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SUMMARY

Over the last decennia, the Netherlands has seen increasingly spatial differences when it comes to migration, regional employment and facilities and housing. Many of the rural areas see a decline in population, while urban regions in contrary have been dealing with a population growth. The Netherlands will face a future which can be characterised by increasingly regional differences in population and livability. However, a third category can also be distinguished. These are the areas with will see neither an increase nor a decline of population. Such areas can be classified as “consolidation” areas. The challenge for municipalities in consolidation or declining areas is to keep a certain standard of facilities and livability. This challenge is complicated by the fact that many municipalities have seen a decrease in government funds and are therefore in need for alternative methods to transform or revitalise lands. The trends above influence all sort of economic sectors in rural areas, one of which is tourism and recreation.

With regard to vacation parks, a few topic-specific trends can be distinguished. As a result of various reasons, an imbalance between demand and supply of vacation parks has occurred over the last decennia. This means that vacation park owners have to adjust to these ever changing desires in order to keep a future perspective. However, not all vacation park owners are able to cope with this ongoing change in demand. Due to this, many smaller or older vacation parks in the area are struggling and notice a decrease in revenue. They are sometimes forced to look for alternative, non-tourism related ways to generate income. As a result the touristic potential of these parks is slowly disappearing and the parks become cluttered, dilapidated or outdated.

In the region of the Veluwe this is also the case. While the region contains roughly 280 vacation parks, many of these parks are in need of either renovation or transformation. The VVP program, municipalities, the province, recreational business owners and other organizations are working together to improve the overall quality of the touristic sector. One of the aims is to bring back the total amount of approximately 280 (mainly small scale) parks to about 120, larger parks with economic perspective. However, the transformation program is still heavily dependent on the benevolence and goodwill of the current land owners and entrepreneurs. This is complicated by the fact that many of the parks are subjected to fragmented land ownership. It is expected that the quick and easy transformation of the lands will go hand in hand with significant financial costs, which are lacking. The VVP is therefore looking at tools for the cost-neutral transformation of vacation parks.

Many of the municipalities in the area are already individually and independently working on transformations. However, such vacation park transformations are often considered black boxes because they have not been conducted on a large scale before. Also, case-specific literature on vacation parks transformation is scarce. The evaluation of the current methods and processes can therefore be valuable for future policy makers. By assessing the current transformation processes methodologically, this master thesis can both contribute to efficient transformations in the future, as well to vacation park transformation literature. The main aim of this thesis is therefore;

“To describe and explain the influence of the actors and the case on the applied methods of transformation of vacation parks, and to explore the possibilities to improve the conditions for these transformation processes in order to develop a comprehensive strategy”
In order to come to a comprehensive evaluation, the transformation processes are systematically analysed. The combined theories of Ostrom (Institutional Development and Analysis framework) and Bressers (Contextual layers) identify two main factors which influence the policy instruments; the wider context and the structural context of the case. The wider context contains case specific indicators such as the spatial, political or problem context. The structural context focusses mainly on the actors and their objectives. The policy instruments in turn influence the process and outcome of the transformation. In order to get a complete overview of the transformation possibilities, it is important to include a wide variety of applied transformation policies in the research. For this, a case selection of nine different vacation parks have been selected. The evaluation is conducted in a qualitative manner, with the use of document-analysis and interview with experts and process supervisors of the municipalities.

The result is a set of nine vacation parks which all vary in terms of internal characteristics like size, numbers of objects, ownership situation, future perspective, etc. and external characteristics like involved actors and their goals. Also, four different policy instruments are identified in the case selection as transformation method;

**VAB-policy based transformations**
The vacation park owner must clear the park of all recreational objects and facilities. In return, the park owner is allowed several building plots as a compensation. The amount of building plots is up for negotiation, but usually equals more or less the value of the park. The determination of the parks value is therefore a key aspect in the process.

**Temporary land-use**
The vacation park owner is allowed to temporary use the vacation park to a purpose which is not in line with the actual land-use plan. This can be the housing of migrant workers, but also other temporary functions like health care. In return, the park owner must clear the park after the temporary agreement has ended. The park therefore loses its economic value at the end of the agreement.

**Re-destination to residential areas**
Seen with fragmented property ownership; the dwellings of the individual park owners are re-destined to residential building. This means the residents can legally inhabit the recreational dwellings the entire year, and these dwellings see a huge increase in value. In return, the municipality can capture this value increase up till € 50.000,-, which can only be used to benefit the local recreational sector.

**Land readjustment**
The land readjustment approach is similar to the re-destination policy. However the lands are not only re-destined, but also redeveloped or partly reconstructed. As a result, the value increase of the lands is even more significant and inhabitants that do not want to participate can be offered a possibility to be bought-out. Also, the municipality again has the possibility to capture the value increase.

The consequences and effects of each of the transformation policies on the process and the end result varies largely (table 25). This means that there is no “best practice” for municipalities to transform. Rather, municipalities have to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each instrument and decide for themselves which instrument is most suitable.
However, the municipalities are not entirely free to choose a transformation approach. They are heavily restricted by many variables such as the case characteristics and the goals and means of the park owner(s). The effect of these variables on the process is elaborated on in the analysis. First of all the effect of the wider context on the policy instruments; the wider context exists of four main variables which are the problem context, spatial context, political context and social context. Out of these groups of variables, the most influential elements on the policy instrument are the ownership situation of the park, the future perspective and the attitude of the municipality towards the transformation. Especially the ownership situation of the park limits the possibility for the transformation method. For the structural context, the most important variables are the goals and resources of the two most important actors; the municipality and the park owner(s). The neighbourhood can influence the process as well, even though this also depends on the policy instrument which is applied. In the end the conditions and success of the transformation from the municipal point of view depends on external context, and the criteria which they value the most. The instruments are a tool that the municipality can apply to reach these criteria, but these are limited by the context of the case. This is illustrated in the model below.

**Table 25: Overview of the effects of the policy instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>VAB-Policy</th>
<th>Temporality</th>
<th>Re-destination</th>
<th>Land readjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public space</td>
<td>+/+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value capture</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick result</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for fair compensation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for financial means</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of nuisance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability on all cases</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1: System diagram of the external context and instruments that effect the conditions and success of the transformation
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This master thesis research will be conducted for the program “Vital Vacation parks” (VVP). The VVP is policy program designed to solve several issues with regard to vacation parks in the Veluwe region. It is a collaboration between eleven municipalities, the province, companies and other platforms to strengthen and develop the touristic sector. The goal is to establishing a diverse supply of tourist accommodations which match the market’s demand. This research aims to gather new insights for the program, by evaluating several transformation cases.

This chapter will start by explaining the research problem statement. This includes background events and trends regarding urban land readjustment and the urgency, a description of the case and the problem statement. Next, the research aim and corresponding research questions are stated. Then, the social and scientific relevance of the research is described. Finally, the overall research model for the master thesis is presented.

1.1. RESEARCH PROBLEM STATEMENT

This paragraph will discuss the project framework of the master thesis. First as background information, the events and trends which have led to the problem statement of this thesis are described. Then, the case area of the Veluwe and the local organisations which are dealing with this problem are introduced. Finally, the problem case for Vital vacation parks and the issues regarding these vacation parks are introduced in the problem statement. This includes the methods and goals that are currently used to tackle the problem with regard to vacation parks. The methods for vacation park transformation will be the main focus of this master thesis.

1.1.1. BACKGROUND

Over the last decennia, the Netherlands has seen increasingly spatial differences when it comes to migration, regional employment and vacancy of houses and offices (CBS, 2015)(CBS, 2014). Many schools in rural areas see a decline in students, while on the other hand (logically) the bigger cities see a slight increase in students (CBS, 2016). Most rural and peripheral (border) regions will notice an overall increase in elderly. Furthermore, the amount of jobs in these so called “shrinking” regions have been in decline since the economic crisis in 2008, and even between 2013 – 2014 when the total amount of jobs in the Netherlands started to increase once more (Kooiman, N. & Siemons, P., 2015). In short; the Netherlands will face a future which can be characterized by increasingly regional differences in population and liveability. While the population in some of the urban areas are expected to increase, many shrinking regions will see a decline over the next decennia (Raspe, 2014). A third category can also be distinguished. These are the areas with will see neither an increase nor a decline of population. Instead, the population is expected to be stable in the upcoming years. Such areas can be classified as “consolidation” areas. The spatial issues in these consolidation areas differ from the other two, and are more orientated towards managing the current situation.

In the case of shrink regions, there are basically three forms of demographic shrink: shrink due to a decline in the amount of inhabitants, shrink due to a decline in households and shrink as a result of a declining labour force (Verwest & Van Dam, 2010). These all lead to vacancy of real estate such as houses, shops and offices. This in turn has a had a negative impact on the availability of services and
the livability of the town-centres in many shrinking areas. As a reaction to these demographic trends, many politicians and social scientist have devoted time and resources into these shrink areas. This has led to an increased awareness that many regions should shift from population growth-oriented policies to rather shrink-oriented policies. There is general consensus that it is useless to contest or dispute demographic decline, and that it’s better to accept and try to constrain the negative consequences (Hospers & Reverda, 2012).

Along with these social, economic, and demographic trends came the shift in political attitude towards spatial planning. Peter van Rooy characterized this as a change from development oriented spatial planning towards a more invitational oriented planning policy. Citizens are more and more encouraged and stimulated to contribute to the development of their own living area (van Rooy, 2012). The shift can also be characterized as a shift from traditional to relational spatial planning (Derix, 2012). It is also noticeable in the field of land and housing development. In the years before the 2008th economic crisis, the Dutch government applied a rather proactive land development policy (Munoz Gielen, 2011). This meant that the government was in control of most land development projects, but at the same time had to take up large financial risks. Nowadays the Dutch municipalities apply much more passive and facilitating land development policies (van der Krabben, 2016). This means that they are looking for new development tools which are cost neutral and collaborative rather than proactive and top-down.

Land reallocation or land readjustment (LR) is a development tool which can encounter several issues with regards to population decline. It offers potential to redevelop (vacant) real estate in town centres. In order to keep the town centres liveable, there has been a switch from new land developments in the outskirts of town, to redevelopment of the urban centre. And this is not only in the Netherlands. Land readjustment is witnessing a revival in academic literature, and at the same time becoming popular with international development organizations such as UN-Habitat or the World Bank (Munoz Gielen, 2015). But when it comes to land readjustment of less profitable land-uses such as forest land, or polluted and deteriorated lands, the cost retrieval for land readjustment can more complicated. However, there are more “new” tools available for municipalities to develop lands. Temporally land use for instance is another possible method for the cost neutral development of lands by the municipality. And also several existing policies can be adjusted to fit transformation demands in shrink areas.

One of the sectors in particular which faces challenges due to the social, economic and political trends which are listed above, is tourism. Due to several factors which are listed in paragraph 1.1.3 “problem statement”, the tourism sector in general having problems. The Veluwe in particular is one of the areas which is facing difficulties with this, due to its large amount of vacation parks on the one hand, and the changing role of the government on the other. Government agencies such as province, municipality and regional networks are looking for new ways to improve the quality of the sector in general. This also means that the sector might require large scale transformation in the upcoming years. Together, the parties are looking for effective ways to do so, which brings us to the program “Vital vacation parks”.

D.C.T. Verberk
1.1.2. Vital Vacation Parks

The VVP is a cooperative partnership between several municipalities in the province of Gelderland (figure 1). The VVP aims to improve the local touristic sector as a whole by focusing on innovation, restructuration and safety and liveability (Appendix 6 contains an overview of the core goals, tasks and assignments for the VPP, as well as an overview of the administrative structure of the program). As the result of many years of public policy to stimulate the development of vacation parks, the region currently faces a surplus of parks. Many of these parks are still of a relatively small scale (less than five hectares), while most experts agree that a minimum of ten hectares is necessary to run a sustainable business (van den Hazel, 2016). As a result, some of the smaller parks are struggling financially, and are facing issues with regards to security and liveability. The VVP is looking at methods to counter these issues. This would bring them closer to their overall goal; the realisation of a diverse and qualitative good supply of vacation parks, which forms a strong link in the entire touristic and recreational supply of the Veluwe (Bestuursakkkoord 2017-2021).

As of 2017, the region participates in the national stimulation program for voluntary land exchange. This governmental stimulation program attempts to spread awareness on the benefits and principles of urban land readjustment among local citizens (Gebiedseconomie, 2016). Recreational park the “Tonselse Veld” is one of the ten pilot projects (Info-Mill, 2016). The region faces some challenges with regard to the tourist sector, particularly in the field of recreational parks. But there are more possibilities to improve the sector. In total, the program contains 16 themes which they want to contribute to. These themes are; digital accessibility, sustainability, “Veluwe Experience”, strengthening the supply of parks, level playing field, new collaborations, restructuring (on a park and area level), nature and economic development, transformation, fragmented landownership, housing of target groups, fund development, prevention, non-recreational use and subversion. This thesis focusses on the theme of transformation, and other themes that go along with this such as restructuring, fragmented landownership, nature and economic development, prevention and sustainability.
1.1.3 Problem statement

As a result of various reasons, an imbalance between demand and supply of vacation parks occurred. In her book “Tussen tent en villa” Mieke Dings states that since 1920, the type of development of vacation parks in the Netherlands can be divided into three phases. From 1920 till 1960, vacation parks would often prove to be a counterpart to the busy city life. Later, from 1960 – 1980, vacation parks would provide a second house for everyone. During the final phase, 1980 till now, she states that vacation parks are aiming for optimal experiences for the visitors (Dings, 2015). This shows that the demand of the recreant is ever shifting, and vacation parks have to adjust to these desires. However, not all vacation parks owners are able to cope with this ongoing change in demand. Due to this, many smaller or older vacation parks in the area are struggling and notice a decrease in revenue. They are sometimes forced to look for alternative ways to generate income. The park owners can for instance turn to the permanent housing of residents, in order to generate an income all year long. Instead of an occupation rate of 60-70%, the houses could be occupied throughout the whole year. This is however illegal, and they often attract people in vulnerable social positions, youth, criminals, or migrant workers. These workers sometimes live under harsh circumstances. And because the owners of the parks are struggling financially, the money for proper maintenance of the parks is usually lacking. For a while, no action was undertaken to change this situation. As a result, these parks are nowadays cause of degradation of public space. In time this can become a threat for the touristic function of the region (van der Krabben, de Wolf, 2014). This created a sense of urgency among stakeholders such as the province, municipalities and local entrepreneurs to address the issue.

In order to solve these problems, the province, recreational business owners and other organizations started the program of “Vital vacation parks” (paragraph 1.1.2). One of the aims of the program is to bring back the total amount of approximately 280 (mainly small scale) parks to about 120, larger parks (van Evert, 2014). As it stands, approximately 20 to 25% of the vacation parks in the region are well managed and operate economically feasible. A small amount of the parks – 10 to 15% - lacks economic perspective. These parks have to be remediated and transformed into new land-uses. The biggest part of the vacation parks is located in the middle group. The goal is to stimulate the parks with perspective to join the leading group (image 2) (Vitale Vakantieparken, 2015). The main aim of the program is to improve the economic prospects and contribution of the regional tourist sector. Touristic revenue must rise and lead to more demand for labour. Furthermore it aims to reduce the nuisance of the remaining parks. The smaller parks (the 10-15%) with less perspective for a sustainable future must be transformed and reallocated to a different purpose, provided that the owners are open for change. The revitalization of these parks is the central topic of this thesis.
However, the program of vital vacation parks is still heavily dependent on the benevolence and goodwill of the current landowners and entrepreneurs. This is complicated by the fact that many of the parks are subjected to fragmented land ownership. While some of the parks are owned by one owner or entrepreneur, other parks have recreational homes which are owned by private individuals. It is expected that the transformation of the lands will go hand in hand with significant financial costs (van der Krabben, de Wolf, 2014). One of the ways to finance these land readjustments is by providing temporary land-use permits (Dings, 2016) (Van der Krabben, de Wolf, 2014) (Derix, 2012). This offers entrepreneurs the opportunity to temporary, for instance 8-10 years, use the land to make profits for various types of land-uses. Examples of these temporary land uses are health parks, small vegetable gardens or temporary housing of migrant workers (figure 3). The profit can be used to finance land readjustment or redevelopment. This can be done in several ways, depending on the new destination of the land and the role of the current land owner. For instance, future “green” destinations of the land such as forests are less likely the generate revenue. Therefore the revenue from the temporary land use should be sufficient to finance the land development. “Red” destinations such as housing construction however, are likely to generate money. This money can be spend in several ways to accelerate the process of Vital vacation parks.
Several municipalities in the Veluwe are currently experimenting with these temporary permits. In return for a permit, the entrepreneurs are obliged to clean the lands after their permits have expired, and sell the lands to the municipality for the symbolic amount of 1 euro (Dings, 2016, p46). But temporality is just one of the many tools which can be applied to revitalize the area. Municipalities are often working alongside each other on separate cases and are using different approaches. As each park is unique in terms of local problems, fragmented ownership, government policies and entrepreneurship, the transformation process varies and requires a fitting approach. Each transformation process is considered to be customized. Therefore an overall evaluation of the process is desirable in order to come to acquire insights in the complex situations and to identify improvements and “best practices”.

1.2 AIM
By means of this master thesis, I want to explore the possible and most effective political, financial, juridical social, communicative and spatial conditions for transformation processes of vacation parks in the Veluwe. In order to do so, the current methods of land readjustment in the region must be evaluated. Then, I must conduct an exploratory research into best strategies and the administrative, financial, juridical and communicative conditions. This should contribute to the revitalization of the Veluwe. In short, the main aim of this research will be:

“To describe and explain the influence of the actors and the case on the applied methods of transformation of vacation parks, and to explore the possibilities to improve the conditions for these transformation processes in order to develop a comprehensive strategy”

The research aim can be divided in a descriptive, explanatory and exploratory part. By achieving the goal above, I hope to provide a positive contribution to the transformation process of vacation parks in the Veluwe.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTION
This master thesis aims to evaluate transformation methods for vacation parks in the Veluwe. This evaluation will lay at the basis of an exploratory research into best practices for future transformations in the region. In order to achieve this goal, a main research question and several sub-questions have been composed.

MAIN QUESTION
The central question of the master thesis is as follows;

“To what extend do general case characteristics of vacation parks influence the possibilities and methods for the transformation of these parks, and how can these methods be improved for future transformation processes?”

The research question as posed above can roughly be divided two parts. The first part is rather descriptive and explanatory, and aims to collect data on the relation between case characteristics and
transformations methods or tools. It is expected that several case variables show a correlation with the chosen transformation method. The second part is exploratory and aims to formulate “best practices” with regard to the political, financial, juridical, social, communicative and spatial conditions for transformation processes. Therefore, the interviewee’s are asked to reflect on the transformation process to evaluate and improve the process. Take into account that “best practices” can be debatable and open to subjectivity, as different approaches lead to different outcomes which aren’t necessarily wrong or right. In order to give a satisfactory answer to the main research question, several sub-questions have been composed.

**SUB-QUESTIONS**

Several sub-questions are formulated in order to answer the central main-question;

- 1. How do the characteristics of cases influence the transformation method of vacation parks?
- 2. How do the characteristics of the involved actors influence the transformation method of vacation parks?
- 3. Which policy instruments for the transformation of vacation parks are applied in the Veluwe?
- 4. What sort of political, financial, juridical, social, communicative and spatial conditions are of importance for the transformation process; and
- 5. How do the policy instruments influence the action process of the transformations?

The research model in paragraph 1.5 will visualize how the sub-questions are related to each other and the main research question. Chapter 3 “Methodology” will pinpoint the research methods and approaches which are used to answer the sub-questions. The research questions are reflected upon in the conclusion of this thesis.

**1.4 RELEVANCE**

This paragraph will discuss the societal and scientific relevance of the master thesis. The societal relevance focusses on the communal gains of the report for the society. The scientific relevance explains how the research will contribute to the existing pool of scientific knowledge.

**1.4.1 SOCIETAL RELEVANCE**

For citizens living in areas of population decline, the cluttering of the landscape and vacancy of property is becoming an increasingly big problem. It reduces the quality of the public space, and the living environment in general (SER, 2011; Hospers & Reverda, 2012). In order to maintain certain standards of living, it is sometimes necessary for public or private organizations to intervene in the spatial domain (Verwest & van Dam, 2010). The alternative, doing nothing, would lead to a further decay of the rural living areas.

In the case of the Veluwe, the numerous small scale vacation parks are cause of many undesirable activities. Many of these vacation parks are in decay and often do not house tourist, but (illegal and sometimes permanent) residents such as migrant workers, the poor, refugees or (ex-) criminals (Dings, 2016). Since the owners of the parks can’t rely anymore on a solid income of a “regular” exploitation of the parks, they turn to alternative sources of income. Furthermore, the parks often take up large shares of space which could otherwise be used for more desirable land uses. Of all areas in the
Netherlands with problems with regard to vacation parks, the Veluwe is probably one of the precursors when it comes to solving these problems (Pietersma, 2012).

Readjustment of the land does not always lead to a value increase of the land (Verwest et al., 2008). Especially when lands are intended to be redeveloped into a nature-destination. The program vital-vacation parks attempts to develop a fitting organizational structure which can proactively readjust the lands to a more desirable destination by developing alternative revenue models. New and effective ways of temporary land use are

1.4.2 SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

The scientific relevance of the thesis lies within three aspects. The first aspect are the theories on (urban) land readjustment. The second aspect is with regard to temporary land use permits as a revenue model. But the third and most important is the general scientific relevance on transformation literature for vacation parks. As land readjustment is becoming a more and more popular development tool, many research has been conducted over the last couple of years in the applicability of the instrument on land development issues all around the world (Suzuki et al, 2015). However, the context and playing field with regard to land readjustment varies all around the world, with different instruments being used in different countries (Gielen, 2015). The program vital vacation parks aims to apply the theory of land readjustment to the very specific domain of cluttered vacation parks. Unlike urban areas, many of these parks are located in rural areas and are not necessarily destined to be redeveloped into revenue generating land-uses such as housing plots. Therefore more than often a decent revenue model is lacking, making it more difficult to redevelop the lands. One of the solutions to this specific problem can be found in the essay “Re-creatie door Arbeidsmigratie” in which the system of temporality is described and applied to the region (van der Krabben, de Wolf, 2014). “Temporality” provides for a system of temporarily land use in order to generate revenue to finance the desirable future land developments. However, the research focusses mainly on the temporary housing of migrant workers and the administrative, juridical and economic conditions which apply. Further studies into alternative temporary land use, and the translation of this theory into a feasible strategy for the region are not mentioned. Therefore, this research can provide a guide for further similar processes or land readjustment. The theories of Bressers and Ostrom provide guidance to assess transformation process of all kinds. This research digs into the specific topic of vacation park transformation. By means of this thesis, the contextual analysis model of Bressers (paragraph 2.1) can be filled in and the most important variables can be identified. This will add information to the scarce existing literature of vacation park transformation. Paragraph 2.3 contains the propositions for this thesis, based on the literature. These propositions are reflected upon in the analysis chapter, and finally the scientific relevance is reflected upon in the discussion.

1.5 RESEARCH MODEL

In order to achieve the goals of this research, several steps have to be undertaken. This research will be conducted in roughly five different phases (Step A – Step F). This paragraph explains step by step the build-up of the research from beginning till end. The research model (figure 4, full image in appendix 16) contains a schematic overview of the steps in which this research will be conducted. The steps form the core of the report, as described in paragraph 1.5.1 ‘Reading guide’.
**A. Theoretical framework:**

The first step is the compilation of the theoretical framework. The theoretical framework form the base and starting point for the formulation of the hypotheses, which is step B. The theoretical framework will be compiled using literature studies. The framework will consist of five separate groups or paragraphs of theories, which are linked to the five sub-questions as mentioned in paragraph 1.3. Together they form the input for the conceptual model and the operationalisation of the variables. The theoretical framework of this research has three main purposes:

- It is used to formulate hypothesis for each of the sub-questions;
- It is used to shape and structure the questionnaire for the interviews; and
- It is used as input for the analyses chapter of this research. Some of the sub-questions of this research will be answered by using the literature from the theoretical framework and comparing it with the results from the empirical research.

The first paragraph of the theoretical framework focusses on literature regarding actor-analysis. It is mainly based on the theory of decision analysis, which is a tool to identify stakeholder goals, means, alternatives and hierarchy. The second paragraph focusses on the description of the case. One of the key elements of this research are the vacation parks, and the future perspective in particular. The Tourist Area Life-Cycle (TALC) concept describes and operationalizes variables which can be used to describe the vacation park and its future perspective. The third paragraph is a summary of land development strategies and tools which are applied in the Netherlands. The fourth paragraph describes tools to evaluate governance and power structures. It will serve as input to value and reflect the conditions for transformation which are mentioned in the interviews. The final paragraph of the chapter contains tools and theory to structure the evaluation of the transformation processes.

**B. Propositions**

Step two is formulating propositions for each of the sub questions, in accordance with the literature study from the theoretical framework. The propositions (three in total) will be reflected upon in the analyses of this research. The propositions focus on the influence of the wider (1) and structural context (2) on the policy instruments, and the influence of the policy instruments (3) on the action process. The comparison of the theories in the theoretical framework with the data from the interviews by use of the propositions also form the scientific relevance of this thesis. This is reflected upon in the analysis and the discussion paragraph of the conclusion.

**C. Empirical Research:**

The third step is the empirical research of the thesis. The information retrieved in the literature study led to the operationalization of the variables, which on its turn let to the composition of the conceptual model (chapter 2.4). The main research strategy for the empirical research phase of the thesis are case studies. The data for the case-studies is collected in two separate manners. The dominant method of data collection are interviews with experts on transformation in the region. Furthermore, additional information on the cases will be retrieved by document analysis. This means the land-use plans and areal visions of the municipalities in particular. This should lead to a complete overview of the actors, case characteristics and transformation method. Together with the data retrieved in the literature study phase, the empirical research will result in the input for the analyses of this thesis.
D. Case description:
The fourth phase of the research is the description of the results. During this stage, the data which is collected in step C will be structured and described. For this, the data will be split into various subtopics;

- **Actor analysis**: an overview of all actors involved, the objectives, goals, means and hierarchy. This will be executed using the method of value three analysis;
- **Case Description**: an overview of the cases and their corresponding characteristics. The results will be put into perspective by use of the TALC-concept;
- **Policy instruments**: an overview of the applied policy instruments for each of the transformations. The methods will be put into perspective and described based on the theoretical framework.
- **The action process**: The action process is described by use of a timeline. It contains a step-by-step overview of the necessary conditions for a successful transformation process, structured in accordance with the timeline theory in paragraph 2.2.4.

