to planning strategies for urban foodscapes? Based on the characteristics of foodscapes described in the previous chapter – see points of interest - this chapter starts with introducing the concept of Communicative Planning Strategies (CPS). Thereafter, three major types of communicative planning strategies, each with its own implications, will be chosen on their applicability for planning for foodscapes. Subsequently the chosen strategies will be described and explored in order to get a clear understanding of its principles and methods, and search for overlap between foodscapes and CPS.

Communicative Planning Strategies (CPS)

First of all, what are Communicative Planning Strategies? And why and how do Communicative Planning Strategies relate to planning for urban foodscapes? These are the guiding questions for this part, departing from the points of interest in urban foodscapes in the previous chapter.

Communicative Planning Strategies (CPS) can be seen an umbrella for planning approaches from the perspective of communication. In the literature, this is also named as Collaborative Planning (Allmendinger, 2002). Although CPS is not specifically designed for foodscapes, its approach seems to relate closely to it. Linkages can be found in the fact that CPS is very much about participation, communication and how to embed social phenomena in spatial strategies. Referring back to the concept of urban foodscapes, these issues are closely related to foodscapes, since foodscapes seem to bear a strong communal and local character. Nevertheless, society is changing and changing quickly while planning as a practice and as a collection of processes remains wedded to ideas and procedures from a different age (Allmendinger, 2002). In other words: planning is very much society-dependent and therefore ever changing to the new context. How to embed the concept of foodscapes in spatial planning strategies?

Well, to start, what are Communicative Planning Strategies in more detail, and what is the background of its emerging? CPS has gained increasing theoretical popularity and is to see planning as a communicative or collaborative project, as influenced by Habermas, Foucault and Giddens (Allmendinger, 2002; after Healey 1996). In essence, it can be seen as planning strategies or approaches, but particularly on its communicational and societal aspect rather than on its in instrumental rationality. CPS can be seen as a reaction to modernist planning; but also due to growing complexity and practical reality. Instead of modernist rationality, Habermas speaks of “communicative rationality”, which involves breaking down the dominance of scientific objectivism and building instead a different kind of objectivity based on agreement between individuals reached through free and open discourse. According to Allmendinger, it is the instrumental rationality that has crowded out other ways of thinking and knowing and distorted power relations in society. Habermas accepts the existence of a complex mix of cultures and discourses though argues that there are ways in which people can make sense together (Allmendinger, 2002). Whereas postmodernist state that no real objectivity exists, reformed modernists believe that some form of objectivity can be achieved through communicative rationality. In order to do so, Habermas claims that the “life world” should reclaim
ground lost to the “system” (wherein life world is a symbolic network in which subjects interact and through shared practical knowledge coordinate social action, and the system operates through power and interest and forms the context within the life world operates). Among the criticasters of this concept of communicative rationality, is the postmodern Foucault. In their opinion communicative rationality can be seen as an interesting normative assumption, but reality teaches us that it is complete nonsense to assume such idealistic rationality, since knowledge and rationality always exist in a power related context. Conflict and power-relations, they are everywhere, in Foucault's perspective. Even participants are influenced by these, often hidden, relations and forces. Who is involved and who is not? What is often seen as consensus (or communicative rationality) is often no real consensus but a temporary power relation.

Anyway, whether there exists something as communicative rationality or not, the collaborative stream in planning looks further than just modernist instrumental rationality; it is very much related to other forms of knowledge (people's relations, communities, hiding power relations, etc.). “The communicative action model of policy making takes a broader view of what counts as knowledge, including stories, myths and social constructions and of who should be involved” (Holden, 2008, p. 10). Actually, besides the hard primary data such as soils, laws, costs and other – more technocratic types of data – Collaborative Planning aims more for relational types of data such as commitment and a web of relations. Hereby CPS addresses the problem of “normative poverty” of rational systems approaches, as described by Allmendinger. Planning focuses on people’s surroundings, and it is CPS that strongly focuses on this human (and inter human communication) aspect of planning.

How can planners work with diverse communities, reach agreement between them and formulate a plan (Allmendinger, 2002). That is the challenge of CPS, and the goal it strives for. Keywords in communicative rationality are equity, social justice, democracy and sustainability. Planning as a communicative process has definite ideas about what planning is, ideas that challenge professional neutrality and raison dére of many planners: it is about planners with an agenda (Allmendinger, 2002).

**Selected Approaches in CPS**

Now we know more about CPS and its origins, how does CPS relate to planning for urban foodscape? Based on the characteristics and issues of the concept of urban foodscape, such as localism and community-based (see previous chapter), three differing planning approaches have been selected in this broader stream of Communicative Planning Strategies. For each Communicative Planning Strategy there will be an exploration of its underlying principles and its methods. These approaches will be used as theoretical references in developing spatial strategies for urban foodscape.

The criteria:

- strong involvement of the community or emphasis and attention for bottom-up initiatives and how the deal, support and embed them in the spatial strategy (the principle);
- strong communicative aspect; the “communicative rationale” (the way to do it);
- possibilities for adaptation during the plan in an continuous and ever-changing process; so flexibility for all of the actors
- theory on involvement, actors, organic plan making, where possible guided with participatory forms to involve with the community
- and at last, the approaches should also be distinctive enough, to fit in the broader stream of CPS, but also offer different insights and theoretical lessons
The following approaches have been selected:

1. Planning for Real (Gibson, 1995)
2. Social Learning (Wals, 2007; Holmen, 2008)
3. Evolutionary Governance Theory (Van Assche et al., 2014)

Since communicative planning is a rather broad term, several distinctions have been made between each of the approaches. Basically, all the methods have participatory elements in common, but are also distinctive enough to – each of them – highlight a specific approach to participation.

In the following part, the three approaches will be explored. The perspective of this exploration is the search for theoretical lessons for the planning of urban foodscape. Point of departure in this search is the communicative or collaborative or participatory line of thought in solving the issues in foodscape (previous chapter, points of interest). How to overcome localism and temporariness in foodscape by embedding local initiatives for foodscape in spatial strategies? How to embed these initiatives in food planning?

### 4.2 Planning for Real (PFR) or Touchtable

Planning for Real (...) brings out an exchange of knowledge and experience – a controversial exchange, where people who are literally rubbing shoulders as they consider some part of the model are able to talk to each other out of the sides of their mouth, with their gaze focused on the subject matter, not each other personalities (Gibson, 1995, p.5).

Although PFR has been used for issues such as traffic, community safety, housing and environmental improvement, it has also been used for plan strategy formulation, local plan participation and development briefs for specific sites (Allmendinger, 2002, p. 204).

The Planning for Real-strategy emerged in the late 1970s and therefore may seem old and outdated, whereas its principles are still very much at matter in contemporary planning. Just as the concept of foodscape, participation is not a new concept after all. However, participation in planning processes is more of a leading trend or method now, than it used to be (in more technocratic, rational planning).

The modern equivalent of PFR can be found in the concept of Touchtable. Instead of physical models or maps spread out on the table, the Touchtable includes both tables as study-material. In fact, the Touchtable is a large digital Tablet, which can display several maps and visualizations from the GIS-database, which the involved people can view, discuss and adjust.

So, the main principle is connecting people to plan making actors via adjustable representations such as maps and models, in order to translate the opinions of participants in plan making. Another strong element is its strong spatial connotation as well as its consequence-related character. Planners and participants are directly able to envision their thoughts, but are also confronted with the results. Therefore PFR and Touchtable bear a strong sense of trial-and-error. In fact, PRF and Touchtable form a communicative bond between people, in the form of the study area itself.

Another principle of PFR is its character of planning and design through visualizations, as also argued by Van Dijk (2011). Representations are being used as mode of communication, and to ease the discussions, by envision the impacts and consequences.
The third principle is the synergy that can be created by trusting people and giving them the opportunity to fully participate and even draw or adjust model representations of the area.

Planning for Real is traditionally a model-based planning method, which includes participation of local people via discussions about models, which can be adapted. In this approach, a simple three-dimensional model is used so that local people can put forward suggestions by using pictorial option cards. Suggestions are then prioritized by the same process and a clear picture emerges of what needs to be done (Allmendinger, 2002).

From a more critical perspective, there are some critical notes to make, which determines the functioning of PRF. For example, who is involved in the process? And to what extent reaches this involvement? The extent of participation can be defined along the ladder of participation, as defined by Sherry Arnstein in 1969.

![Figure 5: Ladder of Participation, Arnstein (1969)](image)

Each step higher contains new freedoms and rights for citizens in the planning process. Arnstein argues that, in order to get the best (and most fair) participation, citizens should be more involved in the planning process, in serious issues and with formal responsibilities.

In terms of the “ideal” set out by Healey (1994) and the message from Dryzek (1990) that institutions and processes need to be “invented” by those involved, the PFR falls far short of what communicative planners would wish for. The process was already set, the venues chosen, the maps and issues decided and the discussions directed by planners (Allmendinger, 2002, p. 205). This refers back to the discussion about – the existence of – communicative rationality. So, looking at the implications of PFR or Touchtable, it is about the general set-up of the process (think about who is involved and how). Nevertheless, there are certain aspects which are clearly recognisable in the discussion on communicative processes; the “open” discussions, the identification and framing of problem and issues was partly left to the public, and the priorities put upon these, the layouts of the rooms and the process followed are all moves towards communicative processes (Allmendinger, 2002, p. 205).
4.3 Planning as Social Learning Theory (SLT)

Social Learning Theory (or SLT) originates from the field of psychology, introduced by Albert Bandura in 1963. In general it encompasses concepts of traditional learning theory and the operant conditioning of B.F. Skinner (explorable.com), expressed in Bandura’s behavioural experiment with bobo dolls and children reactions after adult behaviour. Most human behaviour is learned observationally through modelling: from observing other, one forms an idea of how new behaviours are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as guide for action (Bandura, 1963). People learn from one another, via observation, imitation and modeling, as a bridge between behaviorist and cognitive learning theories because it encompasses attention, memory and motivation. Or in other words: social learning theory explains human behaviour in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioural and environmental influences.

In that sense, planning can be seen as learning process well. Actually, as Holden argues, planning exists by the very assumption that we – planners and communities – are always in an learning process. “The assumption of the possibility of learning is central to planning theory and practice, in that all planning presupposes that either the physical arrangement of space, or social interactions within space, or both, can be changed with some purpose in mind. Change would hold no value, after all, if planners did not believe that there is at least a fair chance that changes can be purposeful and that changes can be improvements – that we can and do learn from past experiences, patterns and ideas and that we can translate this learning into new plans. It is a matter of common understanding, in planning and public practice as in any professional field, that with time comes wisdom; but good training and education can substitute for time, as can experience, and perhaps even natural ability” (Holden, 2008, p. 2). Learning, and therefore change or adapt the spatial organisation, is at the heart of the planning discipline.