E. Analyses
The fifth phase of the research is the analyses of the results. During this stage, the data which is collected in step C, and described in step D, will be structured and analysed in accordance with the methods as described in the theoretical framework. The analyses focusses on three main points of interest;

- 1. The influence of the wider context on the policy instruments;
- 2. The influence of the structural context on the policy instruments; and
- 3. The influence of the policy instruments on the action process.

These three interest points structure the analyses. At the end of each paragraph the corresponding propositions are reflected upon.

F. Conclusions
The final phase of the thesis are the conclusions. First, the conclusions will focus on the answers to sub-question 1 till 5. The results from step A till E will form the input for these answers. The combined answers on the five separate sub-questions will lead to certain findings for future transformation processes, which is the main question. The conclusion will also contain a discussion, recommendations and a reflection paragraph. The discussion focusses on the scientific relevance of the thesis; how does the thesis contribute and compare to the existing pool of knowledge. The recommendations include practical action points for the VVP and recommendations on future research. Finally, the reflection elaborates on improvements, limitations and weaknesses of the thesis.
1.5.1 READING GUIDE

The first chapter of this master thesis is the introduction of the research. The introduction includes among others the problem statement and background, research aim and questions and the research model. The second chapter of the research is the theoretical framework, which includes theoretical as well as methodological literature which are necessary in order to conduct this research. The theoretical framework is divided into five sub-topics; literature regarding actor analysis, case description, land transformation methods, transformation conditions and process evaluation. It also includes theories and methods for system analysis. It is concluded by the conceptual model of the research, which is then operationalized in four tables. The third chapter focuses on the methodological approach of the research. It contains in chronological order the research philosophy, -strategy, -methods and the methods for the collection and processing of the retrieved data. The collected data is then processed and analysed in chapter four. The analyses is structured in a similar manner as the theoretical framework. It contains an actor analysis, case description, an analysis of the land transformation methods (part I) and the corresponding conditions (part II), a system analysis and finally the process evaluation. This will eventually lead to the final chapter, the conclusions. The conclusions are split into three topics; the sub-questions and hypothesis, the recommendations and the reflection on the research. The report is completed by the list of references and the appendices.
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter will dig into the different theories, approaches and concepts which will be of value for this thesis. Now that the assignment and goals of the research have been established, corresponding theories to the problem are of importance to structure the research. Several theoretical and methodological concepts lie at the basis of this research. As described in the research model (chapter 1.5), this chapter will be divided into literature with regard to four sub-topics. The four subtopics are based on the system analyses theories of Ostrom and Bressers. Combined, these theories form the core and structure of this thesis. They are elaborated in the next paragraph (2.1). The sub-topics which are derived from this system analysis are;

- The wider context;
- The structural context;
- The policy instruments; and
- The action process;

Each sub-topic will contain a reflection on the degree of applicability of the theories on the thesis. Based on the literature, paragraph 2.3 will include three propositions with regard to the influence of the subtopics on each other. The chapter is concluded with the conceptual model of this research, which is operationalized in table one, three, seven and eight of paragraph 2.2. The tables also show how the interview is structured and how the interview questions are linked to the theory.

2.1 SYSTEM ANALYSIS

In terms of policy review, system analysis is a commonly used tool to map and measure the effects of (governmental) interventions on society. System theory is a multidisciplinary theory which applies a systematic view on all sort of systems like nature, science and society. The theories focus on the complexity and mutual interdependence of elements within systems. System analysis provides a tool to measure the effects of public policy and policy instruments. The attention of system analysis lies within the outcomes and feedback of a system, rather than the input or internal elements of the system (Hoogerwerf, 1977). System analysis often linked to effect- or evaluative studies. Evaluative studies state that the policy instruments are the independent variable, and the effects they cause are the dependent variable. The effects on their own are not the only goal of an evaluative study, but mainly the effectiveness of a certain policy is a topic of interest. However, the aim of the system analysis in this thesis is not to evaluate the applied policies for vacation park transformations. The analysis focusses on the input of the transformation process, the actors and the case characteristics, and the effect they have on the applied transformation methods.

The influence of actors on the implementation of policy instruments and vision has been illustrated in many studies and theories (also paragraph; 2.1.4 transformation conditions). Olufemi (2016) distinguishes official and unofficial policymakers. Official policymakers are executive powers (minister, governors, mayors, etc.), legislators (members of parliament, city council). Judiciary (judges and the court) and administrators (government officials). Unofficial policymakers are interest groups (NGO’s, civilian organisations), Political parties and individual citizens. They do not possess legal authority to make binding policy decisions, but can still effect the policy process. Owens (2008) focusses on the
actor characteristics of motivation, information and power balance, and their influences on the implementation of certain policy instruments. These researches focus on the impact of actors on policy processes. However, the involved actors and their goals and means are just one of part of the variables which influence the outcome of policy reforms. The context of the case, or case characteristics, are also of importance. The institutional analysis and development framework (IAD) is a systematic method to analyse the ways an institution can operate and change over time. It is developed by Elinor Ostrom (1986, 1999). The IAD framework, as displayed below (figure 5), is a multi-tier conceptual map which provides steps to constitute policy reforms. The first step is to establish the external variables or context of the institution. The context includes the biophysical environment, the socioeconomic conditions – or attributes of community -, and the institutional arrangements, or in others words the “rules-in-use”. Once the external variables are evident, “Action arena” or “Action situation” should be established. In previous IAD models, the action area consisted out of the actors and the action situation. However, the model was later simplified to focus on the action situation leading to interactions and outcomes. The interactions and outcomes are in turn open for evaluation. The IAD framework specifies the contextual variables for the “Action arena”, but it doesn’t specify how these will impact the course and outcomes of the process.

**Figure 5: The Institutional Analysis and Development Framework**

Bressers (2007) uses a process model to analyse relations between variables. The concept of “process” in this model is not used in its common meaning of “change over time”, but rather in the meaning of a conversion process. A conversion process in this sense is not the change of a phenomenon, but something that forms the relationship between phenomena. Several inputs are in such a process “processed” into something new and different. The process arena consists of interaction processes.

**Figure 6: Basic Process Model with Inputs-Process-Outputs**
Bressers therefore states that policy processes are actor interaction processes. The process “arena” consists of interaction processes between several actors with different sets of motives, cognitions and resources. The characteristics of the actors shape the process. They are on the one hand influenced by the course and experiences of the process, and on the other hand by the external context (the inputs) of the process. These external contexts include the institutional arrangements, the applied instruments, the actor network and other wider contexts. The external elements are all represented as overlapping entities in his model for contextual interaction (figure 7). The figure can best be read from right to left, implying that each step leftwards gives a context for the previous step, while not excluding the possibility of direct impacts of the broader contexts (Bressers, 2007). Both the IAD-framework of Ostrom, as the contextual interaction model by Bressers emphasize the broad perspective and context of planning processes or policy reforms. The IAD-framework identifies three sets of variables; the biophysical conditions, the attributes of the community and the institutional arrangements. The contextual interaction model applies and even wider perspective and distinguishes three layers of contexts which influence the process; the (possible) specific inputs, the structural context and the wider contexts.

**FIGURE 7: LAYERS OF CONTEXTUAL FACTORS FOR CASE CHARACTERISTICS**

Applicability on the thesis.
The main question of this thesis is as follows;

“To what extend do case characteristics of vacation parks influence the possibilities and methods for the transformation of these parks, and how can these methods be improved for future transformation processes?”

The first part of the main question is aimed at the influence of the case characteristics on the possibilities and methods of vacation park transformation. The case characteristics in this sense can be seen in a broad perspective. It is not limited to the (physical) characteristics of the vacation park, but also includes the actors and the interrelations between them. The possibilities and methods for the
transformation of the vacation parks can be seen as *policy instruments* by the municipality. As mentioned before, system analysis in terms of policy review, is a commonly used tool to map and measure the effects of (governmental) interventions on society. The concept of contextual interactions by Bressers (2007) provides some guidelines for the analysis of such systems. It illustrates the influence of wider contexts on structural contexts, and their combined influence on input like policy instruments. Bressers states that these three elements of contextual factors influence the process and its outputs. The second part of the main question is aimed at the evaluation of the process in order to identify possible improvements. The IAD-framework of Elinor Ostrom is quite similar to the contextual interactions model of Bressers, except for the fact that it includes room for evaluative criteria. These evaluative criteria are aimed at the actor interactions and outcomes of the process.

The combined elements of Bressers contextual interactions model and Ostrom’s IAD-framework provide a schematic and structural research approach for this thesis. This is illustrated in figure 8, which includes elements from both models. The inputs consist of the wider contexts, the structural context and the policy instruments. The influence of the wider (1) and structural (2) context on the policy instruments is key in this phase. This influence is answer to the first part of the main question. The second part of the main question focusses on the improvements of the transformation methods. In order to identify improvements, the influence of the policy instruments on the action process must be analysed (3). The action process consists of action situations and interactions. These can be documented by use of a timeline for each of the cases. Eventually the action process will lead to outcomes, which is the (intended or future) end-result of the transformation. The assessment of the action process gives answer to part two of the main question.

**Figure 8: Combined model for system analysis with elements from the Contextual Interactions model (Bressers) and the IAD-framework (Ostrom).**

As figure 8 illustrates, the four main sub-topics of this thesis are the wider context, the structural context, the policy instruments and the action process. The topics include several sub-variables, which are elaborated in the next paragraphs of the theoretical framework. The entire overview of theories is visualised in the conceptual model (figure 20) in paragraph 2.4
2.2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND FOR THE SYSTEM ANALYSIS

The theoretical background consists of four groups of theories. The first ones are the theories with regard to the wider context. It focusses on the case description and is based on Life cycle theory, and in particular the Tourist area Life cycle (TALC)-concept. The TALC-concept elaborates on the rise and fall of touristic areas by identifying several stages of development. The second group of theories concern the structural context of the case, and focus on governance and actor analysis. Theories on (public) governance and the Policy network approach focus on power structures and the role of the government in the spatial development of a given area. The actor analysis is based on the Decision Analysis theory which can be used to identify goals, means and hierarchy between actors. Next, the third group of theories are typologies of policy instruments. The fourth group of theories are related to the transformation process. Because the process itself is subordinate in this thesis, the action situation and interactions are not thoroughly analysed, but simply displayed in a timeline.

2.2.1 THE WIDER CONTEXT

This paragraph focusses on theories with regard to wider context, in particular on the problem context; the internal characteristics of vacation parks. The internal characteristics of the vacation parks like size, accommodations and facilities cover just half of the cases. The degree to which the parks are cause of nuisance and their future perspective are also of importance to this thesis. These external factors are expected to influence the transformation process, as they limit or widen the possibilities for the revitalisation of the vacation park. It is therefore key to gather data on both the internal as the external characteristics of the vacation park. One of the theories able to give guidance to this are the Life cycle theories, and the Tourist Area Life cycle concept in particular. The chapter is concluded with an operationalisation of the wider context.

Life cycle theory

Life cycle theories have been around for decades with regard to many fields of science. In economics for example, product life cycle hypotheses (Vernon, 1979) tried to explain the observed patterns of international trade. In short the theory suggests that early in a product’s life cycle all aspects (parts, labour) of a product come from the area in which it was invented. Once the product becomes adopted across the world, production gradually moves away from its point of origin. The stages in which this happens are displayed in the product life cycle model. Vernon identifies four main stages which are Introduction, Growth, Maturity and Decline. It is a simple method to predict the global patterns of production. However, later on social scientists tried to apply life cycle theory many other topics. This brings us to the application of the life cycle theory to the field of tourism. The connection between Life cycle theory and tourism was first made by Richard Butler in 1980. His Tourist Area Life Cycle, or TALC-model, was a fairly simple concept which described the rise and downfall of a given tourist area. Butler suggested that the life cycle is comprised of the following five stages (figure 9) (Butler, 1980).

1. The exploration stage

During the first stage small amounts of tourist looking to find something different in a holiday find a place that is special in terms of its culture, natural beauty, history or landscape. These are primary tourist attractions. There are no secondary tourist facilities available and tourism has no economic or social significance to local people.
2. The involvement stage
The exploration stage is followed by the involvement stage. During the second stage local residents become more involved in the tourist activities. They notice the increase of visitors to their area and start businesses to provide transport, guides, tourist activities, food or homestays.

3. The development stage
During the third stage the amount of tourist continue to grow until at some point they may even exceed the local population during peak seasons. External organizations start to see the potential of the region and start to invest into tourist services. Local involvement and control over tourism declines rapidly. The demand for tourist related jobs, but also construction or other services, increase due to the large numbers of tourist. Natural and cultural attractions will be developed and marketed, and as a result local people experience physical changes to the area that they may not approve of.

4. The consolidation stage
The local economy if often dominated by the tourist sector by this time. Marketing and advertising will be wide-reaching and major franchises and tourism chains will be represented in the area. The resort areas will have a well-defined recreational business district. Meanwhile local people are becoming more excluded from the tourist activities in the area which arouses opposition and discontent. This phase is also sometimes referred to as the success stage.

5. The stagnation stage
The next stage is stagnation. At a certain point the visitor numbers have reached their peak. When the area becomes too popular among tourist, the carrying capacity of the region will eventually be reached or even exceeded. At this point tourism is cause of environmental, social and economic problems. The area loses touch with the primary tourist attractions for which it became popular in the first place. As a result it is inevitable that the area will attract less visitors, which in turn will lead to economic decline and the under-utilisation of tourist infrastructure. At the end of the stagnation stage the area will either take steps to improve or fall into decline. Which brings us to step six.

6. The post-stagnation stage
The final stage is post-stagnation. Faced with the stagnation, the tourist sector has two options; either go into decline or rejuvenate and develop more sustainable strategies. Rejuvenation means that the tourist area reinvents itself in order to ensure a sustainable future. If the tourist area fails to do so, the decline scenario seems inevitable. In this scenario the area seems unable to compete with newer tourism attraction, and might even ultimately drop out of the tourism market completely. But since it’s not all black and white, various degradations can be identified between rejuvenation and decline. The following five scenarios differ from complete rejuvenation to utter decline:

A. Successful redevelopment leads to renewed growth;
B. Minor modifications to capacity level lead to modest growth in tourism;
C. Tourism is stabilized by cutting capacity levels;
D. Continued overuse of resources and lack of investment leads to decline; and
E. War, disease or other catastrophe causes an immediate collapse in tourism.
Butler's Tourist-area Life Cycle concept seems to be enjoying a certain level of acceptance (Haywood, 1986). But as the model is relatively abstract, it has to be operationalised in order to determine the possible use of it as a planning tool. In 1986 Haywood published an operationalisation of the TALC-Model. He argued that in order to made the tourist life cycle operational, six major conceptual and measurement decisions need to be considered and elaborated:

- Unit of analysis;
- Relevant market;
- Pattern and stages of the tourist area of life cycle;
- Identification of the area’s shape in the life cycle;
- Determination of the unit of measurement; and
- Determination of the relevant time unit.

1. Unit of analysis
How is the tourist area defined and delineated? This can vary from the scale of a specific region, a city or town down to a single vacation park or hotel. But it’s also possible to make several degradations within a tourist area with separate units of analysis such as hotels, motels, vacation parks, campsites, hostels, etc. These units can also be selected in accordance with their size, rate structure or location.

2. Relevant market
The tourist market is a rather heterogeneous market and is composed of various segments with distinct sub segments. While most TALC studies have focused on visitation at the total market level, it is sometimes more appropriate to divide the total market into several segments in order to get a clearer image. For instance, market type (domestic versus international tourists), distribution method (travel agent versus independent booking) or market segment (family orientated or corporate group).
3. **Patterns and stages of the tourist area of life cycle.**

As illustrated in figure 12 the most popular and common pattern of the life cycle is the S-shaped logistic function. But the pattern of the TALC-model is obviously not fixed. For certain tourist areas the exploration, involvement, consolidation and/or stagnation stages might be minor significance. Several research has been conducted into deviant or extreme cases to prove this point. There are a variety of TALC evolitional curves, such as the ones displayed in image 12.

**Figure 12: Varying TALC-curves**

4. **Identifying tourist area’s stage in the life cycle**

The two key questions with occur when trying to operationalise the TALC concept are how to determine the stage of a given tourist area and how to determine the “tipping-point” of moving to another stage. The historical pattern of number of tourist on itself is not enough to determine this, as time-series data rarely obey the theoretical pattern of a smooth curve. Also, as the previous paragraph stated, the S-shaped logistic curve is not fixed but only one of many options (figure 13). Haywood operationalises the identification of the tourist area’s stage by the possible change in the number of tourist from one year to the next.

*These changes can be plotted as a normal distribution with zero mean. If a tourist area has a percentage change of less than -0.5σ it could be classified in the decline stage. Tourist areas with percentage changes greater than 0.5% can be classified as being in the development stage and tourist areas in the range of +0.5σ could be considered to be in the consolidation and stagnation stages* (Haywood, 18986, p 158.)

5. **Determining the unit of measurement**

The main variable of the TALC concept is the size of the tourist population. But the carrying capacity, or saturation level, of the area is also of importance as to determine the stage of an area. Butler’s hypotheses was that the decline stage of the life cycle sets in, once elements of the tourist saturation level were exceeded. The area therefore loses its attractiveness to visitors. This emphasizes the need for a method to define an area’s carrying capacity. However, this is difficult since the area’s capacity consists of various cultural and natural elements, which vary both spatially within the area and temporally throughout the year. Also, it is difficult to pinpoint the fact when the carrying capacity of a region is exactly exceeded as it may also be a perceptual issue (Hovinen, 1981). Residents might have a different perspective on whether the carrying capacity has been exceeded as business owners do.

Therefore the number of tourist can be used as a guideline, but ameliorating variables should be
included to enforce the model. These could be the length of stay, the dispersion of tourists within and throughout the area, the characteristics of the tourist and seasonal fluctuations in visitors (Haywood, 1981).

![DETERMINING THE TALC-STAGE](image)

Another unit of measurement which could be considered is the tourist expenditure in an area instead of just the number of visitors to determine the stage, shape and pattern of the life cycle. And if used, the variable tourist expenditure could be operationalised in several ways such as unit sales (e.g. number of visitors to a park) or just monetary values. And the expenditure can be based on actual expenditure or adjusted for general economic conditions, seasonal/cyclical periods or expenditure per capita. This proves the point that operationalising units of measurements are key to the TALC-model and should be thought over thoroughly.

6. Determining the relevant time unit
Most TALC models are based on annual data. But other units of time can be considered as well such as quarterly or monthly data. Smaller units of measurement are also more likely to show seasonal fluctuations. But in all cases longitudinal data is most important for the TALC since the life cycle can run for decades. This is also one of the major shortcomings of the TALC as there is a lack of empirical data over the long term.

Appendix 13 contains criticisms on the original TALC-model of Haywood. The main criticism focusses on the exclusion of a re-orientation stage (Agarwal) and the differences between products (Zimmerman).

**The Tourist-area Life Cycle concept as a forecasting model**
Once the variables of the TALC are operationalised it can be used to predict the visitation and expenditure rate of a given area. This can be done by assuming the general S-shaped curve, visitation/expenditure rates and a predictive model. In the past, two of these basic predictive models
have already been developed and can be described in terms of four distinguishing features (Brady & Adams, 1962) (Fourt & Woodlock, 1960).

- **A ceiling that reflects in most cases, the researcher’s belief as to the expected saturation level. Most of the models assume a constant saturation level, although they can be modified to incorporate a somewhat more realistic situation in which the level of saturation changes (at a decreasing rate) over time;**
- **An S-shaped diffusion curve. In a few cases, an exponential growth curve is proposed;**
- **An assumption of homogeneity of customers; and**
- **No explicit conclusion of marketing strategy or the action of competitors (Haywood, 1981, p160).**

**Operationalisation of the Wider Context**
Several elements from the theories discussed in this chapter can be of use to (1) structure the interviews and (2) structure the analysis of the data. Table 1 below displays how elements of the TALC concept are used to structure the interview and interview questions. The various (internal) variables as described in the operationalization of the TALC-concept are retrieved through the interview questions. Based on the information which is gathered, the cases can be analysed in accordance with TALC-concept, and their stage within the model can be determined. This offers possibilities to determine the future perspective of the vacation park. To back these statistics, the interviewee’s are also asked on their personal perspective on the future possibilities of the park. Comparing these may lead to interesting insights on the actual or measured future perspective of the vacation parks, and the perceived perspective of the municipality on the park. The case characteristics will finally be put together in an overview which includes the characteristics of each case. The other elements of the wider context, such as the social/cultural, political and spatial elements are retrieved by direct questions in the interview.

Table 1 focusses on the variables with regard to the Wider context. In correspondence with much of the contextual analysis theory, the main aim of this phase is to identify the problem context, political context, spatial context and social context. The economic context is left out the model, as most relevant economic/financial contexts for the research are with regard to the vacation park. The financial prospects of the vacation park are largely described in the problem context. The variable ‘spatial context’ was added to the operationalization, because the direct surroundings can also influence the possibilities for the vacation park. The variables for the internal characteristics for the case, the problem context, are based on the TALC-concept (paragraph 2.2.1). These variables form the baseline for questions 7 till 16 of the interview. The results from these questions will form the input for the analysis of the wider case context in chapter five.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>Theory or author</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem context</strong></td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Who holds the property rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size/revenue of the park</td>
<td>Hectares, units, occupancy rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of vacation park</td>
<td>“Logie”-form, market, distribution method, market segment</td>
<td>Tourist Area Life Cycle (TALC) - Concept</td>
<td>7-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of nuisance</td>
<td>Undesirable activities, aesthetic nuisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future perspective</td>
<td>“Stated” perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political context</strong></td>
<td>Political attitude</td>
<td>Political support, government involvement, transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 16-16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial context</strong></td>
<td>Spatial characteristics</td>
<td>Comparison to surrounding area, location</td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 11, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-cultural context</strong></td>
<td>Social considerations</td>
<td>fate of the residents, complaints of neighbourhood, involvement of citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Operationalisation of the Wider Context**
2.2.2 The structural context

This chapter focuses on two theories with regard to the structural context; actor analysis and governance. The theories with regard to actor analysis provide tools and guidelines to structure the description of the actors, and the interrelations. The theories on governance provide tools to evaluate and analyse the interrelations and power structures between the government and the actors.

Actor-analysis

This paragraph focuses on theories with regard to actor analysis and decision making. When analysing decision-making processes, three types of models can be distinguished according to Teisman (2000) (Figure 14). The phase model suggests that the DM-process consists of several successive and distinct stages of formation, adoption and implementation. For example; defining a problem, searching for, choosing and implementing solutions. The stream model states that concurrent streams of problems and participants lie at the foundation of the DM-process, and eventually determine the outcome together. The rounds model combines elements of the two previous models in assuming that several actors introduce combinations of problems and solutions, and create progress through interaction. The rounds model concludes that a series of independent but interacting decisions taken by several actors decide the outcome of the process (Teisman, 2000). Each model generates specific insights. The phase model concentrates on decisions taken by a focal actor; the stream model focuses on the coincidental links between problems, solutions and actors; and the rounds model on the interaction between actors.

Decision analysis

One theory which can be of use to structure and map actor analyses is Decision analysis. The history of decision analysis is not that long, and can be traced back to the concept of utility theory. This is a numerical measure describing the value of alternative choices, and utility function, the numerical measure itself. The utility concept was mainly used to explain economic or ethical behaviour. From the utility theories emerged the decision analysis as researchers and practitioners mainly from the field of statistics and operations research developed prescriptive approaches and tools intended to help decision-makers (DMs) in difficult decisions. Decision analysts (DAs) distinguished two types of utility. Value preferences are made between choices when no uncertainty is present. Risk preference addresses the DM’s attitude towards risk taking under uncertainty. This learning package is concerned with choices under certainty, that is value theory, and specifically a decision analysis tool called value...
In a decision analysis three different parties can be identified (Figure 15).

- A Decision-maker (D-M). This is the person, organization or any other decision-making entity, who is empowered to make decisions concerning the decision-making problem at hand. In most cases, the DM is also responsible for the decision and possible consequences. Sometimes various decision-makers are involved within the same case and have a different degree of control and say (zeggenschap).
- A Decision-analyst (D-A). The DA provides insight and advice to the D-M in difficult decisions. His/her task is to help with the D-M to find the most appropriate decision alternatives with possible reasoning and facilitate the decision-making process.
- A stakeholder is a person or a body with an interest in the decision under consideration.

The possible relations between the different parties can vary for each DA-process. The degree of involvement to the process, as well as hierarchy between actors can be different. Also, some key players are not necessarily included in the analysis. For example, it might take a considerable effort to identify all the stakeholder groups that may have only a little relevance to the decision analysis process. The roles of the DM, analyst and stakeholders may also overlap.

**Value Tree analysis**

Value tree analysis (figure 16) is an integral part of decision analysis (DA). It can be applied to areas such as public policy problems or business, production and services. The value tree analysis consist of four main stages. The first stage is the problem structuring, in which the main goal is to create a better understanding of the decision problem. First, the decision context should be elaborated (1). Questions such as what is important and relevant, what are the objectives, what is the real problem, who are involved and what information is available should arise during this phase. The next steps are to identify the objectives of the actors (2), and to generate/identify decision alternatives (3). The relations between multiple objectives are analysed with hierarchical modelling (4). Finally the extent to which different decision alternatives satisfy the stated objectives are measured (5). Specification of attributes thus enables the comparison of the alternatives. For example, if sufficient compensation for the work done was an objective, salary measured in euros, could be a suitable attribute (Value Tree analysis, 2002). The second stage is the preference elicitation. During this stage, the analyst’s aim is to measure and estimate the DM’s preference over a set of objectives. This is not necessarily a straightforward
process, as the decision maker is not always aware, sure or able to state her preferences. Knowing the DM’s preferences, information about the attribute levels for different decision alternatives and the hierarchical model of the objectives can be used to find the most preferred alternative. Based on this information, the analysis can recommend a certain decision, which is step 3 (Value Tree analysis, 2002). Finally a sensitivity analysis can be used to explore how changes in the model influence the decision recommendation. Changing the parameters or preferences of the decision maker may lead to a new desirable outcome of the process. If a small change in one or several aspects of the model causes the recommended decision to change, the decision is said to be sensitive to those changes.

**Phases of Value Tree Analysis**

**Identifying the objectives**

One possible methods to display the objectives is by use of an Objectives Tree. Problem/Objective tree is a method to analyse the problems that an organization or a community faces and to set up objectives to respond to these problems. The first step is to identify the ideal and combined long term goal or situation that the actors wish to achieve in order to solve the identified problems (Problem Tree/Objective Tree, date unknown). Figure 17 displays an example of an objective tree. At the bottom line of the tree are the means, at the top the ends. The process of constructing an objective tree consists of four steps:

1. The negative situations described in the decision context must be converted into positive situations, which become the objectives.
2. Starting point is the desired long term outcome or objective.
3. Next the intermediate outcomes which are necessary to achieve the long term outcome are identified.

4. Finally the pre-conditions for the intermediate outcomes are formulated.

**Figure 17: Example of an Objectives Tree**

**Hierarchical model of the objectives**

In order to determine the hierarchy and interdependencies between actors, it is important to explore how the problem owner is dependent on other actors for realizing his objectives. Thissen and Walker (2012) distinguish three different types of interdependencies in their book Public Policy Analysis: New developments:

- Actors may control resources needed to achieve the problem owner’s objectives. For example; owners of land required, or financial institutions able to provide investment capital.
- Actors may have formal power over necessary conditions. For example; local, regional and national authorities make noise regulations, set standards of safety and have to power to grant or withhold various legally required permits needed for the expansion of an airport.
- Actors may have more informal powers to block decisions or frustrate the process. For example; environmental lobby groups can appeal permits several times and public authorities may be sensitive to their arguments (Thissen & Walker, 2012, p.89).

An analysis of the interdependencies of actors should focus only on the major dependencies and resources. One way to map this is by identifying the relevant resources, means and powers of the actors whom are involved in the process. The next step is to determine how crucial this resource is to the problem owner’s need. Actors who control or possess resources that are unique and crucial to the problem owner are called *critical actors*. The cooperation of these actors is essential to reach the goals set by the problem owner. However, if the critical resource can be provided by several actors, they are not considered critical at all. For example; financial capital can be a critical resource for a problem
owner, but as long as different banks are able to provide this resource, the banks are not considered to be critical actors. The results of the analysis of interdependencies can be condensed into a table listing the resources per actor, the relevance of the resources and the degree to which the actor is replaceable and critical. Table 2 is an example of a dependency analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Important resource under control of the actor</th>
<th>Degree to which the actor may be substituted</th>
<th>Dependency on the actor</th>
<th>Critical actor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Final say in land use plans</td>
<td>Non-replaceable</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land owner</td>
<td>Ownership of land</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Example of a simple dependency analysis (Thisen & Walker, 2012)**

Application of the theories on the thesis

Several elements from the theories discussed in this chapter can be of use to (1) structure the interviews and (2) structure the analysis of the data. Table 4 displays how elements of the decision analysis are used to structure the interview and interview questions. With regard to the analysis, the phase model is most likely to show the most similarities with the manner in which this research is conducted. The phase model concentrates on decisions taken by a focal actor, like a municipality. The model suggests that the DM process consists of several successive stages which eventually lead to the outcome, the transformation. The theory of Decision analysis forms the main guideline for the analysis in chapter four. The first phase of the Value tree “problem structuring” contains five clear categories with regard to actor analysis which can act as a guideline for the analysis (figure 6). The first stage of problem structuring, defining the problem, can serve as a short introduction to the problem. Next, the objectives of each of the actors are identified. The objectives can be displayed clearly in an objectives tree (figure 17). For step four, the hierarchical model of the objectives, the dependency analysis (Table 2) is a useful tool. Finally, the data for the entire actor analysis can be displayed in a single overview table which include the problem perceptions, goals and interest of the various actors (Enserink et al., 2004).

**Governance planning**

The theories on policy instruments (paragraph 2.2.3) offer a clear approach to map and structure the applied instruments in the cases. However, policy instruments are mainly based on a top-down mentality from the government (maybe with exception for the network approach). As mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, the role of the government is shifting from development oriented spatial planning towards a more invitational oriented policy. Citizens are more and more encouraged and stimulated to contribute to the development of their own living area (van Rooy, 2012). This shift can also be labelled as a change from government to governance. Governance is a concept with different dimensions and applications. In short, governance implies that the power of the government is becoming more restricted, and less central and vertically organised. The horizontal relation between governmental bodies are expressed through networks, and the government are becoming more and more process facilitators (Klijn, 2008). Guilini gives an in-depth overview of the diverse applications and defines its general meaning as follows: Governance is – in general terms – a notion that deals with the reframing of both formal and working relationships between ideal types of social order in realizing governing effects:
**State:** Public interest, hierarchy, coercion, monopoly of legitimate violence, territorial sovereignty  
**Market:** Private interest, competition, exchange, failure in producing collective goods  
**Community:** “commons”, reciprocity, cooperation, trust, solidarity.  
**Firms:** corporate interest, hierarchy, principal-agent relationships, instruction-based relations, vertical integration.  
**Associations:** concentration of collective interests, collective self-regulation, private government.

Due to the inherent diversity in national traditions and public cultures, there exist many definitions of governance in the literature, but it is possible to isolate just three main types of governance, as Nzongola-Ntalaja does in (Nzongola-Ntalaja 2003). First, political or public governance, whose authority is the State, government or public sector, relates to the process by which a society organizes its affairs and manages itself. The public sector could be defined as “activities that are undertaken with public funds, whether within or outside of core government, and whether those funds represent a direct transfer or are provided in the form of an implicit guarantee” (Manning & Kraan, 2006) Second, economic governance, whose authority is the private sector, relates to the policies, the processes or organizational mechanisms that are necessary to produce and distribute services and goods. Third, social governance, whose authority is the civil society, including citizens and non-for-profit organizations, relates to a system of values and beliefs that are necessary for social behaviours to happen and for public decisions to be taken. Stoker mentions five propositions of governance in his paper Governance as theory: five propositions (2002).

1. Governance refers to a set of institutions and actors that are drawn from but also beyond government  
2. Governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues.  
3. Governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationship between institutions involved in collective action.  
4. Governance is about autonomous self-governing networks of actors  
5. Governance recognizes the capacity to get things done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. It sees government as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide.

**What is good governance?**  
Governance is “good” when it allocates and manages resources to respond to collective problems, in other words, when a state efficiently provides public goods of necessary quality to its citizens. Hence states should be assessed on both the quality and the quantity of public goods provided to citizens (Rotberg 2004-05).

**How to evaluate governance?**  
Governance can be examined at three levels. On a global level, governance can be compared across countries and over time, thanks to standardized data that can be applied to diverse cultures, economies, and political systems. Governance data can enable robust benchmarking between countries, using common units of analysis. On a national level, governance can be analysed more
comprehensively thanks to more flexible and specific features. On a local level, governance assessment is targeted in a geographical region.

**Relations between public and private actors**

In governance, formal rules (laws and administrative arrangements) decisively influence power relations between public and private actors. Property rights are one important – if not the most important – type of formal rule. It is sometimes assumed that property rights grant property owners complete freedom in deciding how to use their land. However, the reality is that all countries restrict the exercise of property rights through formal rules established in both private and public law. Formal rules from private law regulate the obligations between equal actors, regardless of whether the actors are public or private. Formal rules from public law regulate the actions that public bodies impose on others (Needham, 2006: 1–3, 36–38, 39, 43–46).

**Rules versus power**

Together with the concepts of power, dependency and resources, formal rules are also relevant because they regulate the interactions between actors by defining rights and then stating to whom these rights belong. Formal rules also create new resources, which are needed for policy making and implementation, and then allocate them to certain actors (e.g. the legal obligation to have the zoning plans approved and to obtain building permits before being allowed to build). Thus, rules regulate the behaviour of actors and the distribution of resources in the network, and this, in turn, shapes dependency and correspondingly defines the power interactions among the actors. However, this process is more complex because power interactions also shape, consolidate or alter rules (Klijn, 1997: 33; Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000: 139). In other words, rules shape power interactions, but power interactions also shape rules (Figure 18).

![Figure 18: The relationship between rules, resources, dependence and power in policy networks](image)

**There is no dominant actor**

The network approach seems to apply to the policy field the same principles of Giddens’s ‘dialectic of control’ in social systems (1984: 16). The network approach assumes, as this dialectic does, that each actor has at its disposal some of the resources/rules that are required by the other actors to achieve their goals, and thus there is no dominant actor (Verhage, 2002: 158). This assumption explains why the need for cooperation is central in the network approach: policies can develop only when each actor makes its resources available to the other actors. In other words, each actor has a veto power (Kickert...
et al., 1997: 6; Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000: 142–144; Scharpf, 1978: 347, 350). Public actors are recognized as occupying a special position in the network approach because of the unique resources they control and the democratic legitimacy they enjoy. However, this special position is that of a *primus inter pares* and is nowhere close to a dominant role (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000: 151).

**Application of the theories on the thesis**

The theories on governance can be used to structure the result description of the research. The interviews can be structured according to the division of instruments (communicative, economic and juridical) as described by Korsten (2005). If during the course of the interview more instruments or conditions are mentioned, they can be added to the result description at a later stage. The political conditions for transformation should be identified in the interviews as well, as they are an indication of a government or governance approach. The previous paragraphs offer many tools to evaluate the policy instruments, policy vision and government or governance approach during the analysis stage of this report. For example, the choice for a policy vision can be determined to be either based on the instrumental perspective or the contextual perspective (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). Also, the applied instruments can be divided among the four types of visions; rational; network, control from a distance and control by value (Korsten, 2005). The policy network model (figure 18) can provide a clear overview of the power structure regarding the transformations. Table 3 provides an overview of the differences between government and governance planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deciding actors</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position actors</td>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>Horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness actors</td>
<td>Not possible</td>
<td>Depending on rules of accession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layers of governance</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position target groups</td>
<td>Object of management</td>
<td>Negotiating actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility of the policy</td>
<td>Dominant actor (authority)</td>
<td>Involved actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relation between actors</strong></td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy actors</td>
<td>Vertical hierarchical relations based on order and obey</td>
<td>Horizontal hierarchical relations based on dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination instruments</td>
<td>Rules and regulations</td>
<td>Negotiation and consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution based on</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Unicentric</td>
<td>Pluricentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem perception</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem perception and goals</td>
<td>Dominant actor</td>
<td>Consensus actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation policy process</td>
<td>Structural approach</td>
<td>Process-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement policy goals</td>
<td>Focus on aspects on the problem (object-oriented)</td>
<td>Focus on negotiations, dialogue and support (process-oriented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention/control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operationalisation of the Structural context

The next table focusses on the structural context of the transformations. The division of the variables regarding structural context is based on the theory of contextual analysis by Bressers. Based on this model, two main variables have been identified; actor analysis and governance. The actor analysis variables are based mainly on the decision and stakeholder analysis theory. Both variables are divided into indicators in order to get a more comprehensive and detailed structural description. The results from these questions will form the input for the structural analysis in chapter five. Together with the wider context, they form the most important variables which influence the chosen transformation instrument. This influence is described in chapter five.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>Theory or author</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor analysis</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Involved public and private actors</td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>4-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision context</td>
<td>“0-meting”. What is the problem</td>
<td>Value tree analysis</td>
<td>3-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying objectives</td>
<td>Municipal, owner, user and third party objectives</td>
<td>Objectives tree</td>
<td>5-5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying alternatives</td>
<td>Decision alternatives</td>
<td>Decision analysis</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder hierarchy</td>
<td>Interrelations between stakeholders and power structure</td>
<td>Dependency analysis</td>
<td>6-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifying the attributes</td>
<td>Comparison of alternatives</td>
<td>Decision analysis</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>Power structure</td>
<td>Relationship between actors, rules vs. power.</td>
<td>Klijn and Koppejan</td>
<td>6-6.8, 19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Different perspectives on government and governance planning (Muskens, 2011) (Vreke et al., 2009, p. 15)**

**Table 4: Operationalisation of the structural context**
2.2.3 THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS

This paragraph focusses on theories with regard to policy instruments. It provides tools to analyse the transformation conditions and the policy instruments of the government in particular. As mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the government can either attempt to conduct the transformation according to a top-down government approach, or a rather vertical governance approach. Either way, the government applies (to a certain degree) policy instruments to reach a more desirable state of the public domain. The NATO-typology of Hood (1984) illustrates one of the possible taxonomies for policy instruments. It distinguishes four key principles with regard to governmental policy and action.

- **Nodality**: the government holds in esteem instruments and resources which are based on their position “in the centre of information flows”;
- **Authority**: the possession of legal and official power;
- **Treasure**: the possession of financial means or “fungible chattels”;
- **Organisation**: the possession of a stock of people which can be put into action to execute public policy instruments.

Policy instruments can be defined as “the means to achieve policy goals” (Elmore, 1987), or more specific; “an identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem” (Salamon, 2002). Policy instruments have a central place in the policy process, because they turn policy goals with regard to a certain problem into policy initiatives (Hoogerwerf, 1989). The interventions by the municipalities on the vacation parks are by these definitions executed by policy instruments. Policy instruments should not be confused with the transformation strategies as described in the previous chapter (2.1.3). Policy instruments are the tools or methods which can be applied by a government to achieve or execute such strategies. There can be distinguished four types of policy instruments; (1) free initiative, (2) free initiative supported by behavioural influencing communicative and economical instruments, or (3) directive juridical instruments and (4) additional facilitative instruments in the form of governmental programs (Verhoest et al., 2003). Policy instruments based on free initiative are initiated by families and communities, civilian initiatives, non-profit actors and the private market. Howlett and Ramesh (1995) distinguish not four but three types of instruments (table 5);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of instruments</th>
<th>Degree of governmental involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary instruments (free initiative)</td>
<td>1. Family and community relationships;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Voluntary organisation (civilian initiatives and non-profit actors);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Private market;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed instruments (communicative and economical instruments)</td>
<td>4. Information and exhortation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Subsidies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Property rights;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. User-tax and levies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligatory instruments (Juridical instruments and government programs)</td>
<td>8. Regulation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Government companies; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Direct government programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5: TYPOLOGY OF POLICY INSTRUMENTS ACCORDING TO GOVERNMENTAL INVOLVEMENT (HOWLETT AND RAMESH, 1995)**
The government has several types of instruments to influence or regulate the free initiative. All of these instruments offer the government different possibilities to approach a case, and the set of chosen instruments can be regarded as a policy vision. A policy vision is sort of a comprehensive approach of rules and beliefs which are shared by a certain group of people (Korsten, 2005, p1). As mentioned earlier, there are three basic types of policy instruments within the domain of public management; communicative or informative instruments, economic instruments and juridical instruments. Communicative instruments are based on the assumption that actors can be encouraged to show desirable behaviour based on the norms and values they possess. Economic instruments are aimed at offering incentives to civilians and organisations in society. It assumes that these actors are utility maximizers and will adjust their behaviour when encouraged by such incentives. Juridical instruments are based on the assumption that restricting rules with regard to behaviour are necessary to withhold actors from expressing undesirable behaviour.

Each of the three basic type of instruments can work either stimulating or restrictive, and one-sided or two-sided. Stimulating instruments offer incentives for actors to collaborate or comply with a certain policy. Restrictive instruments try to achieve the opposite by prohibiting behaviour which is considered undesirable. In reality the policy instruments are often combined into an policymix (Korsten, 2005, p2). Furthermore, both stimulating and restrictive instruments can work either one-sided or two-sided. One-sided means that the instruments are applied from a governmental institution (e.g. a municipality) to a third party (e.g. civilians or companies). Two-sided instruments are agreements between governmental bodies mutually (e.g. a ministry and a municipality). This is displayed in table 6. The applied policy instruments offer opportunities to determine the type of policy vision which was applied for each case. The policy vision of the government can result in several strategies with regard to land transformation. Appendix eight contains an overview of possible land transformation strategies. Appendix nine contains an overview of the possible policy visions which are distinguished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimulating instruments</th>
<th>Restrictive instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-sided</strong></td>
<td><strong>Two-sided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative instruments</td>
<td>Stimulating publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economical instruments</td>
<td>Incentives (e.g. subsidies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juridical instruments</td>
<td>Order or dictate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6: TYPOLOGY OF POLICY INSTRUMENTS (KORSTEN, 2005)**
Operationalisation of the policy instruments

The various typologies of policy instruments can lead to a clear overview of the advantages and disadvantages of each instrument. The instruments can be described and divided into communicative, juridical and economic instruments, stimulating or restrictive and one-sided or two-sided policies. Table 7 below show the variables with regard to the policy instruments. It is divided into two main groups of indicators; the degree of government control (voluntary, mixed or obligatory instruments) and the type of instruments. According to the theory of Bressers, the wider context and the structural context influence the applied policy instrument of the municipality. The instruments for each of the transformation cases are described in chapter four. The instruments are split in three elements; the communicative, economical and juridical conditions which are applied by the government. Based on this, the policy vision or approach can be determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurable</th>
<th>Theory or tool</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary, mixed or obligatory</td>
<td>Degree of government involvement</td>
<td>Howlett &amp; Ramesh</td>
<td>18 – 18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>How are the stakeholders informed; How is the intervention “justified” to the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economical</td>
<td>Division of costs; Revenue model; Risks (timescale); Negotiations.</td>
<td>Stoker</td>
<td>19-19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juridical</td>
<td>Public and private law applied by municipality Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 21.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7: OPERATIONALISATION OF THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS
2.2.4 The action process

The fourth element of this theoretical framework is the action process. The action process is relevant for this research because the documentation and analysis of the transformation processes are useful for future transformation. Also, the application of different policy instruments may also lead to a different process timeline. Since there has not been conducted much research on the exact subject of the transformation of vacation parks, a clear and comprehensive evaluation also contributes to the scientific relevance of this thesis. The action process will be described using a timeline. The timeline will be structured in accordance with literature on planning processes. One of the clear advantages of the timeline, is that it provides a useful tool to evaluate the results of the transformation process. Based on the timeline, the success of the policy instrument can be determined. The evaluation is relevant for this research because the documentation and analysis of the transformation processes are useful for future transformation.

Timeline and planning processes

As mentioned in the paragraph ‘scientific relevance’, little research has been conducted on the very specific topic of vacation park transformations. However, if the case-specific variables of the vacation park are left out of the context, the transformation can be regarded as a regular governmental planning process for area development. And many research has been conducted on these sorts of planning process, in particularly for infrastructural projects (Kenniscentrum PPS, 2005) (Ruimte met Toekomst, unknown) (Commision Elverding, 2004). According to the Dutch government, an area development typically consists of four phases (Rijksoverheid, 2011) (Commission Elverding, 2008). Each of these phases can be linked to different planning procedures like the areal visions (structuurvisie) or land-use plans (bestemmingsplannen). With regard to infrastructural projects, they are also linked to various types of research such as quick scans and environmental assessments. Each phase follows a similar movement of diversion and conversion. During the start of each phase, the possible solutions and approaches are researched (diverge). At the end of each phase, choices have to be made (converge) in order to continue to the next phase. Plan processes are above all processes of people, and they require commitment and cooperation of actors (Ministerie van I&M, 2011). A typical planning process consists of the following four phases (figure 19);

1. The initiating phase.

The first phase is the initiation phase. This phase offers room for research on the areal development, like the degree to which it is desirable or if alternatives should be considered. It can be considered as an exploratory phase. For this, the global vision or outline and starting point for the development are researched and determined. However, there are no documented commitments between actors during this phase, except perhaps for a possible joint intention commitment to research the possibilities of the area development (Kenniscentrum PPS, 2005). The governmental instrument typically applied during this stage is the areal vision document. Depending on the developments it is sometimes necessary to conduct an environmental assessment (Planmer), or a quick scan (Kenniscentrum InfoMil, unknown).

2. The feasibility phase.

The feasibility phase is an intensive and complex phase of the area development. It can be divided into three sub phases; definition, design and preparation. This phase often consists of cyclic ‘trial and error’
stages, as the plans often require feedback which lead to change and new plans, which lead to new feedback.

2.1 Definition: The responsibilities in this phase are mainly for the governmental bodies involved. The program of requirements is the product of this phase, and the generic planologic and public law conditions are established (Rijksoverheid, 2011);

2.2 Design: The program of requirements is turned into a design for the intended development (Ruimte met Toekomst, unknown). Parallel to the design plan, the governmental land-use plan can be devised (InfoMil, unknown); and

2.3 Preparation: The final sub phase is preparation, during which the practical issues of the transformation are addressed. By the end of the preparation phase, the land-use plan and environmental assessments should be finished as well. This is usually a condition in order to start the realisation phase (InfoMil, unknown).

3. Realisation

The third phase focuses on the actual execution of the design plans which were established during the feasibility phase. The task division is clear and agreed on, and risk management and an execution organisation are of vital importance.

4. Management

The final stage is the management phase, which is aimed at the maintenance of the development. The area development has been finalised as a whole, and the area is assigned to the end-users (Rijksoverheid, 2011). For a sustainable area development, it is desirable that the separate phases of the planning process are connected permanently; from vision development till maintenance (Dauvellier et al., 2008).

![Figure 19: The Typical Planning Process (Rijksoverheid, 2011)](image-url)

The timeline is a valuable instrument to assess planning processes. A timeline does not necessarily assume that all processes are linear and in complete coherence; it is an organising principle for the events. It provides an opportunity to link the story with the wider social, political and environmental context during the interview (Adriansen, 2012). Since there has not been conducted much research on the exact subject of the transformation of vacation parks, a clear and comprehensive evaluation by
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use of a timeline contributes to the scientific relevance of this thesis. The process evaluation will focus on the formulation of “best practices”. The evaluation is structured in accordance with the DRIVE-approach to identify “best practices”. The best practices are based on the factors which have proven to be either problematic or a recipe for success, or elements which should be improved in future transformations.

**Drive-approach**

DRIVE is an approach to problem solving and analysis which can be used in the context of process improvement. Drive is an abbreviation which stands for Define, Review, Identify, Verify and Execute and stands for;

- **Define** the scope, criteria for success/failure and the deliverables
- **Review** the current situation and the background
- **Identify** improvements or solutions to the problem
- **Verify** that improvements will bring out benefits
- **Execute** the implementation of solutions and improvements

**Application of the theories on the thesis**

The process timeline as described in the previous paragraph offers insights in the course of a regular governmental planning process. The timeline can serve as a guideline for the evaluation of the transformation processes of this thesis. The results from the cases can be compared with the regular course of a planning process, and the identified milestones and phases can be fitted into the planning process timeline (figure 19). If necessary, the timeline can be customized into a new and fitting format so it will accurately illustrate the course of a transformation process. This can be linked back to the scientific relevance of this thesis, as it contributes to the (scarce) literature on transformation methods of vacation parks. As Adriansen mentions, timelines are a valuable instrument to assess planning processes. It provides an opportunity to link the story with the wider social, political and environmental context during the interview (Adriansen, 2012). Therefore, the interview questionnaire should also contain questions regarding the social, political and environmental/spatial conditions of the transformation. The DRIVE-Approach is a relatively simple guideline to structure the evaluation. It focusses on the improvements, or solution to the problem and the process, and the criteria for success (and failure). Such an evaluation are useful to people ‘in the field’, as they focus on the practical application of the transformation methods, and lead to ‘best practices’.

**Operationalisation of the action process.**

The next table (table 8) concerns the variables for the timeline analysis of the action process. The interviewees are asked to reflect on the planning process. This is necessary to develop a guideline for future transformations. In order to do so, the interviewees are asked to formulate the most important milestones of the process. Based on this, a timeline is composed. This timeline is compared with the timeline of a typical planning process in the Netherlands, as described in paragraph 2.2.4. A typical planning process consists of four phases; initiative, feasibility, realisation and management. The timeline is important because it is a valuable tool to assess and plan transformation processes. The interviewee’s are also asked to evaluate the process in hindsight with the knowledge they have now. The goal of the evaluative phase is twofold. First, it forces the interviewee to reflect on the transformation process. This may lead to new insights and improvements for future transformations,
in other words “best practices”. Secondly, it offers an opportunity to document the transformation in a timeline, with clear stages and delimitations. However, it is expected that the various cases will show little comparisons as each of the transformations are customized processes. The timeline will be structured in accordance with the planning process timelines. The process evaluation will be executed in accordance with the DRIVE-Approach. Both approaches are further explained and in table 10 below. Based on the timeline and the evaluation, the success of a transformation can be determined. It will also lead to recommendations for future transformation methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8: OPERATIONALISATION OF THE ACTION PROCESS**
2.3 PROPOSITIONS

The input of the theoretical framework, combined with information from the VVP, allows the composition of propositions for some of the sub-questions. The propositions will be reflected upon in the analysis and in the discussion part of the conclusion of this research. The comparison of the theories in the theoretical framework with the empirical data from the interviews by use of the propositions also form the scientific relevance of this thesis. The propositions are in coherence with sub-questions one, two and five of this research, as described in chapter one.

Proposition 1

The first proposition will be in accordance with sub-question 1. Sub-question one elaborates on the influence of case characteristics on the transformation method. The theories of Bressers and Ostrom state that the wider context influence the policy instruments and therefore the process of transformation. However, the theories do not include statements on the degree to which elements of the wider context influence the transformation methods/policy instruments. As a matter of fact, very few scientific research has been conducted into this case specific subject of vacation park transformations. The VVP states that a small amount of the vacation parks – 10 to 15% - lack economic perspective. According to the program Vital vacation parks, these parks have to be remediated and transformed into new land-uses. The biggest part of the vacation parks is located in the “middle group” and has some sort of economic perspective. The goal is to stimulate these parks with perspective to join the leading group (image 2) (Vitale Vakantieparken, 2015). This implies that economic perspective of the vacation park has an influence on the process of transformation. The future perspective can be determined in two ways; the stated perspective and the revealed perspective. The stated perspective is based on the attitude of the interviewees towards the case. The revealed perspective is based on the case characteristics. The TALC-model provides a background to “measure” the degree of future perspective. Based on the internal variables with regard to the case (paragraph 2.5.1), the vacation parks can be classified with regard to future perspective. The VVP (van den Hazel, 2017) also stresses the importance of the ownership situation of the park. Individually owned parks require a different approach in comparison to parks with fragmented land ownership.

Based on these assumptions, it can be expected that elements of the wider context influence the policy instruments to a certain extend. Variables such as ownership situation or future perspective are expected to have the biggest influence on the chosen policy instrument. Whether this is the case will be reflected upon in the analyses.

Proposition 2

The second proposition will be in accordance with sub-question 2. Sub-question one elaborates on the influence of actors on the transformation method. The theories of Bressers and Ostrom state that the structural context influence the applied policy instruments and therefore the process of transformation. But once again, they do not elaborate on the degree to which elements of the wider context influence the transformation methods/policy instruments. The theories on actor analysis and governance state that the relationship between rules, resources, dependence and power influence the policy network. Actors with abundant resources (e.g. juridical or financial means) are expected to have a larger influence on the transformation method. The available resources also contribute to a certain hierarchy between actors. The VVP mentions that the municipality is, in principal, the actor which holds
the main juridical resource; the final say with regard to the change of land-use plans (van den Hazel, 2017).