But not only planners are in a learning process. In fact, the main concept or principle behind social learning is that participation and cohesion can be generated through a communal learning process. “As a specific, collective form of learning, social learning has special significance in planning and policy fields” (Holden, 2008, p.3). Without understanding and indeed promoting social learning, ‘there is little hope of reasoned resolution of the clash of inevitably partial ideologies or rationalities’ (Dryzek, 1990, p. 122). Social learning is based upon (...) social support, that is, most people’s willingness to act in a stewardship and supportive capacity” (Argyris, 1997). Besides that learning is essential in planning as a discipline (of plan making), social learning is also a tool in spatial planning, to embed spatial plans in the community by a joint learning process.

Second, social learning also seems to address issues such as multicultural society, democratic legitimation and growing complexity, because it’s strong focus on intersection of diverse visions. “Individuals and communities have diverse, partial, and sometimes irreconcilable perspectives on public problems and solutions. Learning together where these partial views intersect, diverge, and may reach compromise may be the only democratically legitimate means of devising socially reliable solutions to many contemporary planning and policy problems” (Holden, 2008, pg. 3). Social learning acknowledges the plural and various opinions within communities (as postmodernist approach), in within that given, strives for intersection and communality of these opinions. Actually, social learning strives for communicative rationality as well; there is no such thing as objective rationality, but some kind of rationality can achieved if the (majority of) people agrees.
Third, social learning – literally a process in the minds of people – moulds spatial planning, but on the other hand also embed plans in minds of people. “In failing to understand how learning processes function in the public realm, planners and policy makers miss an important means to connect with communities and members of the public to push for desired ends” (Holden, 2008, p. 3). In the end, it is the people who live there and make the space their own place. In that sense, social learning both adds value to the plan development (by delivering secondary knowledge) as the embedding of the plan in its site specific social context.

Danny Wildemeersch (in Wals, 2007) relates social learning directly to participatory process of planning. In trying to make the learning process more concrete, Wildemeersch describes four main phases in the learning process: planning (or action), reflection, communication and negotiation. Of course, the sequence of the phases can sometimes vary per planning case. Each phase is characterised by a certain tension; the social learning process has to manoeuvre between these tensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning or action</td>
<td>Need, Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Reflectivity, Reflexivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Unilateral, Multilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Conflict, Co-operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevance for Spatial Planning**

Social learning theory (SLT) can relate to the spatial planning of foodscape as communal participatory form of planning. Within the community, citizens can discuss initiatives and learn from each other, in developing the communal vision on food. Hereby the sequence of planning (or action), reflection, communication and negotiation gives the main structure. Social learning – literally a process in the minds of people – moulds spatial planning, but on the other hand also embed plans in minds of people: by approaching spatial planning (for foodscape) as social learning, it both generates ideas in the community as well as embed the arrangements in the hearts and minds of people.

Implications for spatial planning:

- social learning is at the essence of the planning discipline
- social learning is tool, to achieve willingness
- communicative rationality, addressing diverse communities and democratic legitimating
- embedding spatial plans in the minds
4.4 Evolutionary Governance Theory (EGT) – Van Assche, Beunen & Duineveld 2014

Evolutionary Governance Theory (EGT) can be seen as another, most recent, way of understanding planning. The shortest definition of the EGT is the following:

“Governance is the coordination of collectively binding decisions for a community. Everything in governance is the result of evolution: actors, institutions, organizations and discourses. Governance also affects the evolution of these elements. It introduces a cohesion that can be understood as co-evolution” (Van Assche et al., 2014, p. 79)

Actually, EGT states that plans, people, institutions or anything else is constructed by its context, and in their turn constructs others. Plans, actors and institutions can have varying and redefined roles, being influenced (or evolved) by other contexts, and in their turn influence other aspects. “Actors will transform in governance, as a result of the manner in which they are coordinated and the manner in which they coordinate” (Hacking, 1999). In fact, from a social-constructivist perspective, everything is relative, and can adept multiple – and changing – roles. EGT is very much about the context in which for example the planning case takes place, as well as its strong relation to interaction – as part of governance – between the different actors, which can evolve during the process. In other words, each region has its own ingredients (based on path dependence, interdependence and future dependence; Van Assche et al., p. 81) but how the ingredients interact and influence each other – the “construction” - is different for each recipe or meal. “Each path, and the sites it connects, is unique. Each site is marked by different techniques of governance” (Van Assche et al., p.81).

In broader perspective, scientist speaks of evolutionary or organic development (EGT is an addition of that line of thinking). Platform 31 defined the characteristics of organic development as: gradually approach, small scale development, focus on process rather than on project, strategic characteristic, containing small developers and private persons, wherein the municipality facilitates, and development and maintenance is mixed (Platform 31, 2012). This debate fits in the broader transition from government to governance, including the growing complexity of society and therefore plan making. It is in the same perspective that EGT emerges. In in modern governance, laws, policies, but also plans can play the role of formal institution (Van Assche et al., 2014). “The continuous discursive transformation taking place in governance, the instability of objects, subjects and narratives, as well as the construction of spatial and temporal boundaries governance deploys to structure itself” (Van Assche et al., 2014, p.8). In fact, although there are many uncertainties, the right configurations will lead to an planning structure – although this is ever evolving.

So, EGT refuses to see planning as a rigid process, but as a dynamic, interacting and evolving process, with evolving roles – as influenced by the interaction between each other – for the various actors. It is about the (process of) creating actors in planning processes. Each place is the result of a different and evolving process of governance, wherein different factors worked differently upon each other. So, each place is the result of a unique process wherein various factors interacted in a certain way; which, actually, makes each site unique (and context dependent).
EGT has three main methodological implications, as argued by Van Assche et al.:

(1) **Mapping** of governance paths and their context; analysing which actors or subjects are involved and how their roles are defined over time.

(2) **Detailed investigation** of the discursive mechanics that can be observed in the path or related paths.

(3) **Categorisation** of a governance arrangement, in terms of a cohesive set of choice dimensions, can bring yet another perspective to path reconstruction.

In this respect, what does EGT implicates for planning for foodscapes?

EGT is very much of a constructivist theory: each planning (or governance) project is unique and the result of a site specific interaction, influenced by path dependencies and power-knowledge relations. What results, is a unique role or entity, constructed by various influences, and which can change over time. In fact, everything is constructed by everything.

However, EGT has major implications for the thinking and shaping of the planning process, especially on the definition and approach to an actor. From an EGT perspective, an *actor* is only an actor when he thinks of himself as an actor, or is shaped as one, by other actors or circumstances. “The continuous confrontation with others, their strategies and ideas, in the production of polices, plans and laws, will inevitably change an actor” (Van Assche et al., 2014). And this role as actor can vary over time, or ultimately, fade away. In the following chapter this will be evaluated in practise, but it is an major chance in thinking about the process of planning for foodscapes: the local initiatives, and the people behind it, are the actors? And are they seen as actors?

Another interesting is the so called goal or future dependence, wherein actors/institutions are dependent on the fact that they will work together again in the future. Besides, EGT speaks of *path dependency*; wherein in an actor can be stuck in a former role, and never really transforms in a newer role. Path dependency – based on historical distribution of roles – merely occurs in relation to governments or other formal institutions, since they are somehow bounded to a classical way of thinking. But, such “settings” are only being used if they are literally kept alive. For example, laws from earlier centuries have to be updated sometimes, since the public doesn’t forward the implications of the law anymore. In the same sense, if a certain role in the planning process is not being forwarded each time, it can alter as well.

Another aspect for spatial planning is the fact that we – as planners – can try to shape processes, but only to a certain extent, and in its turn, the process (and its paths, actors, etc.) shapes and moulds itself and us as well. This is something planners should take in consideration; we can’t force initiatives and their outcomes, only can help to shape the process in the way that it works best.

To conclude, EGT has major implications for spatial planning regarding how to think of the planning approach. Especially, EGT offers insights in how to think about (and approach) actors in the process. In short, the points of interest:

- Constructivist theory; each planning process is the result of a unique interaction between people (hidden power relations, path dependencies) and the site in – and dependent – in time.
- Actor approach: being an *actor* is not so obvious at all, the approach in time towards actors is essential in their contribution to the planning process. Roles have to be stated to keep them alive.
- Path- and future dependency: actors can be dependent on former roles, their *paths*. Their new roles have to be vitalised each time.
4.6 Communicative Planning Strategies: Summary

As concluded earlier, urban foodscapes are about food production, in the direct surroundings of people, so it relates to people’s lives and spaces. Therefore urban foodscapes bear a strong spatial component. How to approach this spatial aspect of foodscapes? In theory, how can we plan for foodscapes? Planning for foodscapes fits within communicative planning strategies, based on the characteristics of urban foodscapes, such as localism and bottom-up initiatives. Within this mainstream of planning strategies, three specific planning methods have been chosen on their applicability for foodscapes and various implications.

The first strategy planning for real (PFR) or Touchtable embeds community participation by plan making via discussing over adaptable models, maps and visualisations, with participants all around it. Although it depends on the participants who are involved, and their extent of participation on the ladder of participation, PFR bears strong influences of bottom-up planning. By visualisation, discussion and altering, the participants construct their surroundings themselves.

The second strategy Social Learning, implicates (food) planning as a communal learning process. By going through the learning process as a group or community, ideas can be generated among the participants, as well as its strong embedding (and positive energy). It is about a direct connection of participants to each other, to the space and the planning process. In fact, the main concept or principle behind social learning is that participation and cohesion can be generated through a communal learning process. Social learning also seems to address issues such as multicultural society, democratic legitimation and growing complexity, because it’s strong focus on intersection of diverse visions. Actually, social learning strives for communicative rationality as well; there is no such thing as objective rationality, but some kind of rationality can achieved if the (majority of) people agrees. Besides, social learning – literally a process in the minds of people – moulds spatial planning, but on the other hand also embeds plans in minds of people.

The third strategy Evolutionary Governance Theory offers a renewed perspective on the construction and evolution of planning process. EGT is very much of a post-modern constructivist theory: each planning (or governance) project is unique and the result of a site specific interaction, influenced by path dependencies and power-knowledge relations. What results, is a unique role or entity, constructed by various influences, and which can change over time. In fact, everything is constructed by everything. This has especially major implications for how to approach actors. How to approach citizens and their initiatives in the planning process? Another interesting implication is the so called goal or future dependence, wherein actors/institutions are dependent on the fact that they will work together again in the future. And furthermore, we can’t force initiatives and their outcomes, only can help to shape the process in the way that it works best.
4.5 Communicative Planning Strategies and Foodscapes; what theoretical lessons to be learned?