With regard to the structural context, it can be expected that actors with a large set of resources have a bigger chance to achieve their goals. These actors can be considered the most key-actors to the process. The goals of the actors in turn influence the chosen transformation direction. Therefore the assumption can be made that the goals of the most important actors influence the transformation method the most.

**Proposition 3**
The third proposition will be in accordance with sub-question 5. The theories of Bressers and Ostrom state that the contextual and structural context influence the applied policy instruments and therefore the action process of the transformation. The paragraph on policy instruments mentions the juridical, economic and communicative conditions for policy instruments. Paragraph 2.1.4 elaborates on the action process by providing background for the construction of a timeline for planning processes in the Netherlands. It includes four typical stages and sub-stages of a development process. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the VVP and local municipalities consider each process to be customized. This implies that every process is unique and therefore not in coherence with a regular planning process. This should, in theory, lead to nine unique timelines, with nine unique outcomes. The process of the transformation is described by use of timelines in chapter four of this thesis. In theory, the different policy instruments should influence the transformation process with regard to the length, steps, deadlines, etc. In practice however, this may not be the case.

Based on these assumptions, it can be expected that the outcome of each of the process varies, even between vacation parks which have been transformed using the same policy instrument. This proposition can be tested by comparing the nine timelines and rating them on certain criteria.
2.4 CONCEPTUAL MODEL

The figure (20) below displays the conceptual model of this thesis. The overall aim of this research is to gain insights into the transformation process of deteriorated vacation parks in the Veluwe, and the influence of case characteristics on this process. The green squares contain the four main elements of the research.

- The wider context;
- The structural context;
- The policy instruments; and
- The action process.

For each of the four elements, the most important sub-variables are displayed. For the wider context these are the problem context, the political context, the spatial context and the social context. For the structural context these are the actor analysis and governance-related variables. For the policy instruments these are the juridical, financial and communicative conditions. And finally for the action process these are the timeline and the process evaluation. The operationalisation of each of the sub-variables is displayed in table one, four, seven and eight of this chapter. The four elements structure the description chapter of this thesis (chapter four). Paragraph 4.1 describes the elements of the wider context for each of the cases. Paragraph 4.2 describes the elements of the structural context for each of the cases. Paragraph 4.3 focusses on the applied policy instrument per case and the corresponding juridical, financial and communicative conditions. Finally, paragraph 4.4 focusses on the action process for each of the cases. In order to do so, a timeline has been constructed for each case, and the end results are evaluated.

Chapter five contains the analysis of this thesis. The analysis forms the explanatory element of this thesis. It focusses on three main topics, which are displayed as blue arrows in figure 20;

- The influence of the wider context on the policy instrument;
- The influence of the structural context on the policy instrument; and
- The influence of the policy instrument on the action process.

The influence of the wider context on the policy instrument is explained in paragraph 5.1. The influence of the structural context on the policy instrument is explained in paragraph 5.2. The influence of the policy instrument on the action process is explained in paragraph 5.3. Each of the paragraphs is concluded with a reflection on corresponding the propositions as described in the previous paragraph.
Figure 20: Conceptual model of the research
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY
This chapter will elaborate on the research methodology of the master thesis. In other words; how this research is conducted, which strategy and methods are applied, and how is the data collected and analysed. The chapter will begin with a brief explanation of the research philosophy. Next, the applied research strategy and methods are elaborated. Then, the corresponding methods of data collection and analysis are explained. Finally, the validity and reliability of the research is described.

3.1 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY
Research philosophy means the use of abstract ideas and beliefs that inform our research (Creswell, 2013, p. 16). Philosophies are needed for an understanding of philosophical assumptions behind different parts of the research. The research philosophy therefore describes the manner in which the researcher looks towards the development of knowledge. This research has a rather positivistic research philosophy. Positivism generates hypotheses (or research questions) that can be tested and allow explanations that are measured against accepted knowledge of the world we live in. After all, the researches questions are based mainly on the existing pool of knowledge regarding transformation processes. Furthermore, this research will be conducted by use of a deductive method (Saunders, Lewis, Tornhill, Booij, & Verckens, 2013). The thought process of deduction moves first from theory and background to the research question, then to data collection, findings, and finally to a rejection or confirmation of the research question (University of Derby, 2017). Therefore, the analysis uses existing theory on which the hypotheses are based and tested during the research. According to Saunders et al. (2013) there are three main classifications of research;

- Descriptive research;
- Explanatory research;
- Exploratory research;

As stated in chapter one, this research is both descriptive, explanatory and exploratory. Its main aim is to formulate comprehensive strategies for the program vital vacation parks and therefore the redevelopment of the vacation parks in The Veluwe. As displayed in the conceptual model (figure 12) the descriptive, explanatory and exploratory parts of the research form the three main phases. The first part aims to describe the several case characteristics which form the starting point of each transformation process. Once the starting point is established, it attempts to explain how the given case characteristics influence the chosen transformation strategy by the municipality. Finally, the research is also exploratory. The interviewee’s are asked to evaluate the transformation process. The evaluation of the process is necessary to identify improvements, uncertainties, problematic and success factors of the process. It therefore explores “best practice” conditions for future transformations.

3.2 RESEARCH STRATEGY
In their book “designing a research (2007)”, Verschuren and Doorewaard distinguish three main questions or choices when it comes to designing a research. According to the writers, the first choice which should be made is between a “wide” and an “in-depth” research. A wide research usually means a large scale approach which will lead to results which can be generalized for a certain topic. Disadvantage is the general characteristics of the results and the usual lack of profundity. An in-depth
research is usually applied to a research with a relatively small scope or group of cases, and will lead to more detailed and complex findings. However, the downside of an in-depth case is that the results often only account for the specific case and are difficult to generalize.

In coherence with the above, Verschuren en Doorewaard distinguish two approaches; a qualitative or a quantitative research approach. An important characteristic of qualitative research is that the research subject is usually studied in its natural habitat. It focusses on the understanding the origins of a certain phenomenon and the cohesion between elements. Qualitative research however, aims to formulate universal statements and invigorate these with statistic data (Vennix, 2009, p. 90). The results of quantitative research methods are usually displayed in tables, graphs and calculations, while qualitative research methods focus rather on an interpretative approach in which the report will be mainly contemplative.

The final choice is between field-research and desk-research. Field-research usually implies that a researcher is pro-active, and wants to collect and analyse his own data. In desk-research on the other hand, the researcher uses existing literature and data, and apply this to the subject. It is also possible to combine field-research and desk-research. The five main research strategies according to Verschuren en Doorewaard are:

- Survey;
- Experiment;
- Case study;
- Grounded theory; and
- Desk research.

The choice for a certain research strategy is connected to the choice for a “wide” or “in-depth” approach, a qualitative or quantitative research, and choice between field- or desk-research.

### 3.2.1 CHOSEN RESEARCH STRATEGY

A few concrete choices are going to be made to get a clear view on the type of research this is going to be. As mentioned in the chapter one, the main aim of this research is;

> “To describe and explain the influence of the actors and the case on the applied methods of transformation of vacation parks, and to explore the possibilities to improve the conditions for these transformation processes in order to develop a comprehensive strategy”

Because this research attempts to thoroughly analyse a specific amount of transformation processes in order to make a recommendation for the situation in the Veluwe, it is mainly “in-depth” (Yin, 2003). However, the goal of the research is also to establish a relation between case characteristics and transformation methods, in order to formulate general recommendations for future transformations. This is the characteristic of a “wide” research. It is expected that the results are difficult to generalize as the approach for each transformation is customized. “One park, one approach”. The research methods are of a qualitative nature, as it aims to establish the influence of local characteristics on a
local phenomenon, and focus on the cohesion between these elements (Bryman, 2008, p. 366). The results of the research are meant to retrieve the underlying assumptions, motivations and experiences with the transformation processes. The results are not expected to be generalizable for a large group of cases. Since the data for the ideal transformation conditions in the Veluwe will be collected by the researcher, it is mainly a field-research. The results of the field-research will be combined with results from desk-research, in other words; theories and literature to provide a better recommendation for the Veluwe. The desk-research will vary from literature on transformations processes and methods (theoretical framework) to policy reports from local municipalities such as land-use plans. Therefore it can be concluded that this research will be an in-depth, qualitative field- and desk-research.

This leaves us to the choice and motivation for a certain research strategy. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, there are five main research strategies; surveys, experiments, case studies, grounded theory and desk research. Surveys are often used for generalizing and quantitative research, which is not the aim of this research. The experiment is often used to measure or test the effects of a change of policy. This does not collate with the research aim either. A desk-research on its own would not suffice, since the aim is to conduct an in-depth evaluation of transformation processes in the Veluwe. As this has not been researched before, it is key to gather the data by field-research. The underlying purpose of this research is to execute a policy analysis on the possible methods for the transformation of vacation parks. A common practice is to define the problem and evaluation criteria; identify and evaluate alternatives; and recommend a certain policy accordingly. Looking at the choices made, the most appropriate research strategy would therefore be a case-study. Robson (in Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2008, p. 129) defines a case study as “a strategy to conduct research which uses empirical data with regard to a certain contemporary and current phenomenon, using various sorts of data”. The group of case studies will provide qualitative data with regard to the involved actors, case characteristics and the transformation process. The case studies are therefore of a multiple-embedded nature (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2008)(Yin, 2008). The results of the case-study will be used to develop a new comprehensive approach towards redeveloping vacation parks.

3.3 RESEARCH METHODS
As mentioned in chapter one of this thesis, the research aim of the master thesis can be divided into a descriptive, explanatory and exploratory part. The research methods used during the descriptive phase are literature studies, document analysis and interviews. Literature studies are used to collect data from documents, media or reality (Verschuren and Doorewaard, 2007). This data can be collected both in a quantitative and qualitative matter. The literature study will focus mainly on the methods and theories with regard to actor analysis, vacation park characteristics and land transformation methods (Chapter 2.1.2). The second part of the descriptive phase will consist of document analysis and interviews for several case studies. During the explanatory phase the results from the case studies will be analysed to establish the relation between the independent variables and the chosen transformation process. Finally, during the exploratory phase, the chosen transformation methods are evaluated in order to formulate best practices for future developments. The main method of data collection for this master thesis is therefore interviews with experts in the field of transformation.

Interviews
The information from the literature review and document analysis will be complemented by interviews. The interviews will be conducted with individuals from municipalities whom are involved
with the spatial developments in the region Veluwe, and one expert from the Kadaster on transformation processes and property rights. The Kadaster is an independent organization which sometimes acts as a facilitator in the transformation process. The organization doesn’t stand to benefit from a certain outcome of the transformation process and has unique insights on the process based on its expertise in property rights. Several types of interviews can be distinguished such as structured interviews, semi-structured interviews or focus groups (Verschuren and Doorewaard, 2007). For my research I will be conducting face-to-face, semi-structured interviews which are audiotaped. Semi-structured interviews have the advantage that they offer the opportunity to the researcher to be flexible and ask additional in-depth questions during the course of the conversation (Reulink and Lindeman, 2005). Semi-structured interviews are usually conducted with the use of an interview guide (appendix 1) (Cresswell, 2013). The selection of the respondents is based on the network of the VVP on the one hand, and the desired case selection on the other. The interviews has also led to insights for new contact persons which can be approached for the research. Creswell (2013) calls this “Snowball Sampling”.

3.3.1 Operationalisation of the Research Material.

In order to improve the reliability and the validity of the interview, each of the interviews will be conducted in a similar structure. Paragraph 2.2 describes the operationalisation of the theories in the theoretical framework. Each of the five focus points of this research, the wider context, the structural context, the policy instruments, the action process and the process evaluation, are divided into various sub-variables. These variables are based on the literature as described in the theoretical framework. Table two, four, seven and eight display the variables for each of the research topics and the corresponding theories. The final columns of these tables refer to the interview questions used to retrieve the information. The entire interview guide and questionnaire is displayed in appendix 1.

3.4 Data Collection

Now that the research method is clear, and the interview is operationalised, it is time to focus on the manner in which the data is collected. In this paragraph, the selection of the cases will be clarified, explained and justified. The case selection is important as it is key for this research to gather a diverse set of cases. Furthermore in this paragraph it is explained how the validity and reliability of this research is guaranteed.

3.4.1 Selection of the Cases

As stated in the introduction, this research will be conducted for the program Vitalk vacation parks (VVP). The VVP are actively involved with the transformation of the vacation parks in the Veluwe. They have knowledge of the local vacation parks which are involved in such transformations, and the actors involved. The professional network of the VVP offers the opportunity to efficiently get in contact with local experts on transformation. As a result, most of the cases which are analysed in this thesis are located in the Veluwe area. This also limits the selection of cases, the entire process of vacation park transformation (in the Veluwe, but also beyond) is still relatively new. Therefore, the sample size of this research is limited to nine cases. The goal of qualitative research however is not to generalize the information, but to elucidate the particular and the specific (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007). One of the most important factors with regard to such a case selection is the variety of the cases. Variety in case characteristics in important but each vacation park is unique on itself, so the case characteristics will
always vary to a certain degree. For this research it is important to get a *maximum variation* of cases with regard to the applied transformation methods (Miles and Huberman, 1994). It is important that the VVP ends up with a diverse set of transformation approaches, which can be applied to certain types of vacation parks. The ‘why’ of this is also important. Why are some vacation parks transformed according to a certain method and others aren’t. The assumption of this thesis is that this depends on the case characteristics, wider contexts and the relationship between actors involved. In consultation with the VVP, a set of cases has been selected with largely deviating methods of transformation.

**Note and justification**

The selection of respondents for the interviews are slightly one-sided. The interviews are conducted mainly with experts from the involved municipalities. The benefits of these specialists is that they are knowledgeable regarding the subject, and often able to offer a complete overview of the transformation process from start till end. As a result they have developed a “helicopter view” on all the aspects of the transformation. A disadvantage is that the municipality is not an independent actor in the transformation, as they have their own interests with regard to the outcome of the transformation. Also, the experts are evaluating their own work, and information can therefore be slightly biased. One possibility to counter this is to also interview the other actors involved in the transformation; park owners, park inhabitants, nearby residents, etc. However, due to practical reasons this is expected to be unrealistic. Many of the processes and negotiations are still ongoing and rather sensitive subjects for the actors involved, as it directly influences their environment, finances or business. It is therefore undesirable to disturb this process by involving civilian parties. Because of the sensibility and delicacy of the processes, the cases in this thesis are anonymised. Also, this approach would require a large amount of respondents, as many of the cases are complex with many actors involved. This conflicts with the research aim, which requires a broad and deviant group of cases. It is therefore impractical to interview several actors for each case. The fact that some of the processes are still ongoing can be problematic for the evaluation of the cases. The end result of the process cannot be determined, and therefore valuable lessons might be missed. Due to the small amount of possible case studies, this is however inevitable. It is also of importance to maintain the goal of a diverse set of cases with maximum variation. The results of the analysis show that some applied transformation methods take more time than others. For example, the vacation parks which are transformed by (urban) land readjustment. These processes are more complex, as they include a larger group of actors, and therefore more time consumable. By excluding such unfinished cases to the case selection, the possibility to evaluate urban land readjustment methods on vacation parks will omitted.

### 3.4.2 Validity and reliability

In order to justify the research results it is important to be able to guarantee the quality of the research. Because this research is of a qualitative nature, the interpretation of the research outcome can be subjective. This is not favourable for the generalizability of the research. The quality of the research results depends on the internal and external validity (Verschuren and Doorewaard, 2007) (Saunders et al., 2013)

**Validity**

The internal validity of the results are determined by the quality of the research design. In other words, how credible are the results and are the methods applied the best possible methods to conduct this
research. The internal validity of qualitative case-studies is usually very high compared to quantitative research methods (Verschuren and Doorewaard, 2007). In order to increase the internal validity, several methods of data collection are used within the case study such as literature review, document analysis and interviews.

The external validity of the results determine the degree of transferability of the research methods. In other words, the likelihood that the results of the research can be generalized towards other similar situations in the Netherlands. Qualitative research is usually less externally valid than quantitative. This research also focusses on several units of analysis within one case; multiple actors and organizations are interviewed.

Reliability
Qualitative case study research is often criticized for not being “scientific” (Lewis and Thornhill, 2008). Also, it is often assumed to be less reliable compared to quantitative research methods (Fisher and Julsing, 2007). Cresswell (2013) argues that the reliability of qualitative research is therefore essential. The approach to do this is to come to an extensive and correct operationalisation of the theoretical concepts as described in chapter two. Furthermore, the chosen research strategy and method of data collection should connect correctly to the research questions and theoretical theories. Finally, to increase the reproducibility of the research, all interviews are recorded, transcribed and coded.

3.5 DATA PROCESSING
As mentioned earlier in this chapter, interviews and literature study will be the main source of information for this master thesis. The interviews in this research will be recorded, transcribed and analyzed by use of the program ATLAS.ti. Several steps must be completed during the analysis phase. These steps are in accordance with Cresswell’s (2007) procedures with regard to grounded theory.

1. **Open coding**: during the first step, all potentially important parts of the interview are coded individually and independently.
2. **Axial coding**: during the second step, part of the (relevant) codes from step one are combined into categories which share a relation with important theoretical aspects of the thesis. The categories are based on the operationalisation of the theoretical framework and can be found in appendix 4 (Code list). The axial coding phase let to seven main families of codes, 40 code groups, and 293 individual codes. The individual codes can contain up to 50 grounded codes.
3. **Selective coding**: finally during step three, the categories from step 2 are connected and analysed to develop a theory with regard to the research aim.

The results of the selective coding form the input for the analysis of the interview. As stated in paragraph 1.5, the analysis of the report (chapter 4 and 5) will be conducted in two phases. The first phase is the descriptive part. During this phase, the input from the interviews will be described in coherence with the variables described in the conceptual model. The data for each of the cases is structured into the variables with regard to the wider context, the structural context, the policy instruments, the action process and the process evaluation. The second part is the analysis, during which the nine separate cases are compared with each other, the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variable is explained.
CHAPTER 4: DESCRIPTION OF THE CASES

This chapter contains the description of the cases. The nine cases will first be described individually, in accordance with the conceptual model. This means that the wider and structural context will be described for each of the cases in paragraph one and two. Next, the applied policy instruments are identified and described. Paragraph four will contain the timelines for each of the cases. Finally, paragraph four will contain an overview of the evaluation for each of the cases. Each of the paragraphs will be concluded with an overview of the results in one table. The cases are described anonymously, and therefore the names and location are not mentioned.

4.1 THE WIDER CONTEXT

The wider context includes the problem context, structured by the TALC-concept and the political, spatial and socio-cultural context for each of the cases. The problem context is displayed in tables 9 till 17. The other contexts are explained per park in the associated texts.

Case 1:
The first case is a small vacation park with some (immobile) summer cottages and a couple of mobile homes. The park is cause of a certain degree of nuisance, and owned by an investor. The stated future perspective by the interviewee is low. The park is located in a rural area, in a cluster of 3 to 4 other vacation parks. The degree of tourist activities on these parks are all relatively low. The local municipality has a positive attitude towards a potential transformation of the vacation park. However, the park owner should not stand to (financially) benefit too much from the transformation. The park is also permanently occupied, which is illegal, and cause of nuisance. This was a trigger for the municipality to cooperate with the transformation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Context Case 1</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of the park</strong></td>
<td>Two hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number and type of objects</strong></td>
<td>Eight recreational cottages and an x amount of mobile homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>One park owner (recently purchased by investor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</strong></td>
<td>100% occupied almost all year long, 95% for non-tourist purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison to the area</strong></td>
<td>There are a certain amount of vacation parks in the area, but the touristic usage of these are also relatively low. The new owner/investor has no touristic goals or purposes for the exploitation of the park. Emphasize on the yield of the park, which requires a high occupancy rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree and type of nuisance</strong></td>
<td>Permanent housing (also of migrant workers). Small criminality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stated future perspective</strong></td>
<td>Minimal future perspective. Almost no tourist facilities on the park, and also few facilities in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 9: THE PROBLEM CONTEXT FOR CASE ONE.**
**Case 2:**
The second case is a small vacation park with 44 recreational objects, mainly cottages. The cottages are all privately owned, and the owner of the park has no desire to exploit the park for touristic purposes. The park is barely used for tourism anyway, and located in a green, rural area. The municipality wants to change the land destination to residential purposes. This would mean that the home owners can live legally in the residentially destined houses. In return, the municipality expects a financial contribution, and enforces restrictions on the “permit-free” building enlargements. It is important that the houses will “fit” into the local landscape nicely, and form not too much of an obstruction for the local farm owners business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>One hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>44 objects, all most all recreational cottages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>44 individual owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</td>
<td>100% occupied almost all year long, 90% for non-tourist purposes (permanent housing). The remaining 10% of the owners uses the park as a second home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is located in a ‘green’ area with forests. It is also located near a farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>Little nuisance towards the area. Park subject to illegal permanent housing. The nearby farm fears the existence of the park might interfere with its business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>Minimal future perspective. Almost no tourist facilities on the park, and the park owner is not focussed on tourism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 10: THE PROBLEM CONTEXT FOR CASE TWO.**

**Case 3:**
The third park is a slightly larger park (5-6 hectares) with a certain tourist potential. However, the current owner of the park wants to focus on the housing of migrant workers, instead of the touristic exploitation. The area is located in a green area near a village, with a railway and small business park nearby. It is also located near two companies who offer a work for migrant workers. The municipality’s goals are twofold; on the one hand they want the park to be exploited for touristic purposes. On the other hand the municipality also see the necessity to offer accommodations for migrant workers in the area. The ideal situation for the municipality would be to exploit the park fully recreational, or otherwise construct a system to gradually transform the park to something more desirable.
Problem Context Case 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>Five to six hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>Mix of chalets, recreational cottages and campsites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>One park owner (with no touristic exploitation goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose</td>
<td>Park is split in two; a recreational part and a part which houses migrant workers. The recreational part is seeing a decrease in occupancy, but has still some potential. The other part is occupied all year long by migrant workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is located in a ‘green’ area with forests, near a village, railway and a small business park, and experiences some noise nuisance as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>Few nuisance towards the area. The housing of migrant workers on the park was cause of nuisance towards the touristic visitors of the park, but this decreased after the park was split in two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>The park has touristic future potential. But that would require a new owner with touristic exploitation goals, and the disappearance of the migrant workers on the park. Even though the migrant workers are housed on a separate part of the park, it still proves to be a mismatch with tourism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: The problem context for case three.

Case 4:
The forth case is a small, but not deteriorated vacation park in a rural area near a football field. The park was purchased in 2012 by a new owner whom wanted to house migrant workers in the park. The municipality saw a necessity for the housing of migrant workers, but was unsure what to do with the park. The city council preferred to keep the current recreational supply of vacation parks in the region. The mayor and councillors are more open to transformation because it offers solutions for certain problems. Also the alternative, years of enforcement, would cost a lot of public money. Afterwards, the park should be transformed to something more desirable. With regard to the spatial context; the football club would like to have an additional parking lot. A transformation could facilitate this desire.
Problem Context Case 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>One and a half hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>Chalets and campsites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>One park owner (with no touristic exploitation goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</td>
<td>Because the park was not exploited with touristic purposes, the visitor numbers declined. The park was used 100% recreationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is located in a rural area near a football club and with one neighbour opposite to the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>Few nuisance towards the area. It was a mostly empty park with a few visitors during the summer. Spatial quality was not deteriorated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>The touristic potential of the park is hard to determine. Perhaps with a decent recreational entrepreneur it could have been exploited profitable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12: The Problem Context for Case Four.**

**Case 5:**
Park number five is a small-medium sized park (in comparison to the other cases), owned mainly by one individual. Some of the campsites are owned by private owners. The occupancy rate is high because it is used for permanent housing. Partly because of the permanent housing, it is cause of a certain degree of nuisance to the area. The perceived future perspective is minimal, which is the reason the municipality wants to transform the park. The park owner wants to cooperate with transformation.

Problem Context Case 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>Two and a half hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>Recreational cottages and campsites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>One park owner, some campsites are privately owned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</td>
<td>Occupancy rate is high, because it is mainly (illegally) used for permanent housing. Almost no tourist purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is located in a rural area next time some residential houses and a few companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>High degree of nuisance, varying from permanent housing to (small) criminality. The spatial quality of the park is also deteriorated and undesirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>Minimal future perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13: The Problem Context for Case Five.**
Case 6:
Case 6 is the first of a cluster of four parks (case 6, 7, 8 and 9), and was built in 1997. It contains 88 recreational cottages which are clustered in groups of four. Over the course of years many of the houses have been sold to individuals. The park lacks tourist facilities and is mainly used for permanent housing. The future perspective is therefore minimal. The municipality would like to see it transformed into a residential area. Since case 7 till 9 are still in the first phase of the process, the exact approach is still largely unknown and being research. However, the method of (urban) land readjustment is one of the possibilities for the transformation or revitalisation of the park. The cases 6 till 9 are also part of a government pilot project with regard to urban land readjustment. Such a method has not yet been applied on vacation parks on such a scale. It could offer an earnings model for the municipality, but the juridical, communicative and financial approach is still far from certain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>Four and a half hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>88 recreational cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>The recreational cottages are privately owned. Many of these private owners (30) have a permit for legal residence. The public space of the park is owned by an association of homeowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</td>
<td>Occupancy rate is high, because it is mainly (illegally) used for permanent housing. Almost no tourist purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is divided by two municipalities, and located near a highway with noise nuisance as a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>Minimal nuisance, but many of the recreational cottages are inhabited permanently which is not legal in all cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>Minimal future perspective. The park is permanently inhabited from the beginning and it lacks tourist facilities. The park is old but not deteriorated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14: The problem context for case six.**

Case 7:
Case 7 was for sale a few years ago, and the municipality outsourced a research on the possibilities for transformation if they would purchase the park for themselves. The purchase didn’t go through and the park became remained privately owned. The new owner has ideas for the touristic exploitation of the park. He wants to upgrade the tourist facilities on the park, and install new chalets. The park has a certain degree of future perspective, but the municipality wants to ban permanent housing on the park in the future. This could prove to be difficult as there are a few residents on the park with a permit for legal residence. At this time, the park is cause of minimal nuisance (little deteriorated) but sees a lot of permanent housing.
Problem Context Case 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>Eight and a half hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>4 cabins, 214 mobile houses, 20 recreational cottages and 40 campsites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>One park owner. A few individuals (6) have a permit for legal residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</td>
<td>Occupancy rate is high, also because it is used for permanent housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is located between park 6 and 8, in a green area with many vacation parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>Minimal nuisance, little bit cluttered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>Future perspective possible, it is still used for tourist purposes and the new owner aims to expand the tourist facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: The problem context for case seven.**

Case 8:
The eight park is a reasonably sized vacation park with a pool, tennis court and reception. The ownership of the park is typically complex, with many individual owners. A part of the recreational objects are owned by investors that put up the houses for rent for financial return. Another part is owned by private homeowners which use it (A) for recreational purposes or, (B) for permanent residence, sometimes illegally. Finally, the park owner owns some recreational objects for the tourist exploitation of the park. The municipality considers the park to have a certain future perspective, mainly because the modernised tourist facilities and the central and business-like exploitation. The park is enclosed entirely by other vacation parks, and a terrain for the boy scouts in the east.

Problem Context Case 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of the park</td>
<td>Six hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and type of objects</td>
<td>53 recreational cottages (bungalows) and 79 chalets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Complex ownership situation. Recreational objects are owned by investors, private homeowners and the park owner. Also, the park houses 25 individuals with a permit for legal residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</td>
<td>Occupancy rate is high, and used primarily for recreational purposes, especially in the summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to the area</td>
<td>The park is enclosed by other vacation parks (north, west and south) and the boy scouts (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and type of nuisance</td>
<td>Minimal nuisance, permanent housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated future perspective</td>
<td>Future perspective possible because of modernised tourist facilities and business-like exploitation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: The problem context for case eight.**
Case 9:
Park 9 is a bungalow park which was constructed in 1999. It is the largest park in the case selection, and a high-end park with many bungalows on relatively large building plots. The bungalows are entirely sold to individuals, which is the cause of a large share of permanent housing and the rental of bungalows for temporary residence. The park lacks a central exploitation, and the public space of the park is owned and managed by the association of homeowners. The recreational facilities on the park are owned by the previous owner of the entire park. Despite these facilities, the touristic future perspective of the park is slight. Therefore the municipality wants to transform it into a residential area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of the park</strong></td>
<td>Sixteen hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number and type of objects</strong></td>
<td>190 recreational cottages (bungalows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>All 190 bungalows are privately owned. Public space owned by association of homeowners. (amount of homeowners with permit for legal residence is unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy rate and degree of tourist-purpose of the park</strong></td>
<td>Occupancy rate is high, and used primarily for permanent residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison to the area</strong></td>
<td>Located near a highway in a green environment. Entrance of the park is also the entrance of the entire area which consists of many vacation parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree and type of nuisance</strong></td>
<td>Permanent housing, housing of migrant workers, small incidents and a decent overview of the residents of the park is lacking. This complicates law enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stated future perspective</strong></td>
<td>Future perspective minimal because it lacks a central exploitation and all recreational objects are privately owned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: The problem context for case seven.**

Conclusion
Table 9 till 17 display the problem contexts for each of the individual cases. Appendix two contains a table with an overview for the entire set of cases. It provides a clear overview of the variations in case characteristics of the nine cases. The smallest park is one hectare, while the largest is 16 hectares. In terms of ownership; four of the parks are owned by individual owners, three are owned exclusively by private residents, and the remaining two have a mixed ownership situation with both individual owners, investors and a park owner. The degree and type of nuisance varies as well, although the most common type is permanent housing. Almost all parks have a high occupancy rate, although this is explained in seven of the nine cases by the degree of (legal and illegal) permanent housing. Finally the political context; three of the nine municipalities are in favour of the continuation of the vacation park, three are in favour of transformation to nature or other area, and the remaining three support the transformation to a residential area. (Table 27 in appendix 7 contains an extended table for the problem context).
4.2 THE STRUCTURAL CONTEXT

Paragraph two focusses on the structural context, and in particular the actor-analysis. The actor analysis is based on the value tree analysis and consists of six stages, which will be conducted step by step. These steps are the stakeholder analysis, decision context, objectives and dependency. The decision context has been established in the previous paragraph and will therefore be skipped.

4.2.1 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Table 18 below displays all the actors which have been involved in the nine transformation processes per case. The municipal actors have been divided into four groups; the elected city council (gemeenteraad), the mayor and councillors (college van burgemeester en wethouders), the government officials (ambtelijk apparaat) and a contact person on the park. Even though these groups are all part of the municipality and work together, they hold separate means and power. The park owners have also been divided into four categories, as this was mentioned in the interviews multiple times. The goals and perspective of the park owner on the park have a distinct influence on the transformation process. This is similar for the park residents. The nine cases have shown four types of residents, with a different set of goals and means. The legal permit holders in particular have a juridical base to remain on the park, in contrary to migrant workers or illegal permanent residents. The stakeholders in the area are divided into eight groups, and usually have similar goals and means; improvement of the living area/decrease of nuisance and they can lodge an objection against a change of the land-use plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor analysis</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City council</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and councillors</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact person on the park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park owner (type)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on recreational exploitation of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on alternative source of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on real estate development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive owner, almost no juridical influence on the park</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current residents of the park</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal permanent residents</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal permanent residents with permit for legal residence</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second home/recreational dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist visitors of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders in area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Objectives

Figure 21, 22 and 23 display the objectives of the three most important actors: the municipalities, the park owners and the park residents. For the municipality, the main goal is the improvement of spatial quality and/or the recreational sector. Spatial quality is a wide concept which includes elements as public housing, user value, innovation, economic value, future value and security. Some of the municipalities are opposed to the transformation of vacation parks, as they aim to keep a certain amount of recreational parks in the region. Others execute a policy which is more in line with the goals of the VVP and tend to transform the parks into a new destination. The transformation can be executed basically in two ways, by buying the park or with the use of a more cost-neutral policy instrument. All the municipalities in the case selection went for option two; the use of a policy instrument. The advantage of option two is that it is relatively cheap in comparison to option one. Disadvantage is that it can be a lengthy process.

**TABLE 18: ACTOR ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>x</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy scouts</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football club</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park owners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA (organisation for housing refugees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External project leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of homeowners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 21: OBJECTIVES TREE FOR THE MUNICIPALITY**

**Municipality**

- **Main goal**: Improvement of spatial quality and recreational sector
- **Direction**
  - Facilitate quality improvement of the vacation park
  - Transform the vacation park into a new destination
- **Strategy?**
  - Seize illegal permanent housing on the park
  - Buy out park owner and transform
  - Come to agreement with park owner for transformation
The park owner’s main goal is quite obviously more self-regarding. The vacation park is (partly) their property, and has a certain economic value to them. It provides income, or otherwise represents a financial value in the books. Either way, the vacation park must be used to secure a financial income or future for the park owner. Some of the park owners still have the desire to recreationally exploit the park. The municipality has no real influence on this, but states that illegal permanent residence on these parks is not tolerated anymore. In case 7 and 8, the municipality and the park owners are in consultation on how to deal with the current (permanent) residents living on the park. The other group of park owners (case 1, 3, 4 and 5) are open to transformation, but want to gain something from this transformation as well. The structure of compensation is often the result of a negotiation between the municipality and the park owner, in which either can take the initiative. Also the degree of ownership of the park is of importance for this negotiation. The park owner can choose to sell the vacation park as a complete entity to one owner, or sell the recreational objects individually (uitponden). Case 2, 6 and 9 are almost exclusively owned by the residents and the association of homeowners. The park owner has a lesser say in the negotiations with the municipality in these cases. This complicates the situation for the municipality.

The final objectives tree is for the residents of the park. This is more complicated. First of all, the residents of the park can either be the owner of the recreational object, or a tenant. As mentioned in table 18, the group of residents can be split in four. First are the migrant workers who often rent the houses or mobile homes. The migrant workers have almost no rights in such a transformation, and are therefore usually not a direct involved actor. Their interests are represented by either the municipality or the company/park owner which provides the housing. The second group are the people who use the recreational houses as (cheap) alternatives to live. This group resides in the recreational objects basically all year long. This is illegal in principle, but some of the residents have permits for legal residence (persoonsgebonden gedoogstatus). Their goal is to acquire certainty with regard to their housing situation. In both cases, a transformation of the house from a recreational purpose to a residential purpose would be ideal from their point of view. It provides certainly, but also an increase of the real estate value of the recreational houses. The final group are the house owners who use the park for recreational purposes, for instance as a second vacation house. Each group has a different goal, but also different resources. These are displayed in the dependency analysis (paragraph 4.1.3). The objectives tree for the residents of the park (figure 23) focusses on the permanent residents.
4.2.3 Dependency analysis

The dependency analysis focuses on the resources of the actors and the hierarchy between the actors. The resources and dependency are illustrated in table 19, and the hierarchical interrelations are displayed in figure 25. The dependency table includes all the main actors described in the actor analysis. The most important dependencies and interrelations are described in this paragraph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Important resource under control of the actor</th>
<th>Degree to which the actor may be substituted</th>
<th>Dependency on actor</th>
<th>Critical actor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City council</td>
<td>Approval of land-use plans and area visions</td>
<td>Non-replaceable</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and councillors</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Non-replaceable</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Semi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal officials</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Replaceable (external sources)</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Semi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park owner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner with entire property rights</td>
<td>Property of the park</td>
<td>Semi-replaceable (Buy-out)</td>
<td>Large (unless owner sells park)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner with no property rights</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Replaceable</td>
<td>Non-dependent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents of the park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers</td>
<td>Money to pay rent</td>
<td>Replaceable</td>
<td>Slight (unless park owner is depending on migrant workers for income)</td>
<td>Semi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit holders</td>
<td>Legal status</td>
<td>Semi-replaceable</td>
<td>Semi-dependent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 23: Objectives Tree for the Park Residents**
Illegal residents | Property right of recreational object (sometimes) | Replaceable | Non-dependent | No or Semi
---|---|---|---|---
Tourist visitors of the park | Choice for different vacation park | Replaceable | Non-dependent | Semi
Local stakeholders | Juridical objection against change of land-use plans | Almost non-replaceable | Semi-dependent to largely dependent | Semi
Law enforcement | Man power for enforcement | Non-replaceable | Slight | No
COA | Financial means and man power | Semi-replaceable | Non-dependent | No
External project leader | Expertise and time | Replaceable | Non-dependent | No
Association of home owners | Property of public space | Semi-replaceable | Semi-dependent | Semi
Bank | Financial means | Replaceable | Semi-dependent | No
Kadaster | Expertise on property rights | Semi-replaceable | Slight | No

Table 19: Dependency analysis of the actors

The dependency analysis shows that the most important actors in the transformation are the municipality and the park owner and/or residents. The municipality (city council) is always a critical actor because they have the final say in the approval of land-use plans. The municipal officials have expertise on transformation and can facilitate the process. The degree to which the park owner is a critical actor to the process depends on his property rights of the park. If the park is owned by one individual or entrepreneur, he has the final say in the transformation. The municipality can’t force a transformation, they can only enforce the compliance of rules and legislation such as illegal permanent housing. This is the same for the residents of the park. Residents with property rights and a permit for legal residence have a strong position in the negotiations with the park owner and municipality. The parks with many permanent residents are often organised in an association of home owners. Together they own and manage the public space of the park. Representatives from the association of home owners organise also the contact between the municipality and the individual home owners. Residents on the park with no legal status and no property rights however have no important resources at hand and are therefore no critical actors. Other stakeholders in the area only have some juridical resources available such as the objection against land-use plan changes. This can delay the process, therefore the municipality sometimes involves the local stakeholders in the beginning of the process to preclude such event. The Kadaster is also involved in some of the cases, as they are experts on property rights. In that sense, they can contribute to larger processes with my different actors involved such as cases 6 till 9. They are also independent in such a process, which makes them well-suited to be the process facilitators. Figure 24 contains an overview and specification of the typical types of resources for the two main actors of the process; the municipality and the park owner. For the park owner(s), the loss of (juridical) property rights means the increase of financial means. But it can also be the other way around, the loss of financial means (the financial contribution) results in increased (juridical) property rights (change of land-use destination).
Figure 25 contains the hierarchical model of the cases. The three layers of government have a hierarchical power structure, but the municipality has the freedom to work within the boundaries of the rules. The VVP program is located somewhere in between the province and the municipality, as a facilitator and initiator of the vacation parks revitalization. The elected city council determine the policies of the municipality, while the mayor and councillors take care of the executive part. They are supported by the municipal officials and can apply law enforcement as well if necessary. The park owners and park residents have financial and juridical means, but rely on the municipality for a change of the land-use plan. The park owner sometimes has advisors working for him, while the park residents are sometimes organized in associations of home owners. Finally, many stakeholders are indirectly involved and hold the right to object to land-use plan changes.
4.3 POLICY INSTRUMENTS

Paragraph 4.3 describes the policy instruments which have been (or are most likely going to be) applied in the nine cases. Table 20 contains an overview of the applied transformation method per case. The methods are further explained in this paragraph. This includes the communicative, economic and juridical conditions for each of the instrument. Also the degree to which the instruments are voluntary, mixed or obligatory are mentioned.

Table 20 contains an overview of the applied or planned instruments. There are four basic type of instruments, all with corresponding specific conditions, benefits and disadvantages. The communicative, economical and juridical conditions for each of the transformation methods are discussed in this paragraph, in coherence with the theory of stoker (chapter 2). The application and conditions of the instruments may also vary for each individual case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy instruments</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformation methods</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAB-policy</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary land-use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurpose to residential area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Urban) land readjustment</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transformation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 20: OVERVIEW OF THE APPLIED TRANSFORMATION METHODS.**

4.3.1 VAB-POLICY

The VAB-Policy is a policy which is applied in the Netherlands with regard to vacant agricultural buildings. Because of up-scaling in the agricultural sector in the Netherlands (and many other countries as well), smaller farms deal with an insufficient future perspective. As a results, many of the farms are threatened to become vacant. This can be problematic for the viability and economic vitality of rural areas. The VAB-policy offers government institutions a tool to counter this problem. In short, the VAB-policy offers farmers a financial stimulants to demolish their vacant agricultural destined properties, by compensating them in some way. Depending on the location of the agricultural property, it can be re-destined to new purposes of various types and size. The possibilities for the redevelopment are limited and depend on conditions such as noise, traffic, etc. Also, qualitative criteria such as the contribution of the transformation to the economic, social and spatial structure are applied (Gemeente Hof van Twente, 2006). One frequently used possibility is the transformation to a residential land use. This means that the agricultural entrepreneur is compensated with an x amount of building plots. He can then either sell these building-plots, or develop real estate on its own. The amount and size of the building plot and the regulations with regard to the construction of the houses is the result of negotiations between the farmer and the municipality.

The VAB-policy forms the core and base for the transformation of case one and five. Instead of agricultural buildings, the park owner are compensated for the demolishment of the recreational buildings. They lose the recreational destination in the land-use plan, but in return regain a certain amount of building plots. The amount of building plots that the owner gains are the result of a negotiation between the owner and the municipality. In case one, the park owner was given the possibility to receive the building plot on a different location than the vacation park. The vacation park would be transformed to nature entirely, and the park owner would receive a building plot somewhere else in the region, in a more suitable location. He also gained the possibility to enlarge an existing
It is quite essential for this transformation method that the park is owned mainly by one individual. The park owner of case one became the owner of the entire park. For case five this is almost the same, although some of the campsites are owned by individuals. In this case it is the responsibility for the park owner to buy-out these campsite owners. The VAB-policy is largely a voluntary policy instrument. However, because of the illegal activities on parks one and five, the municipality has the authority and resources to enforce restrictions on the park. Law enforcement (handhaving) can be applied to end illegal activities such as permanent housing and (small) criminal activities on the park. The permanent housing provide a steady source of income for the park owner, but this is of course not sustainable. For both cases, the degree of recreational future perspective was minimal. This means that the park owner has little alternative then to go along with a transformation. They stand little chance to exploit the park recreationally, and are also not able to continue to run the park as it is now due to law enforcement. A transformation provides a certain revenue model and incentive for the park owner to transform. The advantage for the municipality is that this tool allows a relatively quick solution to the problem. In a matter of years, the dilapidated vacation park is remediated into nature (case 1) or several building plots and houses (case 5). In comparison with the old situation, this proves to be an improvement of the quality of the public space. The municipality makes sure that the new building plots and reconstruction possibilities for these dwellings are up the right standards. The building should fit in the local environment with regard to lines of sight (zichtlijnen), group contours (groepscontouren), etc. This means that the stakeholders in the neighbourhood are more likely to refrain from any objection against the change of the land-use plan.

**Communicative conditions**

The municipality negotiates mainly with the park owner (and his advisors). The park residents are not included in the process, as the park owner has the final say in the transformation. The park owner is responsible for the communication towards the residents on the park. In both cases the residents resisted a little bit at first, but this did not lead to major issues in the end. The municipality was however aware that both parks housed residents in so-called “social vulnerable positions”. It is not desirable that these individuals are reallocated to a different vacation park, as this can cause the same problems in the future. The degree to which the municipalities anticipated this problem varied. For case one, the municipality did not look for alternative housing, but they watched together with law enforcement...
how the situation would develop. For case five, the municipality was involved more actively in the search for new housing possibilities. In the worst cases, the municipality took initiative from within the social domain to look for new social houses. The municipalities has urgency possibilities for the application to social housing for people in vulnerable positions. And if the residents do not qualify for these urgency possibilities, the municipality consults with housing cooperatives for alternative houses. The neighbourhood are informed in the standard procedure for the change of a land-use plan.

Economical/financial conditions
For both municipalities, the main advantage of this transformation method is that it doesn’t require any financial means from their side. The financial risk is entirely for the park owner. One of the most important factors in such a transformation is the compensation which the park owner receives for the park. The compensation is in both cases determined by the value of the vacation park. But this often proves to be difficult, as the park owner and municipality can have a different point of view on the actual value of the park. Interestingly, the municipalities used different methods to determine the value of the park. In case one the municipality was helped by a public execution sale of the park. The precious owner of the park had gone bankrupt and the bank became the owner of the park. The new park owner bought the park for the execution value which was set by the bank. The goal of this “investor” was to use the park as a medium of exchange for the construction and enlargement of other houses in the region. Because the park went in an execution sale, the value of the park was known by the municipality upfront. The compensation was therefore based on the financial depreciation of the park when the land is devaluated from a recreational destination to an agricultural destination. Based on the sum of this depreciation, the investor was compensated with building plots or construction possibilities. It is his responsibility to turn this into a revenue. The financial risks are therefore for the investor, who minimized this risk by including this transformation into a private limited-liability company construction (BV-constructie). In case five, the municipality had no such “luck” of an execution sale, and had to find other ways to determine the park value. They choose to determine the value of the park on the “WOZ-Value” of the park. This is the value determination of the real estate which the municipality uses to determine the tax assessments. The costs which the park owner had to make to finalize the transformation, such as excavation, demolishment of the recreational houses, cleaning and road changes were added to the WOZ-value of the park. This led to the amount which the municipality had to compensate in the form of construction-rights for dwellings. The park owner can choose for himself if he wants to sell the building plots, or develop the houses for himself. The latter option would require another big upfront investment from his side. The costs for the procedures for the change of a land-use plan are allocated to the park owner and not compensated.

Juridical Conditions
With regard to each transformation, the municipality has to apply both public as private laws and constructions to reach the desired situation. The possibilities for the transformation are negotiated in the informal pre-stage of the transformation. These will lead to appointments which are made official and binding in the formal stage. For this, private laws (anterior agreements) are applied such as a declaration agreement (vaststellingsovereenkomst) or covenant with fixed commitments for both the municipality and the park owner. This includes agreements on the effects of (unforeseen) calamities. Next, the intended future situation of the park is described in a spatial vision by the municipality. Finally, if the city council agrees with the plans, the regular procedure for the change of a land-use plan is followed. It is expected that this will not lead to many objections by the local stakeholders, as the
intended result is an improvement in comparison to the current situation. The land-use plans also includes the additional conditions for the transformation, such as construction requirements. This is an additional possibility for the municipality to control and influence the quality of the public space. For one of the cases, the park owner has an additional (juridical) risk as a result of residents on the park with permits for legal residence. These residents can’t be removed from the park easily. The park owner must come to terms with these residents in these cases. The municipality has some expertise in these situations and will support the park owner if necessary.

4.3.2 Temporary Land-use

Temporary land-use ("Tijdelijkheid") is a spatial concept or tool to generate revenue from temporary land purposes, in other to realize a desirable land use in the future. Derix (2012) argues in his essay "Tijdelijk anders bestemmen" that in contemporary relational spatial planning, temporary land planning is essential. He argues that every development of areas or location should be approached and planned as if they are temporary instead of perpetual. This is the only way to achieve sustainable land use. According to Derix, traditional spatial planning more or less assumed that new spatial developments would last eternal. This creates room for perversion, as it insufficiently takes in account the consequences for future generations. Current generations could profit from the land, while the results of irresponsible land use would be the problem of future generations. Temporality according to Derix, means that areas are designed and planning in such a way that the roads to future different land use remain open. While Derix argues that the main advantage of temporary land-use is the abstract, sustainable side of such a construction, the principle of temporary land-use provides also practical opportunities. The concept of temporality can therefore be translated to the cases in this thesis. As it stands, temporality in the region is seen as a tool to temporary profit from the land without damaging future land use possibilities. It can provide an undesirable revenue model on the short term, in order to gain a sustainable and more desirable state on the long term.

Temporary land-use is the starting point for cases three and four of this thesis. Temporary land-use in this case means that (part of) the vacation parks are destined for other purposes than recreation for a certain amount of years. The period to which this alternative land-use is permitted is the result of a negotiation between the municipality and the park owner. If the municipality agrees to this temporary land-use, they must stand to benefit from it eventually. After all, why would a municipality otherwise allow a temporary land-use with all sorts of negative consequences. The intended future land-use should be a significant improvement in comparison to the current situation. Temporary land-use is a voluntary policy instrument. However, the park owners cannot temporary use the land for other purposes as destined in the land-use plan. They therefore need approval of the municipality, otherwise the municipality has the power to start an enforcement procedure. For both of these cases, the park owner wants to temporary use the recreational land for other purposes. And in both cases, this temporary land-use is the housing of migrant workers. And with regard to the case characteristics, the parks both had some recreational future perspective. However, in both cases the park came under new ownership of an “investor” who wanted to focus on housing migrant workers. The housing of migrant workers have a big advantage for park owners because they provide a continuous revenue. While the recreational visitors of the park usually visit the park only during the summer months, the migrant workers can be housed all year long. Also, the municipalities often have a certain necessity to look for decent housing for these migrant workers, as they are sometimes housed illegally and under poor conditions. For the municipality such a land-use would be agreeable, but only if this would mean
that the park will be closed after this period and be transformed to a more desirable destination. This would be nature or agricultural lands for example. The temporary land-use provides revenue for the park owners, which can be seen as a compensation for the closing of the park. The main benefit is that the municipality has a more desirable land-use in the long term, without spending any financial means on this. The main disadvantage is that it can cause nuisance on the short term, especially towards the local stakeholders.

For case three it became soon apparent that the new owner of the park his main objective was to house migrant workers. The park was at that point already divided into two parts; a recreational part and a part with migrant workers. The new park owner suggested to house migrant workers for 10 years, after which they would make place for “pause dwellings” (pauzewoningen). The municipality didn’t agree, as this was not a clear improvement compared to the current situation. Also, they municipality would rather see the park lose its recreational destination, as to create room for recreation somewhere else in the region. The park had still some tourist potential, but this was decreasing as migrant workers and tourist on the same location proves to be a mismatch. The municipality would rather see that the park would be closed after the temporary period, and transformed to nature or perhaps some houses as a revenue model. The park owner didn’t agree and therefore the process is currently in deadlock. The municipality applied an enforcement procedure (handhavingsprocedure) against the park owner. As it stands, the park owner must remove all current migrant workers on the park.

In case four the process went much smoother. The municipality was opposed to the transformation of vacation parks in general, but also identified a certain necessity to provide decent housing for migrant workers in the region. The municipality came to an agreement with the park owner that he could house a certain amount of migrant workers for a period of seven years, after which the park would be transformed to nature. The forest would also include a parking lot for a nearby football club. For the park owner, it is not logical to remain the owner of the lands after these seven years, as it would only cost him money for the planting and maintenance of this forest. The municipality therefore came to an agreement to buy the park from the park owner for a symbolic amount. One of the most important aspects of this process for the municipality was the involvement of the neighbourhood. The park was situated in a rural area, but had some neighbours nonetheless. The local stakeholders have been approached up front in order to explain the plans and gain their support.

**Figure 27: Temporary land-use as a method to transform vacation parks.**

D.C.T. Verberk
Communicative conditions

The communicative conditions for this transformation method are one of the key elements of the process. The largest contrast between the two cases is the communication between the municipality and the park owner. In case three, the park owner puts up much higher demands. Also, the park owner is “stalling” the process, as he does not stand to benefit from a quick outcome of the negotiations. The park already houses migrant workers illegally, and as long as the negotiations are ongoing, he can continue this illegal land-use. The municipality wants to remain on good terms with the park owner to come to an agreement. As it stand the park is managed properly and there is some degree of control on the situation. In case four, the communication between the municipality and the park owner went much better, possibly because the park owner was more realistic compared to case three. Once the transformation method became apparent, the municipality took initiative in the communication towards the neighbours. The neighbours of the park were to expect, due to the migrant workers, a lot of nuisance for the coming years. This would vary from sound nuisance, to incidents and an increase in traffic. It was important to gain the support of the neighbourhood upfront, to avert obstructions to the land-use plans in the future. The municipality chose to organise an “open evening” for local residents to explain the situation. Many employees of the municipality were present to offer room for personal conversations. The park owner was also present. Besides the open evening, the municipal employees also visited the most nearby residents to the park, to hear their concerns and explain the plans. The municipality was honest about the nuisance which the neighbourhood could expect for the next seven years. But after this period of time, the park would make place for a forest. Because the neighbourhood was involved in the process upfront, the municipality received no objections to the plan when they put up the concept land-use plan for public review. The park owner was responsible for the communication towards the residents of the park. Because the park in case four was used mainly for recreational purpose, and not permanently housed, this proved to be no issue.