After the theoretical explorations of the concept of foodscapes and the communicative planning strategies, this chapter synthesises the forwarded knowledge. In the previous chapters, both foodscapes and CPS have been discussed separately; this part focuses on bringing them together. The characteristics of urban foodscapes, and therefore its specific planning questions, will be answered with the features of the discussed planning strategies. In that sense, the above described planning strategies can add to the planning of urban foodscapes.

- Planning and localism

Urban foodscapes are very much local constructions, it about the food production in the close surrounding of people, connecting people to food and places. Besides, urban foodscapes are small scale spatial features. Therefore, urban foodscapes need to be approached from a local scale, engaging with the people, and their relation to food and place. CPS is based on local approaches. Besides, as EGT opts for, it is the community itself (and the municipality) that should reshape and maintain modern planning frameworks.

- Planning and participation

Secondly, hence urban foodscapes are very much about people’s local food production, it should be about the people of the area of neighbourhood itself, and their relation to food. Therefore, embed participatory features in the planning process. In order to make it a people’s project, the foodscape should ultimately relate to the people themselves, as a local community construction. CPS strongly focuses on communication and interaction, and therefore offers possibilities for participation. Methods such as planning for real and Touchtable could engage with people, in order to generate participation. Both methods are not methods per se, but means of enhancing participation in planning processes.

- Planning and dependency

Moreover, after establishing localism and participation, it is about widespread participation. However, contemporary urban foodscapes are mostly very dependent on one or two individuals. These individuals embody the urban foodscape, and are therefore essential for the existence of the foodscape. Nevertheless, an urban foodscape can only be sustainable (as in long-term sustainability) it is carried by more people, or even better: the whole of the community. In order to achieve more community-wide, sustainable foodscapes, more people should be involved, by enhancing the social learning theory. In other words; transform the urban foodscape from a rather individual project towards a community project.

- Planning and temporariness

The temporary character of many urban foodscapes could be addressed by (a) embedding the urban foodscapes in the minds of people, connecting them more to the site, by social learning, and (b) change the path dependency of governmental institutions, thus to enhance urban foodscapes as a more consistent and widespread land-use. Once again, a new planning framework should be made and maintained. Hereafter, these theoretical lessons will be tested in two examples from the practise, the cases of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. What is the current practise in planning for foodscapes? And what can practise learn from above described theory, and vice versa?
Chapter 5 Case Studies: Amsterdam, Rotterdam

After the theoretical framework – consisting of the concept of urban foodscapes and three communicative planning strategies – this chapter introduces the two case studies, bridging theory and practise. In the case studies, the theoretical lessons will be compared to the practical strategies in recently emerging food visions, of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The emphasis is on food strategies in the practise of two case studies, where after the conclusions serves to compare theory with practise and draw conclusions and recommendations. Actually, this chapter switches to the practise of produced strategies. Main question among this chapter can be formulated as: how is food strategically approached in the practise of food visions?

5.1 Case Study of Amsterdam

The case study of Amsterdam has been analysed via the data collection methods of document analysis and interviewing. The chapter starts with the summary document analyses. Thereafter the summary of the interview is presented, whereas entire interview can be found in the Appendix.

Summary of Document Analysis

“Voedsel en Amsterdam; Een Voedselvisie en Agenda voor de Stad” – January 2014

The Amsterdam food vision is about the citizens of Amsterdam and how they relate to food. The Amsterdam food vision consists of four main themes or pillars: food and health, food and economy, food and participation and food and sustainability. Actually, the main emphasis is on awareness of food and the offering of responsible and sustainable alternatives. Awareness can be achieved, according to the Municipality of Amsterdam, by educating children by special food programmes (and farms) and showing how food grows. Besides, the municipality wants to offer a widespread offering of responsible alternatives, such as local food, biological food, healthy school canteen and offering meat substitutes. So the Amsterdam food vision is not only about food production for the market, but more about awareness about food, attractivity of the city and increasing social cohesion. The food vision focuses primary on foodscapes as lifestyle and for social goals and secondary for its food production, referring back to the various discourses. Interesting is the fifth chapter of the food vision, the goals and agenda to achieve it; the so called food agenda. Regarding the stimulation of the production of food in the city, several measures are being forwarded:

- helping to find suitable sites and buildings;
- giving information about required licenses and zoning plans;
- the set-up of a Voedsel Informatie Punt (VIP) – “food information point” – where all the above mentioned information can be found;
- helping in launching a website where initiators and interested persons can find and inform each other;
- the realising of several different (urban farming) parts of the bidbook Floriade 2022 in Amsterdam Zuidoost.
Summary of Interview

**Interviewee:** Frank Bakkum, spatial planner, municipality of Amsterdam (Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening), co-writer of Voedselvisie Amsterdam

**Interviewer / Researcher:** Wim Bosschaart

**Date:** Wednesday 17 December, 10:15-11:30, Amsterdam, voormalige stadstimmertuin 4.

**Goal:** Get an overview of the practise in strategies towards foodscape - to combine theory and practise afterwards, to formulate and advise for planning for foodscape.

The Amsterdam Food Vision is an elaboration of the three years earlier produced City Vision. In this structural city vision food was acknowledged as special theme, to be elaborated in an specific food vision. The alderman of Green and Public Space was in charge of this strategy, but directors of all layers have worked on the food vision. Actors have been involved in (1) a meeting with practise-oriented people and (2) a meeting with all the directories, directors and aldermen. The planning horizon has been set at 2025, but the food vision has to be translated in a concrete agenda and zoning plan each year. Although not every aspect bears a spatial connotation, most aspects consist of an spatial translation.

In the food vision, the municipality of Amsterdam positions itself as central actor, setting preconditions, wherein citizens are able to take initiatives. So the municipality offers an framework, but is - within this framework - dependent on local initiatives. For example, new zoning plans can have the function of "urban agriculture". Also some financial support can be applied for, but in general the initiatives are personal enterprises. There are no selecting procedures for initiatives, although each district can give various space to initiatives based on its predicted functioning and success-rate.

Citizens are informed about the initiatives by showing and naming the already functioning initiatives. Besides, the municipality organised a Food Information Point; one desk for informing, supporting and connecting initiatives. An important role is there for the societal partners, such as Farming the City and Platform Eetbaar Amsterdam. So, the municipality sets the preconditions, where in the citizens can take initiatives and societal partners function as connecting elements. The municipality is there for all the citizens and the general interest, which can sometimes be conflicting with initiatives and that, is why the municipality searches for a cooperative attitude.

The initiatives consist of two groups; on the one hand the neighbourhood initiatives (community-based), on the other hand a group of self-reliant citizens (as lifestyle). The municipality is dependent on what initiatives they receive. What groups participate most, and to what extent of success, is not acquainted by the municipality. And are it real local initiatives or is there an intermediary actor with interest in it? Initiatives are supported by the district, but also by the Stadsloods (function within DRO for all initiatives searching for space in the city). Besides there are initiative teams among the districts, close to the practise.

More in general, the Municipality of Amsterdam faces a shifting practise in planning as well. The centralistic top-down approach functions no more, and therefore more and more emphasis is on bottom-up strategies. But the answers and standards for this new approach to planning have not yet been set. The municipality starts experimenting with workshops and meetings. For example, some citizens designed their own square. But what about the public interest in these forms? There are new circumstances for the municipality. But this also creates possibilities. The most important role of the municipality is openness. Although we're seeking the right approach, everybody should have the
chance to participate. As municipality we're also thinking of new forms of planning (de Nieuwe Wibaut). By suggestion, also a connecting FoodApp could be of help. The most important notion is, once again, openness: space for experiments. Try to make space within the organisation to introduce new forms and approaches. And evaluate them on their functioning.

Amsterdam characterises itself by the development and renewal in food. The municipality should take a stand in public debate about sustainability and effective production. The task is to translate that in the city. Up scaling of local produced food, for example. Food will not solve every problem, but can add to solutions. It starts with your own organisation; which has to be open minded towards new initiatives and new organisational models (internal). Besides, the municipality should show what is going on and what citizens can contribute to that. The municipality can connect.

5.2 Case Study of Rotterdam

The case study of Rotterdam has been analysed via the data collection methods of document analysis and interviewing. The chapter starts with the summary document analyses. Thereafter the summary of the interview is presented, whereas entire interview can be found in the Appendix.

Summary of Document Analysis

“Food & The City: Stimuleren van Stadslandbouw in en om Rotterdam” - Februari 2012

The policy document of Rotterdam contains a special chapter about “strategies to support urban agriculture”. In short, the following schema summarizes the strategic aspects of the Rotterdam Food Vision:
The emphasis is on health, sustainable economy and spatial quality. What differs Rotterdam, is the use of a multicultural society, according of the vision. Once again, the municipality takes a facilitating role in the planning process. “The actions of the municipality aim at creating good conditions for civil initiatives, education, contribute to research and bringing together different parties” (Food & The City, p. 17). Actually, the main strategy for urban agriculture is the stimulation of initiatives of civilians, companies and organisations. The content and ideas have to come from society; the municipality supports the initiatives which fit in the policy agenda. The municipality uses the potential of society, combining civil initiative and entrepreneurship.

Looking at the earlier named occurrence of localism in foodscapes, the municipality want to maintain the spontaneous character of urban agriculture, bottom-up initiatives. The role of the municipality is thinking along with the initiatives, if needed, or solve problems.

Strong point of this food vision is the notion of action points after each part, in which is concretely named what steps the Municipality of Rotterdam is going to take. However, some action points are rather weak, others more strong and exact. What is missing is the question of how the initiatives emerge and linked to municipality? The municipality actually works a bit restrained; initiatives have to come up and find the municipality.

Summary of Interview

**Interviewee:** Annemieke Fontein, municipality of Rotterdam, landscape architect, urban development, co-writer of Food & the City Rotterdam  
**Interviewer / Researcher:** Wim Bosschaart  
**Date:** Wednesday 7th of January  
**Goal:** Get an overview of the practise in strategies towards foodscapes - to combine theory and practise afterwards, to formulate and advise for planning for foodscapes.

Annemieke Fontein is responsible for the quality of the products in the public realm of the municipality of Rotterdam, especially in the inner city. Besides, Annemieke, leads the Think-tank Stadslandbouw and Regional Food Council Rotterdam, and contributed to the Rotterdam Food Vision. It is about a policy framework rather than an official food vision, to stimulate urban agriculture, assigned by the college of B&W and alderman Alexandra van Huffelen. It is one of the many policy documents. Although there is an executive programme, there are no hard elements in the document. Besides the executive programme, the Regional Food Council has been established, as part of the economical food cluster.

The policy framework is the result of some 3-4 years of network meeting with various stakeholders in the food chain (farmers, distributors, restaurants, citizens, self-employed entrepreneurs) about food. As an result of the meetings, three goals were formulated, namely health, spatial quality and sustainable economy. The reasons for these meetings were twofold; on the one hand it was about getting clear whether urban agriculture is a trend or not; on the other hand the stakeholders were asked to give their opinion on what they would expect from the municipality. Besides, from the beginning there has been corporation with experts (such as Jan-Willem van der Schans, LEI) and their networks, since food is a relatively new theme to the municipality. Even more, the role of the municipality was unclear to the municipality itself, and had to be defined.
Because the arrangement of the policy document *Food & The City: Stimuleren van Stadslandbouw in en om Rotterdam* started at the Urban Development Department, the spatial component is embedded in two of the three goals; spatial diversity by small citizens initiatives and maintain the rural surroundings of the city. Over time, the theme of food has spread and broadened and is more and more embedded in the economic policy of the municipality, aiming at the Top Sector Food (including Westland and Rotterdam harbour).

In Rotterdam, three types of urban agriculture can be recognised:

- Urban-focused farmers, who would like to supply the city (at the edge of Rotterdam) commercially. Think of products such as milk and vegetables, but also services as excursions, daily care and bed-and-breakfasts.
- Social-economic initiatives, about initiatives with social concern but as well economic gain, which can vary. Also about guiding people back to work, offer structure, get concerned (think of Voedselbank with garden)
- Citizen’s initiatives, such as common gardens on open spaces in the public realm.

This distinction implicates that the municipality of Rotterdam has several approaches. Citizen initiatives are being supported, but almost no financial support is given. Concerning social-economic initiatives, the municipality offered possibilities for renting land plots. Regarding the urban-focused farmers, the municipality actively mediates, broadens networks and improves the relation between the city and its surroundings.

In communicating and informing towards citizens, the municipality takes an awaiting attitude. Via website, markets and using existing networks such as Eetbaar Rotterdam, the municipality aims at showing what is possible in food and what not. It really has to be an initiative of the citizens. Nevertheless, in some neighbourhoods the municipality takes a more supportive and proactive attitude, together with GGD and self-employed entrepreneurs to get started with the citizens. For example, project of Eetbaar Rotterdam (translated: Edible Rotterdam). Besides, municipalities are often not very good in maintaining websites, and also Rotterdam has too less capacity for that. Nevertheless, most information goes via external networks such as Eetbaar Rotterdam.

How to connect initiatives? Well, the various districts sometimes actively strived for more involvement of citizens with the public space, for example via gardens. But also in the districts the device is that initiatives have to come from citizens themselves. Therefore the municipality organised network meetings to connect initiatives and made them visible. However, how to support these initiatives? The bottom line is that the municipality of Rotterdam does not provide financial support by any citizen initiative. Till 2014 Rotterdam had 13 districts, with own budgets. Small contributions for citizen’s initiatives have been made. Besides, urban agriculture has not been added as a land use function. It is the question whether the communal gardens that have emerged over time, can be maintained, if the construction sector grows again.

One of the issues in urban agriculture is the question of who is the owner of the ground. Between 2008 and 2012 it was not so hard to provide ground for temporary use, but no landowner wanted to make arrangements for the long term. Now that the building sector is growing again, it is getting harder. Besides it was not possible to make a map with empty land plots because each plot bears a certain ground value, and by making an official map rents should be paid. In smaller municipalities it could be easier to deal with, and offer compensation, but in large municipalities there are a lot larger urban problems that ask for money.
What about the future? Healthy food (-production) will stay in the public interest, both worldwide as well as on a local scale. Worldwide, the focus is on the growing lack of resources, and therefore on the production of resources (and food), also in the close surroundings of people. Besides, the demand for food with as less as possible adaptation and additional food grows, which also has to be affordable and accessible. This is an important issue for the municipality of Rotterdam. The question is whether the movement of communal gardens will grow and can be maintained. There is definitely a challenge, because there is even more the emerging of regional food selling points, and besides farming costs much time. Furthermore, the innovative sector is a growing market, starting with small bottom-up initiatives.

In planning for urban agriculture, it is very necessary to investigate what questions rise among citizens. Besides, investigate what goals or needs the city have to fulfil that you can combine with food production. Clear definitions can help as well.
Chapter 6 Conclusion

This chapter concludes this research with answering all research questions. After a short review of what we have seen, conclusions per question follow. Where do theory and practice have overlap and learn from each other? A comparison of theoretical lessons and the reality of practice.

What is the research problem?

What was the problem of this research again? Since the rapid urbanisation the issue of food is becoming more and more a natural thing – in the sense that it is always available in the city – which has led to ignorance in thinking of food and its spatial component. However, due to increased geopolitics – caused by globalisation - and the recognition that food relates to other factors such as health and social cohesion, food is once again on the agenda. Since approaching food also deals with strategies and communication, and has to be translated into space, it is an issue in spatial planning as well. As a result, many cities worldwide are producing food visions. In the Netherlands, Amsterdam and Rotterdam are experimenting with how to approach food, among many other cities. In that respect, urban foodscapes serve as a means to achieve awareness of food, which is once again a means for targeting other issues such as obesity. The urban foodscape adds to awareness, by bringing the food back to the people in the city; by showing them how food "works". But based on the characteristics of urban foodscapes - often dependent on local initiatives - tools can be made. In this case, tools can be found in supporting and embedding the local initiatives in food strategies (thus to enhance urban foodscapes, which target food awareness).

Figure 6: Goals, means and tool in food planning. By Wim Bosschaart.

How did urban foodscapes emerge over the past?

Nevertheless, the concept of food production in an urban setting is not new at all. Although food was merely produced by the rural surroundings of a city (in fact, agriculture is at the basis of the emerging of cities), food production has always been part of the cities of the past. However, urban foodscapes face a strong renewed interest, not only resulting in various new forms, but also on the strategic levels of policy making, resulting in urban foodscapes. The re-emerge of foodscapes has two major causes; the new food equation, which puts food planning on the geo-political agenda, as well as the increased consciousness of food and health due to increased welfare. Therefore food is more and more an issue in spatial planning, as developing of the field of food planning. Food planners are working in, or engaged with, the food system with the aim of rendering it more sustainable with respect to its social, economic and ecological effects.
What is meant by the concept of foodscapes?

Urban foodscapes can be defined as socially constructed urban landscapes or places which are able to produce food or deal with other forms of food processing along the food chain, including institutional settings, and which relate people and food to places, especially on a local or community scale. Urban foodscapes can have multiple spatial configurations, dependent on the community and the goals related to the foodscape. The spatial component is in this translation of thinking about food into a spatial organisation; relating food to places and to people. What are the most striking points in urban foodscapes to be taken into account whilst planning for them?

- The majority of urban foodscapes bears a strong temporary character – how to enhance more structural urban foodscapes?
- Urban foodscapes are very much dependent of initiatives from citizens, and therefore very much carry a participatory character; how to support and enhance these initiatives?
- Urban foodscapes often depend on one or two individuals, in coming up with the initiative, bringing it to practise and maintain it;
- Urban foodscapes can be distinguished in a) self-reliant individual projects or b) guided, communal projects, depending on the community;
- Urban foodscapes can have multiple spatial configurations, varying from backyard gardening to guerrilla gardening and rooftop farming, depending on the community;
- The dependence on the community and local site (as well as the initiatives), give urban foodscapes a very local character. Urban foodscapes can be seen as a site-specific spatial construction, build upon various site specific conditions, as a kind of palimpsest.
- The actual urban foodscape itself is the translation of thinking about food in to its spatial organisation, relating food to places and people. The landscape is the actual way in which the concept is shaped, communicated and used.

What various forms communicative planning strategies seems applicable for foodscapes? And what are their characteristics and how do they work?

*Communicative Planning Strategies (CPS)* or *Collaborative Planning* (Allmendinger, 2002) can be seen an umbrella for planning approaches from the perspective of communication. Communicative Planning Strategies relate to urban foodscapes, since CPS has a strong focus on communication, participation and issues of localism, relating to the above mentioned characteristics of urban foodscapes.

From a theoretical perspective, Communicative Planning Strategies such as Planning for Real (PFR), Social Learning Theory (SLT) and Evolutionary Governance Theory (EGT) seems to address these issues of how to embed initiatives, how to think of actors and how to overcome locality. Planning for Real forwards that participation can be shaped by connecting citizens (the participants), plan makers and the site by discussing over representations such as models and visualisations. The *object* in this case, bridges the various actors. Social Learning Theory approaches planning as a joint learning process. SLT does not think in organisational terms, but in people and processes. SLT generates both ideas among participants as well as embeds them in the community. Besides, it addresses issues of the multicultural society, democratic legitimation and growing complexity, because of the strong focus on the communality of participants. Evolutionary Governance Theory has implications for the planning of foodscapes, since it very much relates to the approach of the initiatives and the thinking of how to
organise the process. Essential is the actor theory; who are actors (and who are not) and how to approach them? In fact, each site is constructed by a unique planning process. With different roles for the various actors; roles, which are to be forwarded and made clear each time, to keep them alive. Besides, actors can be bounded by path and future dependencies. Actually, planners should not have the illusion to force the process, but only try to shape it in a well-thought conscious way.

How do the characteristics of urban foodscapes merge with the rationales behind the Communicative Planning Strategies?

- **Planning and localism**

Urban foodscapes are very much *local constructions*, it about the food production in the close surrounding of people, connecting people to food and places. Besides, urban foodscapes are small scale spatial features. Therefore, urban foodscapes need to be approached from a local scale, engaging with the people, and *their* relation to food and place. CPS is based on local approaches. Besides, as EGT opts for, it is the community itself (and the municipality) that should reshape and maintain modern planning frameworks.

- **Planning and participation**

Secondly, hence urban foodscapes are very much about people’s local food production, it should be about *the people* of the area of neighbourhood itself, and their relation to food. Therefore, embed participatory features in the planning process. In order to make it a people’s project, the foodscape should ultimately relate to the people themselves, as a local community construction. CPS strongly focuses on communication and interaction, and therefore offers possibilities for participation. Methods such as planning for Real and Touchtable could engage with people, in order to generate participation. Both methods are not methods per se, but means of enhancing participation in planning processes.