Economic/financial conditions

Both municipalities refrain from using financial resources for the transformation. The transformation must be financed by the temporary land-use entirely. The most important financial condition for this transformation method is the negotiation for the period during which the temporary land-use is allowed. The municipality obviously want the shortest period of time, to minimize nuisance to the neighbourhood. The park owner wants to longest period, for maximal revenue. The maximal allowed term for a temporary land-use in a land-use plan is 10 years. In case four, the municipality first attempted to come to an agreement for five years. The park owner did not agree to this. The municipality then made a simple calculation to estimate which term would be agreeable for the park owner. They calculated the expected income for the park owner per year. This was based on the income of one migrant worker per week, multiplied with the maximum allowed amount of migrant workers on the park (150). It became soon apparent that five years would indeed be insufficient, but seven years would provide a revenue model. The park owner agreed with seven years. After seven years the park will be purchased by the municipality and transformed by themselves. This way, they also keep the control over de kind of nature development that takes place on the plot. The financial risk is also for the park owner. In case four, the park owner had already an agreement with an employment agency to house migrant workers. This provides certainty from his side that the objects in is park would indeed be housed with migrant workers.
Juridical conditions

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, a temporary land-use can either be arranged through the change of a land-use plan (maximum of 10 years) or by an area permit (also maximum of 10 years). In case four, the park owner came with the proposal for the change of the land-use plan himself, which provided the municipality certainty that the park would be transformed into a new destination. Later in the process, the park owner applied for an area permit to house migrant workers for seven years. Both the concept land-use plan and area permit received no objections. One important aspect of the area permit is that it did not specify that park had to house migrant workers (because this is considered discrimination). Instead, the area permit stated that the workers living on the park had work in the region, and not somewhere else. This made the area permit spatially relevant. It is however possible that one of the largest employees of migrant workers in the area has to shut down in the near future. This provides a risk for the park owner. In that case, the park owner is allowed to switch to a second category of people who are looking for housing. This category must also be connected economically or socially to the municipality, for example people who divorced or local youth looking for a house for themselves. Beside these public law agreements, the municipality also made an anterior agreement with the park owner on the transmission of the plot after the seven years of temporary land-use. The municipality is provided by the park owner with a power of attorney to sell the plot (to themselves) without interference of the previous owner. The juridical conditions for case 3 can’t be described as the municipality and the park owner have not yet agreed on the conditions for a transformation. The park owner has until January 2018 to come up with an alternative approach, or else the current migrant workers will be removed from the park. It is the responsibility of the park owner to find new accommodations for the migrant workers. The municipality has an alternative available, as they also need to meet certain norms to house migrant workers in the municipality.

4.3.3 R'E-DESTINE TO RESIDENTIAL AREA

In the Netherlands, land-use lands define the exact purpose for the entire country. Every destination has its own possibilities and restrictions. This includes user and construction possibilities of the lands. The land-use plan is a municipal instrument and a juridical binding document for the government as well as citizens. Municipalities are forced to have actual land-use plans for the entire territory of the municipality. In general, land-use plans cannot be older than 10 years, but sometimes this term is extended. For vacation parks this means that the land-use plans describe accurately and precisely the type and amount of recreational objects which can be placed on the park. The objects on the park such as recreational cottages, mobile houses or campsites are destined with for recreational purposes. Permanent residence in a recreational object is prohibited in principle, but municipalities are allowed to have different policies and approaches in such cases. Weather a recreational dwelling is subject to permanent residence at sometimes also arbitrary, because what exactly is permanent residence? First of all each individual should have his main address in a dwelling with a residential destination. In this main dwelling the individual spends the most part of his time. The recreational house should be seen as a second house. It can be considered permanent residence if the individual has no other main (and legal) address to live, and spends most of his time in the recreational object (Gemeente Maasdonk). However, municipalities also have the possibility to issue permits for legal residence in a recreational object. This is sometimes done in cases of socially and financially vulnerable individuals. People with such permits are allowed to stay in the recreational dwellings permanent. The permits are bound to the individual, and not to the dwelling.
Case two of this thesis is currently conducted a process with this transformation instrument. Case two is a small vacation park (one hectare) with 44 recreational cottages. In contrary to the previous cases, the recreational objects are all privately owned. The recreational future perspective of the park was minimal. The occupancy rate of the park is almost 100%, with just 10% using the objects as a second dwelling. This means that the other 90% of the objects is permanently inhabited. The residents have no permits of legal residence, but they do own the property right of the objects. As a consequence, the park owner has lesser influence on the transformation process. The municipality is forced to negotiate with the individual owners, or in this case with the association of home owners on the park. The municipality is currently doing looking at the possibility to give the recreational objects on the park an adjusted permanent residential function. This means it would keep the recreational destination in the land-use plan, as this will restrict the construction and expansion possibilities of the park. The private house owners want the opposite, which means a residential destination and regular construction possibilities. Also, the municipality would like to receive a financial contribution from the home owners, because the changed destination of the objects will induce an increase of the real estate value. It is debatable to which degree this value increase belongs to the residents of the houses, as they would be rewarded for illegal permanent housing of recreational objects. However, in the Netherlands it is not allowed for a municipality to directly receive financial means for the change of a destination, without a predetermined expenditure for this income. The municipality needs to frame a system in which the received earnings have a predetermined destination, which is spatially relevant. The province is also an important actor in this process, as they principally disallow permanent residence in recreational objects in the provincial area vision. The applied instruments must therefore be customized to fit the provincial rules and legislations as well. And besides these, there is also the spatial aspect. The municipality has conducted research on the spatial implications and consequences of the intended transformation. This included environmental impact assessments, spatial integration of the dwellings, and the consequences for an agricultural entrepreneur nearby. No obstructions were found, and this was an important condition for the transformation. However, if no decision would have been made with regard to the transformation, the situation on the park could have worsened. Nuisance could increase, and the alternative of expropriating the illegal residents would lead to social problems elsewhere in the municipality. The municipality does not own many social houses with could provide an alternative to the current residents of the park.

Communicative conditions
The political will to re-destine the recreational objects is key in this process. The municipality negotiates with the association of home owners on the conditions for the transformation. The municipality (and the province) has the final say in the transformation, but they must cooperate with the private homeowners as well to come to an agreement. The contact between the municipality and the association is well, also because the process had been in deadlock for years. This meant that the home owners were also eager to cooperate and think along with the municipality. Other local stakeholders such as neighbours understand the necessity of the transformation of the vacation park. The proposed transformation has also almost no negative impacts on the area. One of the factors which delayed the process was the communication between the municipality and the province. The municipality wanted to change the destination from the recreational objects to residential, and thought this was possible because the province didn’t object at first. When they later on wanted to work out these plans, they got notified by the province that such a construction was not possible. The municipality had to come up with a new construction.
**Economic/Financial Conditions**

As a result of the proposed adjustment to a permanent residential function for the recreational objects, the value of these objects will increase. The municipality wants to capture this value increase to improve the quality of the public space in the region. The financial means for municipalities have decreased for years, and this means that especially recreational expenditure of municipalities have been cut. The captured value could be destined to improve the quality of the recreational sector in the region. However, by law, the value increase of a recreational object as the result of a change of the land-use plan can be captured up till € 50,000,- per object. The value increase of the recreational dwellings is expected to be much higher. The individual owners are therefore sort of “rewarded” for the illegal permanent residents of the dwellings. The earnings from this construction will be put into a fund, much like the existing fund for monuments in the area. The exact division of the earnings has not yet been worked out.

**Juridical Conditions**

Like previous methods, the juridical aspects of the transformation have to be secured both with public laws as private laws. As mentioned, the destinations of the objects on the park will remain recreational, but with an allowance for permanent residence. The construction and expansion possibilities of the dwellings are still up to discussion. The municipality wants to exclude the possibility for permit free expansion of the dwellings, or allow it with limited possibilities (e.g. maximum expansion of 15m²). The park owners want the possibility for maximal permit-free expansion, which are 150m² for regular houses. The agreements with regard to the financial contribution of the owners to the municipality are captured in anterior agreements with individual owners. This included a certain risk for the municipality, because such agreements can be contested in court up till five years after they are signed. If the judge would rule on behalf of the individual owners, the municipality is forced to pay back the capture earnings.

![Figure 28: Re-Destining Recreational Dwellings to Residential Dwellings](image)

**4.3.4 Land Readjustment**

Several theories regarding (urban) Land readjustment provide a background for this policy instrument. Land readjustment refers to “a procedure in which the structure of boundaries and facilities within the chosen area is transformed, but the old owners still keep the land” (Larsson, 1997, p. 141). Many research has already been conducted to land readjustment. Often the finance aspect of land readjustment projects proves to be difficult. One of the ways to finance land readjustment is by value capture tools. As a result of land readjustment an increase of the environmental and property value
can be expected. This phenomenon is a prerequisite for value capture. Value capture “*can be described as a method whereby additional land value is extracted as a result of public investment into community infrastructure*” (Lombard, Behrens & Viruly, 2016, p.58-59). However, land readjustment tools are not only applied in urban areas, but also in rural places. They can provide solutions for problems regarding the vacant or deteriorated real estate in rural areas due to the decline of the population. Land readjustment can also be a valuable tool for the transformation of vacation parks according to the Kadaster (Kadaster, 2017). From its expertise on property rights, the Kadaster is well-suited to facilitate land readjustment processes. They are independent and have no other objectives then the successful completion of the transformation. Furthermore, they are experts on property rights and understand the influence of these rights on the process.

Cases six and nine are looking at the possibility to apply land readjustment as a tool for transformation. As mentioned, case 6 till 9 are all located next to each other and the transformation process is therefore perceived by the municipality as one area development. Two of the vacation parks, park seven and eight, will not be transformed, but continue with the recreational exploitation of the park. They are however still included in the overall transformation process. The municipality is looking into the possibility to replace permanent residents from park seven and eight onto the parks six and/or nine. The aim is to use park seven and eight entirely for recreational purposes, while the other two parks will be re-destined for residential purposes. In order to meet the standards for residential dwellings, the parks must be adjusted. The municipalities do not want to contribute to the transformation financially, and are therefore looking at other tools. The principle of urban land readjustment is that the investment in the public space will lead to an increase of the value of the real estate. This value increase is the “reward” for the investors; the individual home owners on the park. Disadvantage is that requires an investment upfront from the home owners; an investment which they might not be able to afford. The municipalities are still looking into the exact conditions, but there are other land readjustment processes for vacation park where they can learn from. The Kadaster is a Dutch agency that collects data on property rights of lands and real estate, and from that expertise have contributed to transformations in the past. The Kadaster understands the possibilities of readjustment for the recreational sector, and provide a guideline for the process. They state that there are three key elements that determine the possibilities for a successful transformation;

- The property rights (land and real estate);
- The characteristics of the properties; and
- The characteristics of the property owners.

The characteristics of the real estate include variables such as the value of the real estate, the condition of the estate or when it was built or last renovated. The characteristics of the property owners include variable such as the age, the origin and/or the financial means of the individual. These variables influence the possible strategies and sequence of transformation which the municipality can apply. For example the average age on the park; if the average age of the park owners is relatively high, this could indicate that something is about to happen because the property owners are looking at possibilities to transfer their properties. Either by selling them, or by transferring the properties to new generations who inherit these properties. Therefore, this might be a suitable time for the municipality to intervene and transform.
Communicative conditions

The municipalities in case six till nine are currently at the start of the entire land readjustment process. The first step is to develop a comprehensive plan which is supported by both city councils. This includes the financial arrangements for the transformation. At this moment, a Quick Scan is being conducted by the BNG (Bank Nederlandse Gemeente) for the area, to determine the possibilities. In this Quick Scan they look at the current land-use, the intended future land-use and the value increase of the lands as a result. The value increase is not necessarily financial, but can also be the degree to which the plan resolves into a sustainable future. This plan is the starting point for the negotiations between the municipalities and the park owners and association of homeowners. The park is located in a rural area, near a natura2000 area. Therefore the consequences of the transformation for local stakeholders is slight. Once the municipalities have decided on the strategy and the delimitations of the project area (area agenda (1)), the individual property owners can be included in the transformation. The Kadaster state that a typical process for readjustment (on a vacation park) should start with a “wish-meeting” (2), in which the individuals state their personal preferences with regard to the transformation. Question like what do you have and what you want are discussed. One of the key elements in this stage is that (the majority of) the stakeholders have the intention of staying. If they do not want to stay, a project developer could buy them out and redevelop the area himself. Based on these wish-meetings, several variants are drafted to choose from (3). These variants are often changed several times, until they are actually achievable in terms of finance. Transition periods have to be financed as well, and sometimes it is necessary to phase the plans. Next, the individual allocations of the lands and properties (4) are discussed, which includes the financial arrangements (5) (see; economic/financial conditions). This will result in a final exchange plan of properties and lands (6). This is the juridical basis of the land readjustment (see; juridical conditions). The properties are redefined, and the owners who want get to stay on the park (see; figure 29).

The desires of the owners should be leading in the process, as they are key to the completion. A good and comprehensive understanding of the goals and means of the individual owners is important for a successful transformation. Collectivity between the property owners is important, and the added value of joint land readjustment must be apparent to the owners and the municipality (van Geene, 2017). This process is displayed in figure 28 below. Each transformation has a ‘hard’ side and a ‘soft’ side. The hard side include all the financial and juridical arrangements. But the soft side, the communication and relations between stakeholders can be equally important. Local forerunners in the (recreational) sector have proven to be efficient as mediators between stakeholders.

Figure 29: A typical process for land-readjustment according to the Kadaster (2017)
Economic/financial conditions

For land readjustment, it is key that the area includes stakeholders who want to stay or expand their business or dwelling. Their desires drive the process. Other stakeholders might want to leave, provided that they are compensated fairly and therefore provide “switch space” (schuifruimte). In terms of vacation parks it is important to determine the value of each of the properties. This can be based on taxations or the WOZ-value of the dwellings. Next, the expected value increase is calculated and the individual elements which are the cause of this value increase are labelled and quantified. For instance, the new division of the properties are cause of a “nicer view” (mooier uitzicht) of the dwellings; how much is this worth. These added values are redistributed and taxed to the corresponding property owners. These are often complicated calculations. It means that the property owners who wish to develop/extent their properties are in need of liquid assets to finance the transformation and buy out the owners who want to leave. The final arrangements are captured in the exchange plan.

The municipalities and VVP are also working on a development company which includes a restructuring fund. Such a development company can become an active player in the process, and ease the transformation process. Readjustments cost money in principle, because the lands have to be served, new infrastructure has to be put in, and real estate has to be constructed or adjusted. However, because properties are exchanged against each other, the cash flow of these transformation is lower compared to regular developments. This results in lower interest costs. The restructuring fund can provide even lower interest rates for such transformations. Another use of the restructuring fund is to equalize (vereevenen) expenditure between various transformations, or bridge transition periods. Money is not anymore bound to one location or time, but can be moved between.

In case six and nine, the re-destination of the real estate to a residential area leads to a value increase of these properties. The value increase can be captured in order to (1) finance the necessary infrastructure adjustments on the park and (2) stimulate the tourist sector in other ways in the region. One of the bottlenecks of value capture is that the re-destination of recreational dwellings leads to a value increase but not to an increase in liquid assets, unless the homeowners chose to sell their properties. The municipality is looking at possibilities to include other financial stakeholders in the process in some way. In case seven and eight the value increase is not the result of the re-destination, but because the recreational value of these parks will increase.

Juridical conditions

As mentioned, every transformation has juridical conditions with regard to public and private law. Land readjustment is a largely voluntary transformation tool. With regard to private law, the following conditions apply. The final exchange plan contains the details and financial arrangements for the exchange of the lands. This includes the old situation, the new situation and the financial calculations. These arrangements are put together in one legally binding document or exchange agreement (kavelruil overeenkomst), which is signed by every individual property owner. As a result of this document, the old situation “expires” into the new situation. This is in accordance with the principle of “originaire eigendomsverkrijging”. This provides legal certainty for the individual owners.

One of the principle problems which occur with land readjustment are the free-rider or hold-out problems. In urban areas, land readjustment is a voluntary tool and property owners can’t be forced to comply with the transformation. The process facilitator should look for alternatives in case some of
the owners refuse to comply, but sometimes a property owner is crucial for the transformation. In this case, this owner is in a position of power as he cannot be expropriated. In rural areas (het buitengebied) this is slightly different. In accordance with the WILG-law (Wet Inpassing Landelijk Gebied), property owners can be forced to comply if the majority votes in favour of the transformation. On condition that none of the stakeholders see any disadvantages or loss of value as a result of the transformation. Such constructions are not yet possible in the urban area, as the new law for urban land readjustment has no forced variant. However, for vacation parks this is often not relevant as they are mainly located in rural areas. Another element which could make land readjustment more efficient is the abolishment of transaction costs such as transfer taxes (overdrachtsbelasting). The abolishment of such transaction costs would make the exchange of properties even more attractive for owners.

The degree to which public laws are applied vary for each transformation. With vacation parks it is sometimes the case that the land-use plan do not have to be adjusted, because the amount of recreational objects on the park do not increase. However with regard to case six and nine, the land-use plan must be changed because the recreational objects are intended to be re-destined to residential dwellings. The municipalities are still unsure on the exact conditions with regard to the change of the land-use plan and the value capture. The method as applied in paragraph 4.3.3 “re-destine to residential area” might provide an opportunity in this case.

**Figure 30: The principles of land readjustment visualized (Çete, 2009)**
4.4 THE ACTION PROCESS
This paragraph focusses on the action process. The action process is described with the use of four timelines, in accordance to the four transformation methods. Paragraph 2.2.4 contains a timeline for a typical planning process in the Netherlands. This timeline contains four phases; initiative, feasibility, realisation and maintenance. This division of phases is also the starting point for the evaluation of the action process. During the interview, the respondents have been asked to describe the process in terms of a timeline and milestones. Based on this, a typical timeline can be constructed for each of the transformation method. The interviewee’s were also asked to evaluate the process and identify improvements, problematic factors, uncertainties, alternatives and factors for success. These are described in the corresponding paragraphs.

4.4.1 TIMELINE VAB-POLICY
Figure 31 displays the timeline with regard to the VAB-policy. The interviewee’s identified several important milestones. The milestones for case one are marked in red, the milestones for case five are marked in blue. Appendix 14 contains the full sized timelines. The stages and milestones for case one and five are largely similar, but the outcome of both processes vary. The direct cause in case one was the execution sale of the vacation park, which resulted into a new owner for the park. In case five, the cause was more indirect in the sense of a research of the program vital vacation parks on nuisance of vacation parks. This prompted the municipality to develop a policy plan for vital vacation parks, which describes the policy of the municipality on vacation parks in the area. In both cases the initiative came from the park owner. Both cases also identify a formal and informal stadium of negotiations between the park owner and the municipality. During the informal stage, the first ideas are discussed and the possibilities are elaborated. During the formal stage, the municipality and the park owner come to a final plan with clear limitations and definitions. This includes the financial compensation and the juridical conditions. This is often a course of trial and error. In case one, the results of the negotiations are captured in a private-law based agreement with commitments for both the municipality and the park owner. The municipality also provided a permit for the reconstruction and expansion of an existing dwelling upfront, which was part of the agreement. Next, the spatial consequences of the transformation are looked at and described. In case one this is done in an area vision. In case five an external consultancy provided an “image quality plan” (beeldkwaliteitsplan) to guarantee the spatial integration of the dwellings in the area. Next, the final preparatory steps are taken to trigger the land-use plan change. The first step is the principal request of the park owner to the city council for the transformation. In both cases the city council came to a principal agreement, which means that the procedure for change of the land-use plan can be put in motion. The concept land-use plan will come up for public review, so that everyone can comment on it (zienswijze). Later on, stakeholders are also offered the opportunity to object to the land-use plan, but only if they commented on it in the round of public feedback. Finally, the new land-use plan is established and the park owner can start with the realisation of the plan. In case one, this meant that the park was emptied, demolished entirely and finally transformed into nature. The park owner received a building plot somewhere else in the region, and a permit to reconstruct and expand an existing dwelling. In case five, the park will be emptied of campsites and mobile homes. The previous residents of the park will mostly have to look for new housing themselves, but in some cases the municipality will provide assistance in the form of social housing. This could also cause some problems for the park owner, as some of the park owners have permits for legal residents and therefore can’t be expropriated easily. The municipality and the advisors of the park owner have some experience with such cases and will assist if necessary. The exact
and final division of houses on the park is still unclear, but it is most likely that in addition to the new building plots, some of the existing houses will be transformed to residential houses. The processes therefore use the same policies, but the end results are different. In case one the park was entirely transformed to nature, while in case five the park became a small residential district in a rural area.

**TABLE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Realisation</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 31:** The timeline for case one and five which transformed in accordance with the VAB-policy.

**Process evaluation**

Case one is one of the few cases in this research in which the entire process has been concluded and actually realised. The previous residents have left the park, the park has been transformed to grassland and the park owner received a building plot and a permit for reconstruction. This triggered other park owners in the area to look at similar possibilities with the municipality. In hindsight, a few elements can be identified which were crucial for the success of the transformation. The park was entirely owned by one individual, the recreational future perspective of the park was minimal and the book value of the park was low because it was bought in the execution sale. Therefore, the compensation could be determined easily. The park owner had no unrealistic illusions about the value of the park. The agreements were captured at the start of the process, which provided certainty and clarity for both parties involved. The settings or starting point for this transformation was therefore rather favourable and the interviewee expects future transformations to be more complicated. The park owner was clear in his demands, and no real alternatives have been considered.

At the time of the interview, case five was still in the preparatory stage. The park owner had just handed in the principal request to the city council. But once the land-use plan is changed, the park owner can start with emptying the park, servicing the lands and adjusting the infrastructure. The interviewee admitted that there were uncertainties at the start of the process on the exact method, as such a transformation had not be conducted before. Also, the first application of the park owner to the municipality was unrealistic and to ambitious. The municipality could not agree to this and the process was delayed. But this might also be part of the negotiation tactics by the park owner. For future transformation, the municipality should define clear boundaries and conditions to the park owner up front in order to save time. No other alternative has been considered, only the type of compensation has been discussed.
4.4.2 Timeline Temporary Land-Use

Figure 32 displays the timeline with regard to the temporary land-use method in case three and four. The interviewee’s identified several important milestones. The milestones for case three are marked in red, the milestones for case four are marked in blue. Appendix 14 contains the full sized timeline. Again the applied method for both cases is similar, but the outcome and the degree of success of the processes vary. For case three, the direct cause was the bankruptcy of the previous owner. As a result the ownership of the park was transferred to a new owner, who focussed mainly on the housing of migrant workers. At the peak, the park housed 300 migrant workers. The recreational usage of the park became secondary. At that time, the municipality was developing a policy regarding migrant workers and therefore didn’t intervene at first. Later, the municipality stated that so many migrant workers on one location was undesirable. The park was only allowed to house a maximum of 150 migrant workers, and not permanently. The municipality also recognised a certain necessity to house migrant workers. It became quickly apparent that the new owner had no intention to recreationally exploit the park. During the informal stadium, the municipality and the park owner discussed other possibilities for the future of the park. This included the temporary housing of migrant workers for a longer period. Also, the possibility to house refugees was discussed briefly with the municipality and the COA, but this was eventually not possible due to a lack of (political and societal) support. Because the informal stadium was leading nowhere, the municipality put a deadline for the park owner to come up with an acceptable plan. In the formal stage, the park owner presented a plan to the municipality which was unacceptable for the municipality. The park owner wanted to house migrant workers for a period of 10 years, after which the residences for migrant workers would be substituted for “pauzewoningen”. The municipality wanted a much shorter period of migrant workers, and the park would have to be transformed to a new destination afterwards. The two parties didn’t reach an agreement and the municipality started a law enforcement procedure. The process is in deadlock at the moment. However, it is expected that the park owner will come with a new request for a temporary area permit of three years to house migrant workers.

Case four was also initiated by a sale of the park. The new park owner also wanted to house migrant workers for a certain time. At first the municipality was reluctant, as they don’t want to reduce the recreational supply in the region. But they also saw a necessity to house migrant workers in the area. During the informal stage, the possibilities where discussed to house the migrant workers. The municipality wanted to see a compensation for this, as the permanent housing of migrant workers is in principal not allowed. During the formal stage, the municipality and the park owner came to an agreement for the housing of migrant workers for seven years. After this period the park would be transformed to nature. These agreements where captured in a private-law based agreement with commitments for both the municipality and the park owner. In the preparatory stage, the municipality took the initiative in the communication towards the neighbourhood. This meant that no comments or objections where filled during the land-use plan change procedure. In the realisation phase, no problems occurred. Because the park was mainly used recreationally, the park owner had no problems emptying the park. The park owner has placed the new dwellings for the migrant workers on the park and will remove these himself and clear the park after seven years. After the agreement has ended the park will be sold for a symbolic amount to the municipality who will transform it to nature and tend to the maintenance of the park.
Process evaluation

The main cause for the unsuccessful attempt for transformation in case three can be found in the mismatch of expectations from the municipality and the park owner. The municipality still saw a certain tourist potential in the park, while the park owner wanted to focus on the housing of migrant workers. However, the park owner also understood the value of the touristic destination of the park, in example for a future sale. The park owner was already housing migrant workers on the park, and was therefore not in a hurry to come to an agreement with the municipality. Also, the park owner had high demands during the negotiations. The municipality let the initiative to the park owner and this caused certain delay. Because the two parties couldn’t reach an agreement the municipality chose to start a law enforcement procedure to empty the park of migrant workers. In hindsight the municipality could have taken more initiative in the process, or could have intervened sooner. The attitude of the park owner, who only focussed on maximum financial return, had proven to be problematic in this case.

In case four the goals and expectations of the municipality and the park owner where much more in line with each other. Even though the city council was opposed to a transformation at first, they understood the necessity to house migrant workers as well. In principle, the municipality will decline requests for such transformations in the future. Both parties soon came to a principal agreement, after which the municipality took the lead for the communication with the neighbourhood. In personal conversations and “open evenings” the neighbourhood was informed and convinced of the eventual benefits of this solution. The fact that the transformation would eventually result in the development of nature contributed to the approval of the neighbourhood. This was vital for the process because it meant that no comments or objects where received during the land-use plan procedure. The fact that the park was owned by one person and was used mainly recreationally, meant that the social consequences for the park “residents” were small and easily overcome. Also, all agreements were made juridical binding at the start of the process. This provided certainty. One factor that delayed to process was the involvement of an external project leader. The municipality brought in an external project leader, who first has to get a understanding of the local situations, politics and the land-use plan. This didn’t work efficiently and the municipality replaced the external project leader with municipal employees. In the future, the internal experts of the municipality should be placed together to come to a solution and strategy themselves. No alternatives had been considered for this transformation.
4.4.3 Timeline re-destine to residential area

In case two, the municipality applied the method of re-destining the dwellings for residential purposes. The process was trigged by the province, who urged the municipality to address the issues with regard to permanent housing on the park. This lead to several lawsuits against the legalisation of permanent housing which the municipality all won. After this, the city council came with the request to look at the possibilities for a legalisation of permanent housing anyway. The reasoning behind this was that the situation on the park was going on for ten years and nothing was changing. It would be better to look at a more sustainable solution. In the informal stage, the municipality and the association of park owners discussed to possibility to re-destine the houses for residential purposes. Especially the construction possibilities and the financial contribution are up for debate in this stage. The municipality only wants to cooperate to the transformation if they can capture some of the value increase of the dwellings as a result of the re-destination. At the time of the interview, these negotiations where still ongoing. When they are concluded, the financial agreements will be captured in anterior agreements with the individual owners. The municipality has already conducted research on the consequences and spatial impact of the intended re-destination on the area. This included an environmental assessment, spatial integration in the area and the consequences for a nearby farmer. This was all found to be positive. The municipality had already put up a concept land-use plan for review, even though the agreements on the financial and construction aspects have not been concluded yet. The steps in the realisation and maintenance phase are therefore still unclear. Figure 33 displays the timeline for case two.