- **Planning and dependency**

Moreover, after establishing localism and participation, it is about *widespread* participation. However, contemporary urban foodscapes are mostly very dependent on one or two individuals. These individuals embody the urban foodscapes, and are therefore essential for the existence of the foodscape. Nevertheless, an urban foodscape can only be sustainable (as in long-term sustainability) it is carried by more people, or even better: the whole of the community. In order to achieve more community-wide, sustainable foodscapes, more people should be involved, by enhancing the social learning theory. In other words; transform the urban foodscape from a rather individual project towards a community project.

- **Planning and temporariness**

The temporary character of many urban foodscapes could be addressed by (a) embedding the urban foodscapes in the minds of people, connecting them more to the site, by social learning, and (b) change the *path dependency* of governmental institutions, thus to enhance urban foodscapes as a more consistent and widespread land-use. Once again, a new planning framework should be made and maintained.
What strategies or approaches can be found in the food visions of the case studies? What seems to work and what not?

After the theoretical framework – consisting of urban foodscapes and communicative planning strategies, and how they can interact – this part focuses on the planning for urban foodscapes in practise, in the cases of Amsterdam and Rotterdam. After document analysis of the food visions, interviews have been taken with the municipalities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam.

In both cases it seemed that food is such a new theme in planning that the municipalities have no clear answer yet about how to approach food planning. Both municipalities were experimenting with different methods, seeking for the best way to embed food in spatial planning. Even more, the shift from top-down planning to bottom-up planning, and therefore the growing importance of participation, raises questions as well. This seeking to new standards and approaches is also translated in the municipal approach, which is actually very awaiting. In fact, the municipality sketches the framework and the preconditions, but there within, it is dependent on the citizen initiatives for foodscapes. In the same sense, the citizens have to find the municipality, and not vice versa. Moreover, the communication towards citizens is not clear as well. And although the municipality (or districts), as is also argued by the interviewees, keeps an important deciding role, they are very much dependent on what the initiatives bring. Moreover, in terms of EGT, the municipalities are still bounded by their former roles, and have difficulties in finding their new role in spatial planning. The local and participatory character of foodscapes seems yet hard to embed in municipal spatial planning.

What can planning for foodscapes learn from communicative planning strategies?

Concluding, planning for foodscapes bears lots of potential as shown by the theoretical suggestions, however this potential is not fully activated this far. Contemporary conservative planning is not fully aligned towards a modern trend as urban foodscapes.

In the trend from top-down planning to bottom-up planning, the municipalities do not yet have a clear approach on how to approach planning for foodscapes. Nevertheless, several initiatives have been taken, and both municipalities starting to address food as a planning theme. Although the good attempts, both municipalities are still bounded by their former role and have no clear approach to planning of foodscapes.

However, as the theory suggests, there is a lot of potential for the planning of foodscapes. First of all, abandoning current institutional patterns could open the planning for foodscapes. As EGT argues, institutional settings exist because they are kept alive, by its users. Now it is time to open up this framework, and establish an opener one.

The municipality should make a level ground, where politics, professionals and public truly interact. Integration, that once again connects spatial planning back to the ground; the actual sites and people itself. Once again, intentions by municipalities have already made clear: they want to embrace participation. They obviously do, but it now results in a waiting though deciding attitude. This role should be abandoned, and again defined in the changing societal context of emerging participation.
After the establishing of new institutional setting, a major step, it is time to design ways of how to organise participation. The last chapter, concerning Recommendations, comes up with suggestions for shaping the new planning process. Tools as planning for real and Touchtable could help in this process, since urban foodscapes obviously rely on local engagement and maintenance, as we have seen a couple parts above.
Chapter 7  Discussion

This chapter takes a broader perspective on the conclusion, since the conclusion touches bigger issues such as awareness, governmental dynamics and the spatial component. The discussion draws upon the comparison of the theoretical framework – containing the concept of foodscape and three communicative planning strategies - and the practice-based interviews.

7.1 Awareness

The goal of both food visions of Amsterdam and Rotterdam is foremost to raise the awareness of food. And secondly, by raising the awareness, address other problems such as obesity and imported products with a large ecological footprint. In fact, awareness is the goal of municipalities, but serves as well as a means to solve other problems. This raises the question, what is actually meant by awareness, since it is a rather black box, same as with the term sustainability. And besides, should we be aware of everything, in our specialised society? And awareness is it the real goal or is it a means for something else?

In fact, urban foodscape brings food back to the surroundings of the people, as explored during this research. And by doing so, food - which has become a vague, complex and most natural thing - once again relates to people. But even more, referring back to the problem and goal of this research, it shows people how food works. From scientific literature, by showing and confronting people, awareness can be achieved (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). In that sense, urban foodscape indeed bear potential to raise awareness. Think of questions such as: where does our food come from? How is food produced? And how does it look like? But that raises the question whether this theoretical function of urban foodscape raises awareness in practise. From the goal of raising awareness, is that fully reached by this municipal approach? First of all, the people themselves have to come up with initiatives, but presumably these people themselves are already aware of their food. Otherwise, they would not suggest other forms of dealing with food. However, other citizens can be informed, so it works partly in raising awareness. And secondly, what exactly the citizens should be aware of is not clear from the municipal documents. Even more, to achieve real awareness, is a complex process. Real awareness can be achieved via three steps: knowing, attitude and behaviour. First of all, one should understand or know what is at stake. Secondly, one should see and recognise the different options. And at last, people should also literally do something.

The point is that while focusing on awareness, but shifting the initiative outside the government, some sort of selection takes place. A selection, because only the citizens with time, financial support, knowledge and energy will dive in to gap that is given by the government. This group is definitely already more aware of the issue of food – otherwise they would not have taken the initiative to change the food organisation. And besides their already raised awareness, it is also the wealthier group with higher social-economic status. In this respect, the drawback of the government leaves space for initiatives, but the group of people who can take an initiative is definitely predetermined. In fact, the initiatives the government strives for are not equally reached by outsourcing the initiative. The wealthier group of people can determine the surroundings of many other people.
7.2 Governmental dynamics

Besides, this research is very much about the role of the government – in this case of the municipalities. In that sense, the research fits in the broader transition (and debate) from top-down planning towards bottom-up planning. But – referring back to the conclusion – the municipalities themselves don’t know the answers right now on how to deal with the new situation of initiatives. It seems that the interviewed municipalities rigorously transferred from top-down to bottom-up planning, without having clear understanding of how to approach this new situation. Therefore, they are actually still very much dependent on their former governmental role; so called “path dependency” (Van Assche et al., 2014). The municipal approach towards initiatives is, however they are trying to change, still very static and classical. This classical approach is being expressed in the interview with Amsterdam; wherein the interviewee sees the biggest gain in approaching initiatives in the organisational structures of the municipality; within the municipality there should be space to alter. In fact, this illustrates a classical thinking in organisational forms, instead of thinking in people (as being forwarded by Social Learning Theory). The municipalities are still bounded by their former or existing structures, and it seems hard to disconnect from them (Van Assche et al., 2014). In that respect, the awaiting and frame worked attitude of the municipalities emerged, wherein the citizens should come up with initiatives. Whereas both EGT as SLT opts for an abandoning of the classical structures - in fact, if they aren’t kept alive, they disappear - and shift towards a more open and gradually defined project. In the municipal search towards a new planning approach, one of the biggest gains can be found in this rethinking of the governmental role. Although their good attempt in giving space to initiatives, the line of reasoning is still very much classical. It seems a bit of rough transition towards bottom-up initiatives, wherein the municipalities have difficulties in defining their own role.

7.3 Spatial component

This research started from the spatial perspective on foodscapes and their strategies; but after all, how large is the spatial component of food strategies?

In the end, the spatial component is the translation of a social phenomenon to a spatial configuration: the urban foodscape (Mikkelsen, 2011). Regarding the first paragraph of this chapter, the spatial component – bringing food in the city - is a means of achieving other goals. The spatial component is also a tool, in that sense. Once again, landscapes bear politics as well. Besides, the conclusion as well as the previous paragraph illustrated that planning for foodscapes is more than just about the spatial appearance of food. Planning for foodscapes is about how to deal with initiatives, and the role of actors (such as the municipality) in the processes. In the end, the place is the result of a planning process, and the people, with various roles, in it. After all, it is not especially about the spatial component; however it is being used as a tool. The urban foodscapes influence how our space is structured, organised and used.
Epilogue  Recommendations

After comparison of theory and practice in the conclusion, and some critical notes in the discussion, this chapter focuses on recommendations for planning for foodscapes. These normative recommendations are both based on overlap between theory and practice in the conclusions as well as based on observations and theoretical suggestions. However, this epilogue is not meant to illustrate how planning for foodscapes should work, but it is a cautious attempt to suggest other ways of thinking.

First of all, as earlier mentioned, urban foodscapes are meant as a means to raise awareness. The means can be operationalised by stimulating local initiatives. How to approach these initiatives? The role of the municipality should be neither top-down nor bottom-up oriented; the answer is probably somewhere in between. Top-down approaches have proven not to work anymore (although there are benefits of this approach), bottom-up awaiting either. No, the principle of (and striving for) bottom-up initiatives can be embraced, but more in a mediated planning approach. A planning, wherein the government authorities neither force nor wait; but constructively approach communities in an open planning process, which is defined and shaped collectively. Planning for Society, that name got me. Planning, which is embedded in society, which is about the close environments of people. The "new" planner combines top-down skills in a bottom-up oriented process. Planning for Real (PFR), Social Learning Theory (SLT) and Evolutionary Governance Theory (EGT) can be seen as influential streams, at the heart of the "new" planner. But how does it look like? Therefore we use the concept of urban foodscapes again.

For example, an office block is being deserted by its company. The municipality keeps track of free spaces within the municipal borders, and communicates this openly to society via a website, maps and app. Although the municipalities have a quite open approach and are willing to use initiatives right now, it should be more actively carried out and communicated to the citizens (via modern information means). In this respect, municipalities can sincerely strive for initiatives, because the citizens are informed via various means which connect to them. Instead of hoping that initiatives will come, an active open and communicative approach could work better in stimulating initiatives. Also because, at least by the attempts of trying to connect more to the people, more initiatives can be generated and the concept of foodscapes makes more difference. Even more, as PFR forwards, visualisations can help to communicate (and therewith) inform citizens. In order to achieve all this, the municipality should think of their communication plan. The first intention is that citizens can come up with initiatives themselves, by contacting their municipality or district about their initiative, but that they should be informed via an active communication plan.