![Diagram of re-destination timeline]

**Figure 33: The timeline for case two which used the re-destination approach**

Process evaluation

In case two the municipality decided to look at the opportunities to re-destine the dwellings in order to come to a solution after years of problems with the park. The urgency for the municipality was big, because the park had no recreational future perspective and continuation on the same path would most likely lead to more nuisance and illegal activities. In return, the municipality expected a financial contribution or compensation from the park residents. At the start of the process, it was unclear to what extend this was possible. The construction possibilities for the newly destined residential dwellings are still up for debate. The park residents are well organised in an association. Nevertheless, the municipality put up a land-use plan for review. The details with regard to the financial contribution will be captured in anterior agreements, which provide a risk because they can be contested by the residents up till five years after signed. In hindsight, the municipality should have come to agreements with regard to the financial and construction aspects at the beginning of the process (during the definitions stage). This would have prevent discussions on these subjects afterwards. Also the possibilities for the adjustment of the area vision should have been researched more thoroughly. This
would have prevented the initial objection to the plans from the province. Finally, it is important to unify the individual owners on the park and jointly come to agreements on the transformation.

4.4.4. **Timeline land readjustment**

Case six and nine want to look at the possibilities to apply the land readjustment tool for the transformation. As these cases are still at the start of the process, the timeline is still at the first stages. Therefore, the conclusions from this timeline are not very valuable. Paragraph 4.3.3 also mentions the Kadaster case, which successfully applied the method of land-readjustment tool on the park. This park was not transformed like case six and nine are intended to be, and the municipality was not largely involved. However it can still provide useful insights. Therefore the Kadaster case is also included in the timeline (figure 34) below. The timeline for case and six and nine is from the perspective of the municipality. The timeline for the Kadaster case is from the perspective of the park residents.

In case six and nine, nuisance and undesirable situations on the parks was the cause of the transformation. The municipality took the initiative. Currently the municipality ordered a quick scan to be conducted on the area to determine the possibilities with regard to the transformation. By the end of the year (2017), both municipal city councils are hoping to have more clarity on the strategy for the transformation. Once this is clear, the municipal officials can start the negotiations with the park residents on the financial contribution and the juridical arrangements.

In the Kadaster case, the initiative was taken by the individual property owners on the park. The process which they went through is visualised in figure 29. This includes a wish-meeting, allocation variants, individual allocations, financial arrangements and finally an exchange plan. The final exchange plan resulted in a juridical binding document to provide certainty to all stakeholders. Once the financial transactions were concluded, the home owners could start with the realisation of the transformation. This meant the demolition or reconstruction of older dwellings, the construction of the infrastructure and finally the construction of the new dwellings. The dwellings remain private property, and the public space is maintained by the association of homeowners. The transformation did not require a change of the municipal land-use plan, as the primary objective of the dwellings remained recreational, and the total amount of recreation dwellings did not increase.

![Figure 34: The timeline for case six and nine and the Kadaster case](image-url)
Process evaluation.
The process evaluation can only be conducted for case six and nine. As mentioned, the process is still in the starting phase and therefore not many valuable lessons can be tracked down based on this timeline description. However, it is clear that the starting points of case six till nine are complicated. Each of the parks have a deviant ownership situation. This results in different approaches towards the transformation. The parks with many individual home owners are intended to be transformed with the use of land readjustment. The other parks will seize the illegal activities and return to the recreational exploitation of the park. Once park six and nine are re-destined to residential areas, the municipal control and overview on these parks will improve. The municipality mentions that the involvement of the Kadaster is important to get a clear and comprehensive overview of the situations on the park. Based on this, the municipality can develop a strategy for the transformation. Also, the appointment of an independent area developer will be a clear milestone for the process.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSES OF THE RESULTS

This chapter focuses on the analyses of the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables. The analysis is divided into three topics of interest:

- The influence of elements of the wider context on the policy instruments;
- The influence of elements of the structural context on the policy instruments; and
- The influence of the policy instruments on the action process.

For each of these topics the influence of the corresponding variables (as mentioned in the operationalisation of this thesis) is analysed. Based on these analyses, policy makers can choose the most suitable policy instrument for future transformations. The results of the analysis will form the input for the answers on the main- and sub-questions as introduced in the first chapter.

5.1 THE WIDER CONTEXT ON THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS

This paragraph focuses on the impact of the variables with regard to the wider context on the policy instruments. The wider context consists of four main variables; the problem, spatial, political and social context. The problem context has been defined by the ownership situation of the park (the property rights), the size, the type of vacation park, the degree of nuisance and the future perspective of the park. The latter variable, future perspective, is divided into the “stated” perspective and the “perceived” perspective. The political context is based on the political attitude towards the transformation, such as support, government involvement and transparency. The spatial component is based on the spatial characteristics of the park such as the comparison to the surrounding area and the location. The social context consists of the fate of the residents. This paragraph describes the influence which each of these indicators have on the chosen policy instrument, and why. This provide new insights for policy makers in future transformation processes as to which policy instrument suits a specific vacation park the best.

![Diagram of the wider context and policy instruments](image)

**Figure 35: The indicators of the wider context and the influence of these indicators on the policy instruments**

**Problem context**

With regard to the problem context the indicators which are most often called key-factors by the interviewee’s are ownership situation, the degree of nuisance and the future perspective. The ownership situation is sometimes simple, with one owner, but can also be complex with mixed or fragmented ownership. Also the extent of their property rights may vary, they may have permits for
legal residence, rent out their dwellings, use them for touristic purposes or live in them permanently. These are all factors which influence the possibilities for the transformation. In general the follow assumptions can be concluded; transformations for parks with one owner are much less complicated and are often transformed using the VAB-policy or temporary land-use. Mixed or fragmented ownership with individual property owners are much more complicated as they include more stakeholders. Furthermore the dwellings are often permanently inhabited and removing them from the parks is a capital intensive process. Therefore these parks are often re-destined into residential areas, sometimes with the land readjustment method. The municipality look at the possibilities to capture the value increase as a result of this re-destination. With regard to the nuisance, no clear correlation is perceived with the policy instruments. The degree of nuisance seems to influence the experienced urgency to transform, but not the applied method. The future perspective does seem to influence the policy instruments. The future perspective is based on the stated perspective by the government officials, as well as the perceived perspective based on the size, tourist facilities, occupancy rate and nuisance. The relation between the future perspective and the policy instrument is logical in the sense that parks seven and eight, which still have a certain degree of future perspective, will not be transformed at all. Parks three and four both have possibilities for tourist exploitation as well, but are transformed both with the use of temporary land-use. The future perspective also influence the financial compensation which the park owner receives. Park one and five are also owned by one individual, but transformed using the VAB-policy. Unlike park three and four, they lack future perspective. The VAB-policy is therefore a relative quick method for these park owners to secure a “pension” for the future. Temporary land-use requires long term commitments from the park owner, and if the municipality doesn’t comply they can still try to exploit the parks touristic. However, this means that the municipality ends up with a rather deteriorated vacation park with no perspective of improvement. The park owners in case three and four therefore have some “leverage”. These interrelations are captured in figure 36 below. Table 30 in appendix 11 contains a more detailed overview. This figure (36) shows the general relations, and not the case-specific relations.

**Figure 36: The interrelations between the problem context and the policy instruments**
Political context
The political context is based on the political attitude towards the transformation, such as political support from the city council and government involvement or initiative. The degree to which the government support the transformation and the attitude towards the earnings model are the elements which form the political support. In most cases, the relations are logical in the sense that the municipal goals match the applied policy instruments. What stand out the most is that in case three and four the municipality were in favour of the continuation of the park (no transformation). However, both parks are transformed using the temporality method, in accordance with the goals of the park owner. The municipality’s desires are therefore not always met. In most cases the municipality wants to reduce the financial benefits for the park owners as much as possible. This means that re-destination to residential area’s often out of the question. This would mean a huge value increase for the recreational dwellings. In terms of the leading role in the process, the main conclusion is that the park owner often takes the initiative when it comes to the VAB-policy and temporality. This can be explained by the fact that these are the private owners of the park, and are looking to secure their pensions. When it comes to the parks with individual owner dwellings, the municipality often takes the initiative and leading role. After all, the park residents are often housed illegally on the park and therefore not in a hurry to change this situation. This is displayed in figure 37. Table 30 in appendix 11 contains a more detailed overview.

Spatial context
The spatial context is based on the comparison to the area. All of the cases are subjected to nearby residents, companies, clubs or parks. It is therefore difficult to determine the influence of the surrounding area on the transformation method. Also, there seems to be no relation between parks located in rural areas or in semi-rural areas. None of the parks is located in an urban area. In general temporality often provides the best solution for the neighbourhood on the long term, as the lands can be re-destined into everything once the period of temporality has ended. This provides opportunities to improve the quality of the area in the future. The downside to this method is that it can be cause of nuisance on the short term, and especially in dense areas this could lead to protest from the neighbourhood. Also, re-destination of vacation parks to residential areas can prove to be disadvantageous for local business such as farms, as it may influence their future perspective and possibilities to expand. This is often researched in the design phase of the process.
Socio-cultural context

The socio-cultural context focusses on the fate of the residents or migrant workers on the park. As mentioned before, the residential situation on the parks can be quite complex. Some parks are used mainly for touristic purposes, while others are subject of legal and illegal permanent housing. The dwellings can also be owned either by the park owner, investors or the resident himself. If the parks are entirely owned by the park owner, the municipality choses either the VAB-policy or the temporary land-use method. In both cases this means that the park must be cleared of all inhabitants, which is usually the responsibility of the park owner himself. In some cases the municipality is actively involved in the search for new (social) housing for these residents. The consequences for the residents in the case of re-destination or land readjustment is less drastically, as they can remain in their houses.

Conclusion

The elements and indicators in the wider context have varying influence on the applied transformation method. The elements with regard to the wider context which influence the policy instruments the most are;

- The ownership situation of the park;
- The future perspective; and
- The attitude of the municipality towards the transformation.

By far the most important indicator for the applied policy instrument is the ownership situation. If the park is owned by one individual owner, the method is either the VAB-policy or temporality. Both options offer the municipality to transform or demolish the park entirely with relatively low costs. The determination of the financial compensation is often key in these processes. If the dwellings on the park are subject to individual ownership, the municipality often must go along with the re-destination or land readjustment tool. The advantage of this method is that it provides the municipality the opportunity to actually retrieve money of the transformation. The disadvantage is that the park will remain were it is, though slightly adjusted and with better enforcement overview. Also, the future perspective of the park influences the policy instruments. Parks with certain future perspective can obviously not be transformed, as they can still be exploited touristically. In other cases, they are transformed using temporal land-use. Finally, the attitude of the municipality towards the transformation is of importance, as they have the final say in the land-use plans. However, sometimes the goals of the municipality and the park owner do not align, like with case 3 and 4. In these cases the municipality must chose to pursue their own goals (no transformation) or go along with the desires of the park owner (temporary land-use).

The first propositions in paragraph 2.3 was aimed at the influence of the wider context on the policy instruments. The proposition was that the ownership situation and future perspective are expected to have the biggest influence on the policy instrument. This is largely the case, as the ownership situation and future perspective are often identified as the most important elements. However, also the political context in the form of the municipal attitude towards the transformation has proven to be a key element.
5.2 THE STRUCTURAL CONTEXT ON THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS

The second analysis focuses on the influence of the structural context on the policy instruments. The structural context includes the actor analysis and the governance analysis of the cases. The actor analysis focuses on the impact of the stakeholders, their objectives and means on the policy instruments. The governance analysis focuses on the influence of the power structure the policy instruments. However, the power structure is largely dependent on the objectives, means, hierarchy and alternatives of the individual actors. The governance analysis can therefore be seen as the conclusion of this paragraph.

**Actor analysis**

As mentioned, the stakeholder hierarchy is largely dependent on the objectives and the means and resources of the involved actors. When it comes to the objectives, the objectives of the municipality and the park owner(s) in particular are of importance. If the park is owned by one individual owner, the objective can be roughly divided into two sorts. Older park owners are often looking at a way to secure their retirement and to get the most value out of what is left of their park. Other (younger) park owners might still see opportunities to exploit the park plot differently for the upcoming years, for instance by (temporary) housing migrant workers. The importance of the stakeholder characteristics is also stressed by Marc van Geene from the Kadaster (paragraph 4.3.4). The municipality has the overall goal to sustain or improve the quality of the public space. But within this main goal, the municipality can distinguish different strategies or sub goals. For instance, some municipalities see the necessity to house migrant workers in the area, while others do not because they already have sufficient housing. Also, one municipal council is opposed to the reduction of the amount of tourist parks in the area, while others are in favour of transformations. Most municipalities agree that the park owners shouldn’t benefit too much from the transformation, as this “rewards” bad behaviour. But one municipality considers this irrelevant as long as it is not out of proportion and leads to an improvement of the public space. And finally, municipalities can also choose between quick gains versus long term benefits. Temporality is often cause of short term nuisance but provides opportunities to transform the park entirely after the temporary agreement has ended, thus leading to long term benefits. The VAB-policy transforms the park much quicker, but results in (new) dwellings in the rural areas. This is in principle undesirable, as municipalities aim to concentrate new dwellings in urban areas. The VAB approach in case one can offer an alternative as the park owner was compensated with a building plot in the urban area, and the park was transformed to nature. This meant quick results as well as long term benefits. The re-destination of the dwellings on the park to
residential houses offers the biggest value increase for the park owner, but leaves the municipality with a new suburb in the rural area. This is considered not to be desirable by the municipality. In more complex ownership situations, the municipality is however forced to look at re-destination (and land readjustment) to transform the park. Benefit to the municipality is that the value increase as a result of the re-destination can be captured and spend elsewhere in the municipality. The influence of some of the stakeholder objectives on the policy instruments are illustrated in figure 39 below.

Figure 39: The influence of the actor objectives on the policy instruments

The other important element of the stakeholder analysis are the means and the resources of the actors. Once again, the most important actors are the municipality on the one hand and the park owner(s) on the other. Most municipalities are looking at ways to transform the parks in cooperation with the park owner(s), but municipalities also have to a certain extent the juridical possibilities to “force” a transformation. However, this is largely depending on the future perspective and the degree of illegal activities on the park. If the park is cause to much nuisance, the municipality has the possibility to actively enforce (handhaven) the park. This can be seen as leverage in the negotiations as well; the park owner has to cooperate at some point or else the municipality can “force” him to. If the park lacks future perspective as well, the park owner has no other option than to comply with the municipality as it would otherwise be capital destruction. But for the transformation, the municipality and park owners require various juridical and financial resources as well. The municipality often “supplies” the juridical conditions such as public and private law requirements. The park owner(s) supply the property rights and sometimes also financial means. Figure 40 and 41 display the consequences for all four policy instruments on the resources of the two important actors. With the VAB-policy and temporality, the park owner loses the recreation property rights for the vacation park. In return for the property rights, the park owner receives either (a number of) building plots or a permit for temporary land use. And with the VAB-policy, the park owner is required to invest upfront into the demolishment of the park and possibly for the construction of the house. He may also chose to sell the building plot on itself. The financial investment for temporality depends on the intended usage of the land (image 40).
In contrary to the VAB-policy and temporary land-use, the municipality’s gain from the policy instruments is not only the improvement of public space, but also financial means. The value capture of the dwellings is made juridical binding with anterior agreements. The destination of the park in the land-use plan is sometimes changed into residential. However, it is also possible to keep the recreational destination but allow permanent housing. For the park residents this means that the value of their property rights will increase. This value increase must be compensated in the form of a financial contribution to the municipality. With land readjustment, the park residents are tasked with additional costs for the construction of the public space on the park. However, these additional costs are largely compensated in the form of a value increase of their properties (image 41).
**Governance**

Klijn and Koppenjan (2000) mention the concepts of power, actor dependency and formal rules are relevant to the process because they regulate the interactions between actors by defining rights and stating to whom these rights belong. The actor description (chapter 4.2) along with the actor analysis provide clear insights in the resources, rules, dependency and hierarchy between actors. Klijn (1997) states that formal rules create new resources, regulate the behaviour of actors and the distribution of resources, which in turn shapes the dependency and correspondingly defines the power interactions among actors. In the structural context of this thesis, formal rules such as property rights, financial means, and public laws with regard to land-use plans or private laws in the form of anterior agreements shape the interactions between the actors. They influence the distribution of resources and the behaviour of actors in the process.

Looking at the power structure of the cases in this thesis, it can be concluded that the two main parties which are involved; the municipalities and the park owners/residents, are both in possession of specific crucial resources. The municipalities mainly have juridical resources; the authority to change land-use plans, the power to extent temporary permits and the power to call in law enforcement against illegal activities. But they are also bound and limited by the rules regarding land-use plan changes or temporary permits. The municipality can only adjust or alter such plans within the boundaries of the law. The park owners and park residents on the other hand are in possession of the property rights, and free to practise these property rights to the extent of the law. Therefore in a transformation process, both parties bring something to the table for negotiations. In most cases this meant that the transformation was conducted in cooperation and (relative) harmony between owner(s) and

---

**Figure 41: The required resources for re-destination and land readjustment, and the effect of these policy instruments on the resources of the actor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Required resource</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Change of land-use plan, Anterior agreement</td>
<td>Re-destination</td>
<td>New destination of dwellings → source of revenue for municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park residents</td>
<td>Property rights dwelling, Financial means</td>
<td>Land readjustment</td>
<td>Loss of financial means → value increase of dwelling due to new destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Change of land-use plan, Anterior agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>New destination of dwellings → source of revenue for municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park residents</td>
<td>Property rights dwelling and park, Financial means</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of financial means → value increase of dwelling due to new destination and quality improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
municipality. This meant that if the terms of transformation were too harsh, demanding or unfair on either the owner or the municipality, they could simply refuse to cooperate. The only exemption was case two, in which the municipality couldn’t reach an agreement with the park owner and therefore started an enforcement procedure. But this was only possible because the park owner was using the park to house migrant workers, which was in conflict with the law. A third group of actors which holds a certain degree of power are the nearby stakeholders such as neighbours, farmers, etc. They have the right to object to land-use plan changes, and the municipality must take these objections in consideration. This is illustrated in figure 42.

**Figure 42: The Power Structure for Transformation Processes of Vacation Parks**

The interactions between the actors are shaped by the distribution of resources (1) and the behaviour of the actors (2). As mentioned before, the resources are distributed fairly equally between the two most important actors; the park owner and the municipality. The behaviour of actors includes the actor objectives and characteristics. This could for instance determine whether a park owner wants to apply for a temporary land permit or the VAB-policy. Together the resource distribution and the behaviour of actors determine the interactions between actors which leads to proceedings and milestones in the action process.

**Conclusion**

The two main actors in each transformation are the park owner(s) and the municipality. Both of these parties hold key resources necessary to the transformation. Other secondary actors include inhabitants and companies in the neighbourhood. They also hold some resources, but are less influential. The goals of the municipality can influence the way in which they want to use their resources. The municipal resources are mainly juridical. On the other hand, the goals of the park owner(s) are dependent on a variety of elements such as financial means, age, future perspective of the park, etc. the second proposition on this thesis stated that the goals of the most important actors influence the transformation method the most. Once again, this is largely true. However, in some cases the neighbourhood had a large influence on the transformation as well. This was especially the case with temporary land-use transformation. Because this policy instruments has big consequences on the neighbourhood, they approval is vital to the success of the transformation.
5.3 THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS ON THE ACTION PROCESS

The final analysis of this chapter features the effects which the policy instruments have on the action process. The action process has been illustrated for each case in paragraph 4.4 and figure 31 till 34. The action process is illustrated with the use of four stages, each with corresponding milestones. In this paragraph, the effect of the policy instruments on the timeline of the action process is described and evaluated. The effect is evaluated based on certain criteria such as the end result, length of the process, compensation and spatial benefits and/or disadvantages.

The VAB-policy on the Action process

The timeline for the VAB-policy cases one and five (figure 31) illustrate the stages and milestones which both cases walked through. In both cases, the park owner took the initiative for the transformation. They are initiated by the declining future perspective of their park, and the desire to secure their financial future. This is much in line with regular VAB-policy processes for agricultural companies, where the owner often has no successor and is looking for financial compensation. During the formal stage, the park owner and the municipality negotiate about the compensation of the park in terms of building rights/plots. The compensation is based on the value of the park, which can be determined in various ways (paragraph 4.3). The agreements are made juridical binding either during the definitions phase or the preparation phase. The main difference between both cases lies within the realisation phase. While in case five the park is demolished and replaced with a small residential area, the park in case one is demolished entirely and replaced with a nature destination. The park owner in case one was compensated with building rights on a land more suitable for housing.

When the end result of the VAB-policy cases is compared with the other transformation processes, a few things are noticeable. Compared with the other cases, case one and five provide relatively quick results. Also, both cases result in a significant improvement of the quality of public space, case one more than case five. The policy instrument provides the possibility for a fair compensation of the park owner as well. Disadvantage is the lack of value capture possibilities. The municipality are unable to retrieve financial means with the VAB-policy, which could otherwise be spend on tourist purposes elsewhere in the region. Finally, the VAB-policy requires a financial investment from the park owner upfront, for the demolishment of the park (and perhaps the construction of the new houses). This investment can be retrieved afterwards, but it does provide a risk for the park owner. Table 21 provides an overview of the ratings of the policy instrument on certain criteria.
**Temporality on the action process.**

Figure 32 illustrates the action process for case three and four. In case three, the initiative for the transformation was taken by the municipality, while in case four the park owner took initiative. In both cases, the aim of the park owner was to house migrant workers on the park temporally. The conditions for this approach, mainly the type and length of the temporally permit, are negociated during the formal stage. In case four, the length of the temporally permit was determined by deducting the estimated yield of the temporality land-use with the estimated value of the park. In case three, the municipality couldn’t reach an agreement with the park owner, and they decided to start a law enforcement procedure. In case four the municipality took on the leading role once they reached an agreement on the conditions for the transformation. One of the most important tasks was the communication with the neighbourhood. This resulted in abstention of objections for the intended land use plan change. The final result is a temporary permit for seven years, after which the park is transformed into a nature destination. When the end result of the temporality cases is compared with the other transformation processes, a few things are noticeable. Compared with the other cases, case three and four provide mixed, but overall long term results. The fact that the method failed to come to an agreement in case three can be ascribed mainly to the rigid attitude of the park owner. In potential, the method provides the biggest opportunity to result in a significant improvement of the quality of public space. After the temporally agreement has ended, the park will be demolished entirely. The policy instrument provides the possibility for a fair compensation of the park owner as well, as it is fairly easy to determine the yield for the park owner. Disadvantage is the lack of value capture possibilities. The municipality are unable to retrieve financial means with this method, which could otherwise be spend on tourist purposes elsewhere in the region. The method does require an investment from the park owner upfront, in the form of housing objects for the migrant workers. But this can also be financed by a third party, for instance the employment agency. However, biggest disadvantage is the short-term nuisance on the park, which is most likely to increase over a number of years. Table 22 provides an overview of the ratings of the policy instrument on certain criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public space</td>
<td>++/++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value capture</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick result</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for fair compensation</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for financial means</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of nuisance</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability on all cases</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22: Rating of Temporality**
Re-destine to residential area on the action process

The action process for case two, which applied the re-destination approach, is displayed in figure 33. The initiative was taken by the municipality. The ownership situation of the park was as such, that the municipality had to negotiate with the association of park owners, instead with one individual park owner. This meant that the temporality and VAB approach could not be applied. The municipality negotiated the terms for the re-destination with the individual owners during the formal stage. The key-element in this stage was the determination of the financial compensation (value capture) for the municipality, the allowable construction possibilities and the juridical fixation of this agreement. In the design stage, the consequences of the re-destination on the surrounding area were thoroughly examined. The final result will be a transformation of a recreational dwellings into residential.

Compared with other cases, the positive short and long term effects of the method on the public space is negligible. The municipality is effectively creating a new suburb in a rural area, which means a long term commitment and impact on the area. On the plus side, the municipality has a better overview of the residents and conditions on the park. The biggest benefit is the possibility to capture the value increase of the dwellings due to this re-destination. Disadvantage to this is that the value can only be captured to a certain degree, leaving the rest of the value increase to the residents. The ratings of Re-destination as a policy instrument is displayed in table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public space</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value capture</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick result</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for fair compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for financial means</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of nuisance</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability on all cases</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 23: RATING OF RE-DESTINATION

Land readjustment on the action process

Case six and nine are looking at the possibilities to apply land readjustment as a transformation tool. The action process for case six and nine and the Kadaster case is displayed in figure 34. Land readjustment is not necessarily a tool which requires municipal involvement. It can be conducted with an independent process facilitor as well. However, in case six and nine the transformation is initiated by the municipality because they want to apply the tool to a larger area, spanning several parks. Land readjustment is much like the re-destination approach, and also based on a situation of individual home ownership. In case six and nine, the municipality start with an initial quick scan of the area to determine the possibilities for land readjustment and value capture. In the Kadaster case, the individual home owners walk through a typical process of stating the desires, looking at variants and possibilities and finally come to an exchange plan. The destination of the dwellings remains recreational and therefore no value capture by the municipality is possible.

Compared with other cases, the improvement of the quality of the public space in case six and nine is reasonable. The parks remain vacation parks, but the public space and dwellings are revitalised or renovated. This is the main benefits compared to the re-destination approach. Also, the nuisance is
expected to decrease slightly as a result over improved municipal overview. Besides this improvement, the main benefit to this tool is the possibility for value capture by the municipality. The degree to which the municipality can count on a fair compensation is yet unclear. The disadvantages of this tool is that it most likely provides no quick solution, and requires financial investments of the individual owners which the might be able to ill-afford. Table 24 contains an overview of the ratings of this instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public space</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value capture</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick result</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for fair compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for financial means</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of nuisance</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability on all cases</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 24: Rating of Land Readjustment**

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, each of the policy instrument have their own advantages and disadvantages. Once the municipality and park owner(s) have come to an agreement on the transformation approach, the end result is also dependent on other factors. For instance, the amount of houses offered as a compensation with the VAB-policy is dependent on the value of the park, and the value for the park can be determined in various ways. With temporality, the length of the temporary permit is dependent on factors such as the future perspective of the park or the goals and resources of the park owner. And with the re-destination method, the municipality is restricted by the law to retrieve more than €50,000,- per person. This shows that various elements of the wider and structural context influence the possibilities and extent to which a policy instrument can be applied. This in turn influences the action process and the end result.