After that, each municipal district has several spatial planners. In short, these planners pick up the initiatives, and communicate them back to other citizens in the district, jointly shape an process, maybe alter the initiative in an joint communal process and put it to practise. In this respect, the planner organises the process, but together with the community. Once again, top-down skills are combined with bottom-up principles. As EGT concerns, the roles should be clearly defined and repeated. By doing so, a communal (social) learning process can be organised. Or if no initiatives are received, the planner can "stimulate" initiatives by contacting citizens about the empty office block. Do they have ideas for its use, or whether it should be destroyed for another use? In the end, the planners should not force the process, but should not let just everything happen; no, it should be an joint process which can be supported by the planners. In this respect, the planner adds to societal process. In that sense, planning for foodscapes can easily relate to advocacy planning.
Within in the larger scale of the planning network – visions, regulations, and policies - it is localism and local initiatives that are used for planning. It should be planning "in" the community, with local knowledge. At least, that is the intention of the municipality; to embrace local initiatives, as also being shown by the practise. From a holistic perspective, planning relates people to places, and therefore turns spaces into places. This spatial configuration is at the essence of planning, and therefore the site itself is the object of study. The link between planning, people and the site should be as small as possible, although planning needs to be embedded in the bigger strategic frameworks. Of course, also external initiatives can be implemented, but only via the local society. People should relate to places rather than to spaces.

Furthermore the municipalities should not focus on citizens and agricultural sector as being completely separate of each other. Why is the agricultural sector not involved in urban agriculture? If food has to be produced in the city, why not connect with the agricultural sector? There is potential in the collaboration between the municipality and the agricultural sector, also to overcome the local and temporary character.

For the municipal planners the task to be both embedded in the larger frameworks and policies of the provinces and municipality (and their visions) and be able to translate it locally in places, together with the community. Local knowledge of essence; the planner should know what is going on in the community, by adapting the spatial plans to it. In the sense of urban foodscapes, it varies per community what type of urban foodscapes is suited, as illustrated by both the interviews. At last, spatial planning should balance between own ideas and envisioning – which can be used to stimulate others) – and his facilitating role. To conclude; planning for society, with society and in the society.
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Appendix 1 Interview Voedselvisie Amsterdam

*Interview met Frank Bakkum, planoloog, gemeente Amsterdam (DRO), bijgedragen aan Voedselvisie Woensdag 17 December, 10:15-11:30, Amsterdam, voormalige stadstimmertuin 4.*

**VOORBEREIDING**

A1. Kennismaking

B1. Introductie thesis onderwerp, focus van het onderzoek, doeleinden interview, gebruik van gegevens, eventuele terugkoppeling, e.d.

- Bachelor thesis *"Spatial Strategies towards Urban Foodscapes: How to embed bottom-up initiatives for foodscapes in spatial planning strategies?"*
- *Urban foodscapes* can be defined as socially constructed urban landscapes or places which are able to produce food or deal with other forms of food processing along the food chain, including institutional settings, and which relate people and food to places, especially on a local or community scale.
- Doel: Beeld krijgen van de praktijk in strategieën in foodscapes, om vervolgens theorie en praktijk te combineren in advies voor het plannen van foodscapes.

**INLEIDING: ACHTERGROND, CONTEXT EN RUIMTELIJK ASPECT**

Even over de achtergrond van de voedselvisie. Hoe is de Voedselvisie Amsterdam tot stand gekomen? Hoe is het idee voor een speciale voedselvisie ontstaan? Wie hebben het geschreven?

De Voedselvisie is een initiatief van de Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening (DRO). Het initiatief tot het schrijven van een voedselvisie komt voort uit de drie jaar eerder opgestelde Structuurvisie voor de gemeente Amsterdam. Daarin werd al opgemerkt dat voedsel een thema is in de ruimtelijke ordening. De voedselvisie volgt dan ook op een zoektocht binnen de gemeente. Hoe om te gaan met voedsel in de stad? Er is gekozen om de structuurvisie verder uit te werken in een specifieke voedselstrategie. Daarbij kijkt de gemeente verder dan alleen stadslandbouw, al is het wel een belangrijk onderdeel. Voedsel is immers een breed thema; deze breedte werkt deels tegen om het complexe voedselsysteem te vatten, maar geeft ook ruimte voor brede thema's als duurzaamheid en gezondheid.

**Hoe is dat proces van schrijven precies verlopen? Wie zijn er betrokken geweest en waarom?**

Na het onderkennen van de ruimtelijke implicaties van voedsel (in de structuurvisie) is er dus gekozen om voedsel uit te werken in een voedselstrategie. Daarbij is een wethouder gezocht om de voedselvisie op te pakken, in dit geval Freek Ossel van Groen en Openbare Ruimte. Echter, ook de andere wethouders (van Economie, Gezondheid, RO, etc.) hebben meegewerkt, waardoor de voedselvisie vrijwel de gehele bestuurslaag bestrijk. Vervolgens is er een startbijeenkomst georganiseerd met een grote en diverse groep actoren, vanwaar men is begonnen met het schrijven van de Voedselvisie. De keuze voor de betrokken actoren is gemaakt op basis van het toenmalige netwerk van voedselgerelateerde organisaties en personen in Amsterdam. Pim Vermeulen - al jarenlang actief op het gebied van voedsel in Amsterdam - heeft bijgedragen aan dit netwerk. Immers, zijn project
proeftuin (eigenlijk de voorloper van de voedselvisie) heeft al heel wat contacten weten te leggen. De bijeenkomst was uitgenodigd doch open voor alle voedselgerelateerde instanties of personen.

Deze startbijeenkomst bestond uit (1) een bijeenkomst met mensen uit de praktijk, de werkvloer en (2) een ambtswoninggesprek een bijeenkomst van directies en bestuurders, inclusief de betrokken wethouders. De discussies en overeenkomsten zijn omgezet in een groot document. Dat document is vervolgens vertaald naar de huidige voedselvisie. Daarin is ook een koppeling gemaakt aan een (jaarlijkse) agenda. De voedselvisie bestaat dus uit een visie / verhaal en een concretisering naar een agenda.

Frank Bakkum was als planoloog van de DRO van gemeente Amsterdam betrokken bij de bijeenkomsten en het schrijven van de voedselvisie, in een rol als secretaris.

Hoe verhoudt de Voedselvisie zich tot andere beleidsnota’s en gemeentelijke documenten?

De voedselvisie is dus een gedeeltelijke uitwerking van de structuurvisie, specifiek op het gebied van voedsel. Verder brengt de voedselvisie ook programma’s (zoals Gezond Gewicht) samen, waarbij de voedselvisie aansluit en verbind met lopende programma’s. Aanhaken bij lopende programma’s en onderzoeken is dan ook een rol. Zo is het Amsterdam Economic Board bezig met het bespreken van het thema voedsel onder ondernemers; de Voedselvisie haakt daar op aan. In principe is de voedselvisie een uitwerking van de structuurvisie, die aanhaakt bij verschillende programma’s en deze verbindt, als een verhaal over voedsel en de stad.

Wat is de beleidstermijn van het document?

In de voedselvisie wordt gesproken over een horizon van 2025; wat hebben we dan bereikt? Concreet wordt de voedselvisie vertaald naar een agenda met prioriteiten en actiepunten, die elk jaar opnieuw wordt afgestemd.

Wat is de juridische status van de voedselvisie? Gaat het om zelfbinding of zitten er ook harde elementen in de Voedselvisie?

De voedselvisie heeft geen harde juridische status, het gaat hier om zelfbinding. De voedselvisie is het verhaal over voedsel en Amsterdam, en dat moet elk jaar worden omgezet naar concrete agenda’s en ingrepen. Het is ook een verhaal naar anderen toe, om hen te informeren en te inspireren. Daarmee is de voedselvisie een flexibele document. Uiteindelijk worden de verhalen omgezet in agenda’s (en initiatieven) en de uiteindelijke opname in bestemmingsplannen, die de ontwikkeling mogelijk moeten maken.

Foodscapes gaan over voedselproductie in de directe omgeving van mensen, en is daarmee dan ook sterk verbonden aan mensen en hun ruimten. In het algemeen, hoe sterk is de ruimtelijke component van de Voedselvisie?

De voedselvisie gaat zowel over een inhoud en een verhaal, maar wel vaak met een ruimtelijk component. Er zijn een aantal doelen niet gerelateerd aan de ruimte (bijv. educatie) maar er zijn ook een aantal doelen die wel een plek moeten krijgen in de fysieke omgeving. Neem bijvoorbeeld het programma Gezond Gewicht. Om dat na te streven moet er wel voldoende ruimte zijn om goed te kunnen bewegen (speelplaats, park, etc.). Er is een ruimtelijke vertaalslag nodig dus.
Wat is het vervolg op deze Voedselvisie? (opvolgingsdocument, inbedding in ruimtelijk ordening, etc.)

De voedselvisie loopt nog en er is jaarlijks een concretisering in een agenda. Er zijn nieuwe wethouders. De wethouder Choho werkt aan een agenda Duurzaamheid, een agenda Groen en een agenda Openbare Ruimte. De voedselvisie moet in de Agenda Groen weer een plek krijgen.

MIDDENSTUK: INITIATIEVEN EN STRATEGIEEËN?

In de visie en agenda zie ik de gemeente Amsterdam als een centrale actor die alle randvoorwaarden uitzet, waarbinnen de bewoners zelf de initiatieven nemen? (“niet bevoogden, maar zelf laten inzien”) De gemeente zet dus de kaders uit, waar binnen de bewoners initiatieven kunnen nemen. Voedselinitiatieven zijn vaak initiatieven van lokale bewoners of ondernemers, zoals ook beschreven staat in jullie voedselvisie. In de visie worden verschillende ruimtelijke initiatieven genoemd, zoals groenen daken, op elk ongebruikt terrein stadslandbouw en verbouw van gewassen in leegstaande kantoren. Initiatieven spelen dus een belangrijke rol in thema voedsel in de stad. Dit deel gaat over hoe om te gaan met deze initiatieven.

Hoe worden de inwoners geïnformeerd over de Voedselvisie en de mogelijkheid tot het nemen van initiatieven?

Het gaat vooral om het zichtbaar maken en het noemen van initiatieven. Zo is er kaart op internet die alle voedselgerelateerde projecten aangeeft. Ook zou een idee kunnen zijn om bijvoorbeeld informerende bordje te plaatsen bij deze projecten. Neem een vruchtdragende boomgaard langs een straat in de stad. De bordjes kunnen dan informeren over het project, de bomen, de vruchten, wanneer je ze kunt plukken (en zelfs een aanvulling met een recept via een QR-code of iets dergelijks).

De initiatieven kunnen worden geïnformeerd over elkaar door een Voedselinformatiepunt; één loket met als functie (1) informeren, ondersteunen, bestemmingsplannen, etc. en (2) het verbinden van initiatieven, vaak met maatschappelijke partners. Deze maatschappelijke partijen - zoals Farming the City, Platform Eetbaar Amsterdam, de Gezonde Stad - initiëren stadslandbouw, in een verbindende rol.

Hoe pikken jullie als gemeente deze initiatieven op om ze te implementeren op grotere schaal?

De gemeente Amsterdam stelt de randvoorwaarden, waarbinnen de bewoners initiatief kunnen nemen en de maatschappelijke partijen functioneren als verbinder. Een gemeente kan - vanwege haar algemene, openbare belangen - soms een belemmering zijn en daarom zoekt de gemeente Amsterdam juist naar een coöperatieve houding. Bovendien richt de gemeente zich hierbij op meer uniformiteit tussen de stadsdelen van Amsterdam (met elk een eigen cultuur, type voedsel, etc.)

Richten jullie je op bepaalde groepen mensen? Of zijn het de mensen zelf die zich aandienen?

Het verhaal heeft twee kanten. Enerzijds heb je de buurtinitiatieven, die via een buurtcentrum o.i.d. naar de gemeente komen. Anderzijds heb je een groep zelfredzame burgers, die weten hoe ze het moeten aanpakken. In principe is de gemeente kaderstellend, en dienen de initiatieven zichzelf aan, hetzij via zelfredzame individuen of collectieve buurtgenootschappen.
Wat is de verhouding in type foodscapes? Vooral zelfredzame initiatieven - zij weten immers hoe ze hun doel kunnen bereiken - of collectieve initiatieven vanuit buurten en gemeenschappen?

Het soort voedselomgang verschilt per stadsdeel. De twee hoofdstromen zijn (1) vanuit de gemeenschap (en met sociale doelen) en (2) als lifestyle, hobby. In Nieuw-West heb je bijvoorbeeld Marokkaanse moeders die een moestuin opzetten en daar samen koken, maar aan de overkant van het IJ is het vooral hippe stadslandbouw, als hobby. Uit een onderzoek is gebleken: hoe hoger de economische klasse, hoe meer er getuinerd wordt. In een breder perspectief, gaat het in Amsterdam dus niet primair om de productie, om te overleven, zoals in een stad als Detroit. Het is of een gemeenschapsinitiatief en toch vaak ook een leuke hobby. Wel is het zo dat er steeds meer wordt gedacht vanuit lokaal produceren, bewustzijn en gezondheid, maar daarin is het financieel aspect ondergeschikt.

Missen jullie nog (groepen) mensen? En zo ja, wie dan? En zo ja, ben je dan nog wel een gemeente voor al je inwoners?

Daar hebben we op dit moment geen antwoord op. We hebben wel het idee om een evaluatie van de tot nu toe gerealiseerde initiatieven te gaan houden. Daarbij hopen we meer informatie te krijgen over: wie zijn dat? Hoe gaat dat? Doen we het goed? Het belangrijkste is de continuïteit; dat de initiatieven op een duurzame manier gestalte krijgen en daarmee het tijdelijke karakter van stadslandbouw overkomen. Er komen in ieder geval zowel gemeenschapsprojecten als lifestyle-projecten voor in Amsterdam. Ook zijn er subsidies. Een belangrijke vraag daarin is: zijn het de buurtbewoners die het willen en het initiatief nemen? Of is er een intermediair (ontwikkelaar, etc.) met een belang? In de huidige aanpak van voedsel in de stad spelen deze maatschappelijke projectmanagers een grote rol.

De initiatieven komen dus van de inwoners zelf. Hoe kunnen jullie deze initiatieven stimuleren?

Door te informeren en te handelen vanuit een welwillende houding. De gemeente heeft wel een beslissende rol, als het gaat om vergunningen en bestemmingsplannen, en waakt daarvoor, maar staat wel coöperatief tegenover de initiatieven.

Aan welke kaders moeten de initiatieven voldoen? Moeten ze bijvoorbeeld samenvallen met de gemeentelijke beleidsdoelstellingen? Of wat maakt dat jullie het ene initiatief wel omarmen en het andere niet?

Er is geen selectieprocedure. De stadsdelen spelen een grote rol in het ruimte geven voor initiatieven en deze verder helpen. Daarbij kan worden gekeken naar de kansrijkheid en de doelen.

Hoe worden deze initiatieven ondersteund? En hoe worden de initiatiefnemers ondersteund?

Wederom een belangrijke taak van de stadsdelen, maar ook voor grotere initiatieven de Stadsloods. Stadsloods is een functie bij DRO voor alle soorten ruimtezoekers in de stad). Zij kunnen vanuit hun netwerk een overzicht geven van de mogelijkheden. Ook zijn er initiatieventeams binnen stadsdelen. Hiervoor is gekozen omdat dit toch gaat om de praktische kant, het beheer en dergelijke en dat ligt bij de stadsdelen.
Hoe worden deze initiatieven uitgevoerd? En voor wie zijn de kosten?


MIDDENSTUK - ALTERNATIEVE PLANVORMING VOOR FOODSCAPES?

De wereld van de ruimtelijke ordening is in beweging: van een centralistische top-down benadering verschuift de aanpak steeds meer naar een bottom-up benadering. Initiatieven spelen een belangrijke rol daarin. Zijn er ook andere manieren om op een goede manier om te gaan met deze initiatieven?

Worden er ook workshops of bijeenkomsten georganiseerd? Meer als een participatief of interactief planproces? Onder andere met modellen en visualisaties, die aangepast kunnen worden?


Wordt er in de uitgegeven vergunningen en bestemmingsplannen in de toekomst rekeningen gehouden met tijdelijke bestemmingen en mogelijkheden voor stadslandbouw?

Ja, het wordt een meer open bestemmingsplan, waarin stadslandbouw ook expliciet wordt genoemd als vorm van landgebruik. Dat is al gedaan in de Tuinen van West. Het gaat wel om meer dan stadslandbouw, het is een definitiekwestie.

Er wordt in de visie gesproken over het opzetten van een verbindende site voor initiatiefnemers. Hier kunnen zij elkaar informeren over hun initiatieven en elkaar vinden, voor eventuele samenwerking. Een soort digitale gebiedsontwikkeling. Wat is uw inschatting van de toekomst van deze ontwikkelingen? En zou er ook potentie zijn voor een FoodApp?

Ja, dat is zeker een interessant hulpmiddel, naar niet dé manier. Planologie is toch afhankelijk van het fysieke element. De FoodApp zou wel kunnen helpen, als eerste stap, voor het initiatief.

Wat doet de gemeente Amsterdam aan het zoeken naar nieuwe vormen?

AFRONDING: DE TOEKOMST

E1. Hoe ziet u de toekomst van Amsterdam en Voedsel?

Bij het schrijven van de Voedselvisie hebben we het gehad over de voedselhoofdstad, maar Amsterdam is al de hoofdstad van zoveel. Nederland is koploper in agrarische productie, en de vernieuwing in voedsel, dat is de hoofdrol voor Amsterdam. Ook in de discussie rondom duurzaam of efficiënt produceren; de gemeenten moet een standpunt innemen. En dat vertalen naar de stad, met lokaal voedsel en een verhoogd bewustzijn. Daarin is het ook belangrijk om lokaal produceren op te schalen. Het doel? De essentie van de stad, die zijn ontstaan dankt aan de landbouw, zal blijven bestaan. We gaan niet ineens al het voedsel in de stad produceren. Maar een deel van de productie naar de stad verplaatsen, kan een bijdrage leveren aan het oplossen van de problemen. Als het voedsel maar iets meer terugkomt in de stad.

E2. Wat is het belangrijkste advies wat een planner moet meenemen in de strategieën rond foodscapes?

Appendix 2 Interview Voedselvisie Rotterdam

Interview met Annemieke Fontein, gemeente Rotterdam, stadsontwikkeling, expert landschapsarchitectuur. Digitaal interview.

VOORBEREIDING

A1. Kennismaking

Annemieke: Mijn taak is om de kwaliteit van de producten die zich afspelen in de openbare ruimte van de gemeente Rotterdam in het algemeen, en de binnenstad in het bijzonder, te borgen. Daarnaast agendeer ik de opgave en ontwikkelingen in de openbare ruimte. Bovendien ben ik “trekker” van Denktank Stadslandbouw en Regional Food Council Rotterdam.

B1. Introductie thesis onderwerp, focus van het onderzoek, doeleinden interview, gebruik van gegevens, eventuele terugkoppeling, e.d.

- Bachelorthesis "Spatial Strategies Towards Urban Foodscapes: How to embed bottom-up initiatives for foodscapes in spatial planning strategies?"
- *Urban foodscapes* can be defined as socially constructed urban landscapes or places which are able to produce food or deal with other forms of food processing along the food chain, including institutional settings, and which relate people and food to places, especially on a local or community scale.
- Doel: *Beeld krijgen van de praktijk in strategieën in foodscapes, om vervolgens theorie en praktijk te combineren in advies voor het plannen van foodscapes.*

INLEIDING: ACHTERGROND, CONTEXT EN RUIMTELIJK ASPECT

Achtergrond van de voedselvisie. Hoe is de Voedselvisie Rotterdam tot stand gekomen? Wie hebben het geschreven?

Allereerst, in principe gaat het hier om een Beleidskader Stadslandbouw om stadslandbouw te stimuleren, dus geen officiële voedselvisie. Het beleidskader is in 2011-2012 geschreven door Kees van Oorschot en Annemieke Fontein, met input van de Denktank Stadslandbouw. Opdrachtgever was wethouder Alexandra van Huffelen, vastgesteld door het college van B&W.

Het Beleidskader is het resultaat van een ca. 3-4 jarig proces waarin de gemeente vanaf 2008 netwerkbijeenkomsten met de verschillende stakeholders in de keten (o.a. boeren, distributeurs, horeca, bewoners, zzp’s) over dit onderwerp heeft gehouden. De insteek hiervan was, om het thema stadslandbouw te verkennen en helder te krijgen of het een trend is of niet. Bovendien hebben we aan de verschillende stakeholders gevraagd wat zij van de gemeente verwachtte.

In het vervolg hiervan, zijn uit al deze bijeenkomsten drie doelstellingen geformuleerd: gezondheid, ruimtelijke kwaliteit en duurzame economie. Daarnaast is vanaf het begin met externe deskundigen gewerkt, zoals Jan-Willem van der Schans (LEI), en het hele netwerk achter hem. Dit, omdat het een onderwerp was waar wij - als gemeente – niet zoveel vanaf wisten. Daarnaast was het natuurlijk onduidelijk, wat de rol van de gemeente hierin zou moeten zijn.
Wat wordt er door de gemeente verstaan onder Stadslandbouw? En welke soorten onderscheiden jullie?

Onder Stadslandbouw worden in Rotterdam 3 type initiatieven verstaan;

- stadsgerichte boeren, voornamelijk in buitengebied van Rotterdam, die aan stad willen leveren. Dat kunnen producten zijn als melk, groente, etc. maar ook diensten; excursies scholen, werk/dagbesteding, bed & breakfast etc. Dit zijn dus vooral commerciële initiatieven
  Uit je Eigen Stad als stadsboerderij behoort hier ook toe

- sociaal- economische initiatieven; gaat over initiatieven die zowel een sociaal-maatschappelijk belang hebben en daarbij ook economische opbrengsten, maar die kunnen heel verschillend zijn. Gaat ook over mensen naar werk toe geleiden, structuur geven, betrokken raken, bijv. voedselbank met voedseltuin, dante tuin, tuinen in schiebroek

- bewoners initiatieven; gemeenschappelijke moestuinen vnl. op braakliggende terreinen in de openbare ruimte

Het betekent ook dat we verschillende benaderingen hebben. Bewonersinitiatieven proberen we te ondersteunen, maar daar gaat vrijwel geen geld naar toe (zie ook verder in dit stuk).

Sociaaleconomische initiatieven zijn vanuit gemeente soms toerijkingen gedaan voor wat betreft huurgronden. Stadsgerichte boeren; hier probeert de gemeente actief te bemiddelen, netwerken uit te breiden om relatie stad-ommeland te verbeteren (is ook een van de doelstellingen van de Regionale Food Council).

Hoe verhoudt de Voedselvisie zich tot andere beleidsnota’s en gemeentelijke documenten?

Het is een van de vele beleidsovereenkomsten, vastgesteld door B&W

Wat is de beleidstermijn van het document?

Die hebben we niet gesteld.

Wat is de juridische status van de voedselvisie? Gaat dit om zelfbinding of zitten er ook harde elementen in de Voedselvisie?

Er is een uitvoeringsprogramma met acties, maar er zijn geen harde elementen

Foodscapes gaan over voedselproductie in de directe omgeving van mensen, en is daarmee dan ook sterk verbonden aan mensen en hun ruimten. In het algemeen, hoe sterk is de ruimtelijke component van de Voedselvisie?

Omdat het vanuit onze afdeling is gestart is de ruimtelijke component uitgangspunt in 2 van de 3 doelstellingen; ruimtelijke diversiteit door kleinschalige bewoners initiatieven en behoud van boerenlandschap rondom de stad. Langzamerhand heeft het zich verbreed en wordt het meer opgenomen in het economische beleid van de gemeente wat zich richt op de Top sector Food (dat betekent Westland, haven-distributie-verwerking Food)
Wat is het vervolg op deze Voedselvisie? (opvolgingsdocument, inbedding in ruimtelijk ordening, etc.)

Naast uitvoeringsprogramma met actiepunten:
Oprichting regionale Food Council Rotterdam, onderdeel van economische Foodcluster

**MIDDENSTUK: INITIATIEVEN EN STRATEGIEËN?**

Voedselinitiatieven zijn vaak initiatieven van lokale bewoners of ondernemers, zoals ook beschreven staat in jullie voedselvisie. In de visie worden verschillende ruimtelijke initiatieven genoemd, zoals groenen daken, op elk ongebruikt terrein stadslandbouw en verbouw van gewassen in leegstaande kantoren.

Hoe worden de inwoners geïnformeerd over de Voedselvisie en de mogelijkheid tot het nemen van initiatieven?

We hebben daar in eerste instantie afwachtende houding; het moet echt initiatief van bewoners zijn. Alleen in sommige buurten heeft de gemeente een meer ondersteunende en proactieve houding door samen met GGD e.a inzet van zzp’rs te financieren die met bewoners samen aan de slag gaan.
Via website, maar ook door op markten en gebruik te maken van bestaande netwerken als Eetbaar Rotterdam, worden nu bewoners vooral inzichtelijk gemaakt wat wel en niet kan.

Het grote dilemma is natuurlijk wie eigenaar van de grond is, voor de meeste braakliggende terreinen was het in 2008-2012 niet zo moeilijk om ze voor 2 jaar in gebruik te geven, maar geen enkele grondeigenaar(dus ook de gemeente niet) wilde voor langere tijd hiervoor afspraken maken. Je merkt nu de bouwmarkt weer gaat aantrekken het lastiger wordt.

Ook binnen de gemeente bleek het niet haalbaar te zijn om bijvoorbeeld een kaart te maken met braakliggende terreinen omdat er grondwaardes op zitten en als we het dan officieel zouden doen er marktconforme huurprijzen voor betaald moeten worden.

Ik denk dat in kleinere gemeente, wethouders daar gemakkelijker mee om kunnen gaan, compensatie kunnen bieden dan in de grote gemeente waar de grootschalige stedelijke problematieke om veel geld vragen.

De initiatieven komen dus van de inwoners zelf. Hoe kunnen jullie deze initiatieven stimuleren en verbinden?

De verschillende deelgemeente hebben soms actief ingezet op meer betrokkenheid van bewoners bij openbare ruimte ook middels moestuinen. Maar het adagium was en is toch vooral het initiatief moet van bewoners komen. Wij hebben als denktank vooral de weg hiervoor binnen de gemeente proberen te effenen door informatie hierover aan beheerders, beleidsmakers e.a. te geven.

Als gemeente hebben we vooral netwerk bijeenkomsten gehouden om de verschillende initiatiefnemers met elkaar in contact te brengen en zichtbaar te maken.
Aan welke kaders moeten de initiatieven voldoen? Moeten ze bijvoorbeeld samenvallen met de gemeentelijke beleidsdoelstellingen? Of wat maakt dat jullie het ene initiatief wel omarmen en het andere niet?

Hoe worden deze initiatieven ondersteund? Hoe worden de initiatiefnemers ondersteund?

Uitgangspunt van de gemeente is steeds geweest bij alle bewoners initiatieven dat we geen geld geven. Tot 2014 had Rotterdam ook nog een bestuursvorm met 13 deelgemeenten, die eigen budgetten hadden voor allerlei doeleinden. Vanuit deze budgetten zijn er soms wel kleine bedragen naar bewoners initiatieven gegaan. Voor sommige sociaal maatschappelijke initiatieven zijn vanuit het Cluster maatschappelijke ontwikkeling, werk en inkomen soms wel kleine bedragen gefinancierd hetzij in materialen in aanleg, hetzij in zzp’rs om proces verder te brengen. Met namen de woningcorporaties als Havensteder en Woonbron hebben verschillende initiatieven financieel ondersteund.

Wordt er in de uitgegeven vergunningen en bestemmingsplannen in de toekomst rekeningen gehouden met tijdelijke bestemmingen en mogelijkheden voor stadslandbouw?

Goede vraag, nee niet specifiek. Ik ben persoonlijk wel heel benieuwd of de gemeenschappelijke tuinen die er nu zijn, gehandhaafd kunnen worden als bouwmarkt weer aantrekt.

In de Voedselvisie zie ik de gemeente Rotterdam als een centrale actor die alle randvoorwaarden uitzet, waarbinnen de bewoners zelf de initiatieven nemen? De gemeente zet dus de kaders uit, waar binnen de bewoners initiatieven kunnen nemen. Wat zou u er van vinden om het planproces nog openener te maken; bewoners en gemeente samen aan de slag te laten gaan?

Het ligt dus anders, zie boven.

Er wordt in de visie gesproken over het opzetten van een verbindende site voor initiatiefnemers. Hier kunnen zij elkaar informeren over hun initiatieven en elkaar vinden, voor eventuele samenwerking. Een soort digitale gebiedsontwikkeling. Wat is uw inschatting van de toekomst van deze ontwikkelingen? En zou er ook potentië heel voor een FoodApp?

Gemeente in het algemeen zijn nooit zo goed met het onderhouden van websites, en ook Rotterdam heeft daar te weinig capaciteit voor. De meeste informatie etc. gaat toch via externe netwerken zoals Eetbaar Rotterdam, en een groep langzamerhand vaste externe zzp’rs die zich met dit onderwerp heel gericht bezighouden. Er zijn heel veel sites en informatie bronnen over het starten, inrichten en onderhouden van gemeenschappelijke moestuinen.

Wat is de rol van visualisaties en modellen in het planproces richting foodscape?

AFRONDING: PART III - DE TOEKOMST

Hoe ziet u de toekomst van Rotterdam en Voedsel?

Gezonde voeding en de voedselindustrie zullen blijvend in belangstelling staan zowel mondiaal als lokaal. Vooralsnog is er mondiaal sprake van voedsel en grondstoffen schaarste en richten alle ogen zich op die productie van grondstoffen, ook dichterbij huis. Daarnaast wordt de vraag van de consument naar gezond voedsel met zo min mogelijk bewerkingen en toevoegingen, maar ook betaalbaar, meer toegankelijk gezond voedsel alleen maar groter. Dus dit zal voor Rotterdam een
belangrijk onderwerp zijn. Of de beweging van gemeenschappelijke moestuinen, naast de oude bekende volkstuinen nog enorm zal groeien, denk ik eigenlijk niet (persoonlijke opvatting), omdat je ook ziet dat er meer en meer verkooppunten komen van regionaal voedsel enerzijds, en anderzijds omdat moe tuinieren eigenlijk wel veel tijd vraagt. Wel zien we dat aan de innovatieve kant, ontwikkelingen zoals het kweken van oesterzwammen op koffiedrap, de kweek van eiwitten uit insecten etc. een groeiende markt aan het worden is, die juist vanuit kleine bottom-up initiatieven kunnen starten.

Wat is het belangrijkste advies wat een planner moet meenemen in de strategieën rond foodscapes?
Heel goed onderzoeken wat de vragen van de bewoners zijn, en welke doelstellingen, noden de stad of dorp heeft die je met voedsel productie kunt verbinden. Is het schaarste, is het een bindmiddel(sociale cohesie), gaat het om de boeren of ruimtelijke kwaliteit. Je ziet dat men daar in Nederland lang niet altijd scherp in formuleert waarmee het een allegaartje kan worden, Canada en USA zijn daar meer gericht in. Je moet altijd de economische-en of sociaal maatschappelijke en ruimtelijke doelstellingen scherp hebben.