The third proposition of this thesis stated that it can be expected that the outcome of each of the process varies, even between vacation parks which have been transformed using the same policy instrument. This proposition can be tested by comparing the nine timelines and rating them on certain criteria. The assumption that each land transformation process is unique seems to be partly confirmed in this research. The most important milestones, products and stages of each policy instrument are sometimes largely similar. However, the end result of the transformation is dependent on to many elements. They are determined by the negotiations between the municipality and the park owner(s), and the starting point of these negotiations is never exactly the same. (Perhaps if more cases would be evaluated, this might be case). The proposition that the outcome of each process varies is therefore true.
CONCLUSION

In the conclusion of this thesis, the results of the case description and analysis are used to answer the main question and the five sub-questions. The conclusion also offers an opportunity to reflect on the research, formulate recommendations for the VVP and discuss the contribution to the scientific knowledge. But first the main and sub questions. The main question of this thesis is:

“To what extend do general case characteristics of vacation parks influence the possibilities and policy instruments for the transformation of these parks, and how do these policy instruments influence the transformation process?”

The research question as posed above can roughly be divided two parts. The first part is rather descriptive and aims to collect data on the case characteristics and transformations methods or tools. The second part is explanatory and aims to look at the influence of the policy instruments on the action process. The main question is supported by the following sub-questions:

- 1. How do the characteristics of cases influence the transformation method of vacation parks?
- 2. How do the characteristics of the involved actors influence the transformation method of vacation parks?
- 3. Which methods and tools for the transformation of vacation parks are applied in the Veluwe?
- 4. What sort of political, financial, juridical, social, communicative and spatial conditions are of importance for the transformation process?
- 5. How do the policy instruments influence the action process of the transformations?

The results of the analysis also allow the formulation of several recommendations for the VVP and the municipalities in the region for future transformations. But the first step is to answer sub-question one till five and the corresponding hypotheses.

**Sub-question 1: How do the characteristics of cases influence the transformation method of vacation parks?**

The first sub-question focusses on the influence of the case characteristics on the transformation method. The analysis in paragraph 5.1 aims to answer this question. In the theoretic framework the variables with regard to case characteristics are established. They are regarded as the wider context of the transformation, and include variables such as the problem context, the political context, the spatial context and the socio-cultural context. The problem context contains the internal characteristics of the park, and is based mainly on elements of the Tourist Area Life-Cycle theory. Based on the analysis in paragraph 5.1, it can be concluded that the case characteristics as described in the wider context indeed influence the transformation method of the vacation park. The degree to which the variables influence the transformation method vary, with the ownership/property rights situation and future perspective of the park as the most influential. Other characteristics like the nuisance and the political, socio-cultural or spatial context are of lesser importance. The property rights of the park clearly delimit the possibilities for transformation, as they rule out certain tools. The future perspective of the park doesn’t necessarily influence the *applied* policy instrument, but rather the go/no-go for
transformation and the conditions of the transformation. If the municipality wants to transform a park which still has a certain future perspective, the park owner has a stronger position in the negotiations. Also, the (financial) compensation from the municipality must be significant to stimulate the park owner to transform. On the other hand, if the park still has some future perspective the municipality is less likely to initiate a transformation. In such case, the transformation is often the objective of the park owner.

**Sub-question 2: How do the characteristics of the involved actors influence the transformation method of vacation parks?**

The second sub-question focusses on the influence of the actor characteristics on the policy instruments. This analysis is (partly) executed in paragraph 5.2. The theoretical framework in chapter two describes the influence of the structural context on the policy instruments. The structural context include the actor analysis and the governance analysis. It focusses on the power structure between actors, based on variables such as the objectives and resources on the individual actor. Based on the analysis in paragraph 5.2, it can be concluded that the actor characteristics indeed influence the chosen policy instrument. The two main variables that influence the choice for a policy instrument are the objectives (of the park owner in particular) and the resources of the individual. The objectives of the park owner are often leading in the transformation. The municipality can only influence the transformation with juridical resources (law enforcement) if the park owner is conducting illegal activities. While the municipality mainly has juridical and communicative resources, the park owners often have juridical rights as well as sometimes financial means. The financial means of the municipality are most of the time low, as they have no funds available for the transformation. But there are more actor characteristics that influence the policy instruments, which are not explicitly mentioned in the structural context. The Kadaster mentions the importance of actor variables such as age, length and type of the contract and family situation, especially with regard to the land readjustment tool. These variables can all influence the actor’s objectives, and are therefore worth to be mapped. This is in particular the case with fragmented ownership of the park. The actor characteristics can provide insights to the municipality on the (most likely) objectives of individual owners in the transformation process.

**Sub-question 3: Which methods and tools for the transformation of vacation parks are applied in the Veluwe?**

Case one till nine of this research are transformed in accordance with four approaches; the VAB-policy, temporality; Re-destination and Land readjustment. The exemptions are case seven and eight, which are not transformed. These cases have served as a benchmark to determine why and when a vacation park is not transformed. It turns out that, perhaps obvious, the objective of the park owner and the future perspective are the main reasons for refraining from transformation. Figure 20 contains an overview of the policy instruments for each individual case.
Sub-question 4: What sort of political, financial, juridical, social, communicative and spatial conditions are of importance for the transformation process?

The theory of Bressers and Ostrom mention the importance of the political, socio cultural and spatial conditions on the transformation process. The theories on policy instruments provide insights into the three types or indicators for these instruments; juridical, financial and communicative. The political, socio cultural and spatial conditions which are of importance to the transformation process are described in paragraph 4.1. The juridical, financial and communicative conditions are described in paragraph 4.3. The main conclusions of the evaluation with regard to each of the policy conditions are;

Political conditions:
Almost all interviewee’s mention the importance of political support for the transformation. The city council has the final say in every change of a land-use plan. Therefore they must agree with the conditions of the transformation. Sometimes transformation is not in line with the municipal policy with regard to vacation parks. In case four, the municipality is opposed to the reduction of recreation parks in the region, regardless the goals of the program Vital Vacation parks. In this case, the park owner and municipal officials had to convince the city council of the benefits of the transformation. In practice it seems that the municipal goals and attitude towards transformation is important, but not all deciding. The case characteristics and objectives of the park owner are big influences as well.

Socio-cultural conditions:
Most mentioned with regard to socio-cultural elements is how to deal with (1) park residents in vulnerable conditions and (2) migrant workers. The park residents are sometimes made homeless as a result of the transformation. The involvement of the municipality in the search for alternative housing varies for each case. Some of the municipalities do not see this as their responsibility, while others are actively looking for social housing in cooperation with housing associations. In some cases the park residents have permits for legal residence, which complicates the situation (see juridical conditions). With regard to migrant workers, the municipalities in this case study understand the demand and urgency to provide housing. By making the housing of migrant workers legal through a temporary permit, the municipality provides certainty to everyone and also control the housing situation of the migrant workers.

Spatial conditions:
The location and size of the park often contribute to the experienced nuisance of the area. Parks located in dense areas obviously cause more nuisance in comparison to more remote located parks. The consequences of each transformation on the surrounding area is thoroughly examined in spatial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy instruments</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAB-policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary land-use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurpose to residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Urban) land readjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20: OVERVIEW OF THE APPLIED TRANSFORMATION METHODS PER CASE

D.C.T. Verberk
assessments. This includes an environmental assessment, spatial integration in the area and the consequences for a nearby farmer, an infrastructural impact assessment and so on.

**Juridical conditions:**
The most important conclusions with regard to the juridical conditions are in twofold. First, the conditions concerning public law;

- The authority to change a land use plan is the main resource of the municipality which they can use in the negotiations. However, the municipality should always take in account that other stakeholders have to right to object to land-use plan changes. It is therefore desirable to contact the neighbourhood who are affected by the new land use upfront. The concerns of the neighbourhood should be discussed in an early stage to prevent delay in the future.
- While the municipality holds the right to change a land-use plan, they also have to take in account the delimitations from the province. In case two, the municipality was delayed in the process because the province couldn’t agree to the initial plan. Short lines of communication are therefore desirable.

With regard to private law;

- All agreements that are discussed during the formal stage of the negotiations should be made juridical binding before stage three and four, realization and maintenance, are initiated. These agreements should also contain the consequences in case a part of the plan fails, for instance if the land-use plan change is not accepted.
- Situations in which park residents own permits for legal residence can implicate the transformation. The municipalities can leave the initiative for this problem to the park owner, and assist if necessary.

**Financial conditions:**
The most mentioned and perhaps most important financial condition is the determination of the value of the park. The value of the park lies at the basis for the compensation and determines the amount of building plots or the length of the temporary land-use permit. The book value of the park can be determined in many ways, but perhaps the most efficient way is to base it on the “WOZ-Value” of the park. This is the value determination of the real estate which the municipality uses to determine the tax assessments. The park owner often value to park higher, which can be unrealistic and leads to large compensations by the municipality. Also, the municipality have the choice to either apply a transformation policy that allows value capture, or a policy that doesn’t but leaves more options with regard to the future land use. Quality of the public space is always the main objective of the municipality, but the money they receive from the re-destination (and land readjustment) policy can be used to revitalise the tourism sector elsewhere.

**Communicative conditions:**
As mentioned in the juridical conditions, decent communication with local stakeholders is necessary if the intended transformation affects them. This communication can either go by “open evenings” or by personal conversations. Also, it is important to remain on good speaking terms with the park...
owner/residents. Law enforcement actions (is possible) can be applied by the municipality but only as a measure of last resort.

**Sub-question 5: How do the policy instruments influence the action process of the transformations?**

Sub-question five focuses on the influence of the policy instruments on the action process (paragraph 5.3). The theories of Bressers and Ostrom state that the contextual and structural context influence the applied policy instruments and therefore the action process of transformation. The paragraph on policy instruments mentions the juridical, economic and communicative conditions for policy instruments. Paragraph 2.1.4 elaborates on the action process by providing background for the construction of a timeline for planning processes in the Netherlands. It includes four typical stages and sub-stages of a development process. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the VVP and local municipalities consider each process to be customized. This implies that every process is unique and therefore not in coherence with a regular planning process. This should, in theory, lead to nine unique timelines. The process of the transformation is described by use of timelines in chapter four of this thesis. In theory, the different policy instruments should influence the transformation process with regard to the length, steps, deadlines, etc. In practice however, this may not be the case. The analysis in paragraph 5.3 show the consequences, benefits and disadvantages of each policy instrument on the action process. The assumption that each timeline is unique turned out to be true. However, this was also due to the fact that the case studies where not all completed yet, in the sense that the intended end result wasn’t reached. Table 25 sums up the ratings for each of the policy instruments with regard to seven criteria. The municipality is the party which holds the most important juridical resources in a transformation process. They must decide what they deem important in the transformation, for instance; quick results, value capture, improvement of public space or a fair compensation. They can try to steer the process into a certain transformation approach upfront, but it is never certain that this will actually work out the way they plan. The case characteristics and owner objectives are also influential on the process outcome. Fact is that each policy instruments influences the negotiations, or the entire action process in a specific way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>VAB-Policy</th>
<th>Temporality</th>
<th>Re-destination</th>
<th>Land readjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of public space</td>
<td>+/++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value capture</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick result</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for fair compensation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for financial means</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of nuisance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability on all cases</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 25: Overview of the effects of the policy instruments**
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REFLECTION
This paragraph is used to reflect on the thesis with regard to the results and the research methods. This includes a statement of limitations, alternatives and weaknesses in the research. First the limitations of this research. The research’s main limitation if the fact that transformations of vacation parks (on this scale) is still a relatively new concept. The experience with these transformations varies within each municipality, and some of the transformations that have been evaluated were still ongoing. This means that the results can lead to new insights for future transformation, but are also delimited by the lack of cases, progress or finished cases. Also, some financial constructions such as the value capture instrument in case two can be contested in court up till five years after they are signed. If the judge rules in favour of the park residents, this could change the entire situation and prospect of the policy instrument. Also, in the future new policy instruments might be applied for the transformation to achieve better or quicker results. These instruments could obviously not be evaluated in this research. Finally, the VVP and local municipalities have recently introduced a new development company with a restructuring fund. With this development company, the VVP can become an active player in the market. With the financial means of this restructuring fund they can conduct transformations much more easily. This means that they might also be able to apply more cost intensive transformation approaches. The policy instruments which have been evaluated in this thesis are all “cost neutral”. This means that the municipality has to invest none or little capital in the transformations. The development company can improve the situation of the VVP in the market, but they can also use the funds to smoothen or improve the policy instruments which have been evaluated in this thesis. After all some policy instruments require financial contributions from park residents, which they might not be able to afford. The restructuring fund could guarantee these contributions or provide loans.

In term of alternatives, the selection of cases might be a point of interest. The cases are mainly located in the Veluwe area, as this is the area in which the VVP is active. Through their network the cases have been selected based on varying characteristics and transformations methods. This limits the amount of transformation methods that could be researched. This problem was countered by also interviewing the Kadaster for transformation cases. But an alternative could have been to have also included cases outside the Veluwe area. This could have provided a larger set of transformation methods and case characteristics.

The weaknesses of the research has already been mentioned in chapter 3 “methodology”. The weakness focusses mainly on the selection of interviewee’s. Cases are evaluated based on interviews with municipal officials. This provides a rather one sided view on the cases and the process. It would have been better to also interview the park owners as well, but this was most of the time undesirable because many cases where still ongoing and this could frustrate the process. The latter is another weakness of the research; because some cases were unfinished it was difficult to evaluate them as the end result was not clear yet.
DISCUSSION

This paragraph contains the discussion with regard to the scientific relevance of this master thesis and the contribution to the existing pool of knowledge on the subject of vacation park transformations. First of all, vacation park transformation is a phenomena which has not been applied on a large scale up until recently. Vacation parks have been transformed in the last decennia, but these were usual individual parks in individual municipality. This is in contrary to this research, where the VVP acts as a mediator and facilitator for several municipalities in order to achieve transformations on a large scale and long period of time. Their goal is to come to a comprehensive transformation strategy in order to revitalize the tourist sector in the Veluwe area.

Looking at the literature, not much extensive research has been conducted on this very case specific subject of vacation park transformation. Van der Krabben and Wolf (2014) looked into the temporality tool as a policy instrument for transformation in their research “Re-creatie door arbeidsmigratie: Tijdelijke huisvesting arbeidsmigranten op recreatieparken”. This focusses on temporality with migrant workers entirely and is mainly an exploratory research, not evaluative. However looking at the bigger picture, more scientific research on transformation processes can be of use. Bressers mentions in his contextual interaction model the broad elements which affect the process of transformation (figure 7).

![Figure 7: The Contextual Interaction Model (Bressers, 2007)](image)

However, the contextual interaction model is a fairly generalising model, which could be applied to all sorts of land transformations. It defines the context of land transformations, but they can differ for each type of transformation. Questions like; “which variable is the most dominant in the process?” are not answered. It merely drafts the boundaries and context for general transformations. The results of this research offer the possibility to fill in the most important elements (within the boundaries of the model) for the specific topic of vacation park transformations.
With regard to the wider context, Bressers mentions general sub-variables such as the problem context, the political context, the economic context, the cultural context and the technological context. For vacation park transformations, the most important variables are the problem context and the political context. The problem context in this sense means the internal and external case (/park) characteristics. Most noticeably are the future perspective of the park and the ownership situation. The future perspective can be determined by evaluating the parks with the Tourist Area Life Cycle (TALC-) model.

With regard to the structural context Bressers mentions many elements with regard to governance (e.g.; levels & scales, network & actors, perspectives & goal ambitions, strategies & instruments, responsibilities and resources for implementation and property & use rights). When applied to land transformation for vacation parks, the most important elements of the structural context turn out to be the resources, hierarchy and goals of the actors (based on the interviews). A dependency analysis can be a useful tool to determine the interrelations between actors as it contains many elements of the structural context.

As input, Bressers mentions several possible inputs such as goals, instruments, resources and time choices. In this case the policy instruments have been chosen as the input, but these are also interrelated with the goals, resources and time choices. For instance when evaluating the influence of the policy instruments on the action process, the goals (e.g.; improvement of public space, reduction of nuisance), instruments (e.g.; possibility for value capture), resources (e.g.; financial or juridical means) and time choices (e.g.; quick results or long term benefits) are the main criteria. Also, most important communicative (e.g.; neighbourhood contact), economic (e.g.; cost division, revenue model, determination book value park, value capture) and juridical conditions (e.g.; juridical enforce agreements in beginning) with regard to vacation park transformation can be determined based on interview results of this research.

With regard to the process, the timeline of the different transformation methods provide insights and guidance for future transformations. When comparing the timeline for each of the transformations with the timeline for infrastructural projects, it can be concluded that they share some similarities. The four main stages and some of the sub-stages of infrastructural projects are mainly the same as with vacation park transformations, however the chronology may vary. However the milestones and products for both types of processes are not the same. Each policy instrument uses different kind of documents, agreements and researches. The timeline documentation for each policy instrument as described in paragraph 4.4 of this thesis therefore contributes to the existing pool of knowledge on vacation park transformation processes.

Finally this thesis contributes to literature on land readjustment. As just one of the four transformation strategies, land readjustment forms a relatively small part of this research. A lot of research has been conducted on this development tool already. This thesis adds case specific data on vacation park transformations to the existing pool of knowledge. The most important conclusion is that the re-destination of vacation parks, in combinations with land readjustment, provides opportunities for the municipality capture the value increase and improve the quality of the public space at the same time. The value increase due to the re-destination is an advantage that “regular” land readjustment processes do not have. This makes the tool attractive for municipalities.
RECOMMENDATIONS

There are a few practical recommendations for the VVP as a result of this thesis. The first statement is that there is no “best strategy” for municipalities to transform the vacation parks. Each of the transformation variants which have been evaluated have advantages and disadvantages of their own. This is described in paragraph 5.3. It is up to the municipality to decide which criteria (e.g. quick result or improvement of public quality) they want to prioritise. Also, the goals of the park owner(s) are also of vital important to the process. What could help the municipality and the VVP is if they become an active market player themselves. Currently, the municipalities do not have the financial means to invest in these transformations. And even though the methods described in this thesis are in principal cost neutral, they do require investments up front. Recently the municipality and the VVP established a development company with a restructuring fund. The development company was established so the municipalities could become an active market player. The restructuring funds can accelerate the transformations in the region, and be used to apply a large comprehensive strategy. For instance by lending out financial funds to park owner(s), buying parks to come to better solutions, or redirecting funds to improve the recreational sector somewhere else. The development company allows new transformation approaches, which brings me to the recommendation for future research. In the future, research can be conducted on transformation strategies for this development company. With the transformation methods of this thesis as a starting point, new possibilities could be explored based on the financial means which the development company could supply.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction:
- Personal introduction of the interviewer and interviewee
- Aim of the research:

“To describe and explain the influence of the actors and the case on the applied methods of transformation of vacation parks in the Veluwe region, and to explore the possibilities to improve the conditions for these transformation processes in order to develop a comprehensive strategy”

- Aim of the interview: to gain insights in the proceedings, experiences and motives within the process of the transformation of vacation park X.

Structure of the interview
The interview is structured in certain phases and with several types of questions.

Lay-out of the interview
- The interview consist of four phases with a total of 30 questions.
- Some questions have up to eight follow-up questions to clarify the subject and improve the integrality.

Types of questions:
- “What” questions: what happened exactly and what are the most important elements within the process?
- “How” questions: How did you experience certain events or proceedings?
- “Why” questions: Why did you act in a certain way and which are the underlying motives?
- “To what extend” questions: To what extend do you agree with a certain statement?
- “Which” questions: Which methods or conditions are key for the transformation process?

Phases of the interview:
- Phase one: Parties and roles. Which stakeholders have been involved into the process and what are their objectives and interrelations. The first phase is mainly structured by Decision-Analysis related theory.
- Phase two: Case description. Description of the case or vacation park. Variables such as ownership, park type, degree of nuisance and future perspective are the key elements of this part. As a result of the case description phase, the parks can be placed within the Tourist Area Life-cycle model.
- Phase three: The transformation or revitalization process. Which methods and tools are applied to redevelop the vacation parks, and what are the administrative, financial, social, juridical and communicative conditions to apply a certain tool.
- Evaluation: the evaluation of the process by use of the DRIVE-Approach and planning process timeline. The timeline will consist of the main steps, products and milestones within the process.
Introduction of the interviewee
1. Who are you and what organization do you belong to?
2. How are you involved within the program vital vacation parks or the case?

Phase one: Parties and roles
3. In short, what is the case of ... about? What is the problem and when did it first occur?
   a. 3.1: How big was the need to intervene?
4. Which stakeholders (public and private actors) can be identified within the case?
   a. 4.1: Which other actors should or could have been involved within the process?
5. What are the objectives for each of the stakeholders?
   a. 5.1: To what degree do you think these objectives are reasonable and achievable?
6. How is the division of roles within the process?
   a. 6.1: Who took the initiative?
   b. 6.2: How did the contact take shape? Which parties where involved?
   c. 6.3: What do you think of the current division of roles?
   d. 6.4: What is your own role within the process?
   e. 6.5: To what extend is there a certain hierarchy between stakeholders?
   f. 6.6: To what extend are stakeholders dependent on each other?
   g. 6.7: What resources does each of the stakeholders have?
   h. 6.8: How is the process communicated with stakeholders?

Phase two: Case description
7. What is the ownership situation of the vacation park?
   a. 7.1: To what degree is there a situation of fragmented land ownership?
   b. 7.2: Who holds the property rights
8. How big is the park?
9. How many and what type of units are available for rent at the park (Logie-vormen)?
10. What can you say about the occupancy rate of the park?
11. How does the vacation park compare to surrounding parks?
12. What market type (domestic or international) is the main focus of the park?
13. Which distribution method (travel agency or independent bookings) is mainly applied by the park owner?
14. Which market segment or target group is the main focus of the parks in terms of:
   a. 14.1: Age;
   b. 14.2: Family situation;
   c. 14.3: Group size.
15. To what extend did the park contribute to nuisance of the surrounding area?
   a. 15.1: To what extend are there any undesirable activities on the park such as permanent housing?
   b. 15.2: To what extend was the park, in your opinion, deteriorated?
16. To what extend does/did the park have any future perspective in your opinion?
   a. 16.1: Did it see a drop in the number of visitors over the last years?
   b. 16.2: Could the park generate sufficient revenue to guarantee its continuity?
   c. 16.3: Can the park compete with surrounding parks?
   d. 16.4: To what extend has the carrying capacity of the region in the field of “verblijfsrecreatie” been reached in your opinion?
Phase three: The transformation or revitalization process

17. Which measures were taken to transform the area?
   a. 17.1: Which tool or strategy was applied?

18. Which administrative conditions are key to the transformation process?
   a. 18.1: Does the transformation require political support?
   b. 18.2: To what extent are governmental bodies involved into this process?
   c. 18.3: To what extent is the process transparent for society?

19. Which financial conditions are key to the transformation process?
   a. 19.1: What is the revenue model (“verdienmodel”) of the transformation process?
   b. 19.2: How is the division of costs within the transformation process organized?
   c. 19.3: What are the financial risks?
   d. 19.4: Who are the financial risks for?
   e. 19.5: How was the financial division negotiated and enforced?

20. Which social conditions are key to the transformation process?
   a. 20.1: How does the intervention influence residents on the park?
   b. 20.2: How does the intervention influence the owner of the park?
   c. 20.3: How does the intervention influence the surrounding residents?
   d. 20.4: To what extent are local residents involved within the process? (mate van “burgerparticipatie”)

21. Which juridical conditions are key to the transformation process?
   a. 21.1: Which sort public and private laws are applied within the process?
   b. 21.2: What will the juridical consequences of the project be in terms of property rights?

22. Which other conditions that have not been mentioned are key for the transformation process?

Evaluation

23. What are the most important milestones within the process?
   a. 22.1: Can you identify a certain degree of gradation of milestones?
   b. 22.2: Can you describe the process and milestones of the process on a timeline?

24. Were the most important milestones (deadlines, steps, etc.) clear from the start?

25. At which steps, if any, within the process were there any type of uncertainties, surprises or difficulties?

26. At the start of or during the process, where there any “grey areas” for you in terms of planning, procedures, rules, etc.?

27. Which alternative approaches or solutions have been suggested and taken into consideration?

28. Do you consider the end result to be an improvement of the public space?

29. To what extent does the end result vary from the initial plan?

30. Are you satisfied with the end result of the transformation?

31. Looking at the timeline, is there a possibility to smoothen or improve the process?

Additional questions

1. Who are you and what organization do you belong to?

2. How are you involved within the program vital vacation parks or the case?

29. Are you satisfied with the end result of the transformation?
APPENDIX 2: CASE OVERVIEW

The list below is an overview of the cases and interviewee’s which have been involved in this thesis.

- Gemeente Barneveld: Casus 1. Interview: Sander van Nieuwenhuizen
- Gemeente Oldebroek: Casus 2. Interview: Martine Emming
- Gemeente Oldebroek. Casus 3. Interview: Martine Emming
- Gemeente Putten Casus 4. Interview: Arjan Stokreef
- Gemeente Elburg Casus 5. Interview: Arno Voskamp
- Gemeente Harderwijk Casus 6. Interview: Inge Rietberg
- Gemeente Harderwijk Casus 7. Interview: Inge Rietberg
- Gemeente Harderwijk Casus 8. Interview: Inge Rietberg
- Gemeente Harderwijk Casus 9. Interview: Inge Rietberg
- Kadaster. Interview: Marc van Geene
- Regio Noord Veluwe: Rob van den Hazel
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### APPENDIX 7: PROBLEM CONTEXT EXPANDED Table

#### TABLE 27: PROBLEM CONTEXT TABLE EXPANDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Overview</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Wider context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (in hectares)</td>
<td>2 1 5.5 1.5 2.5 4.5 8.5 6 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabins</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp sites</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalets</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile houses</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational cottages (or bungalows)</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist facilities on the park</td>
<td>- - - unknown - x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One park owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: tourist exploitation</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: transform in return for compensation</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: house migrant workers</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private homeowners</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park owner</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist purposes</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal permanent residence</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal permanent residence</td>
<td>x x x unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High occupancy rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to permanent housing</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to tourist activities</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average or declining occupancy rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to permanent housing</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to tourist activities</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slight occupancy rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuisance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol misuse</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime (small or large)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated/cluttered area</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littering</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant workers</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing</td>
<td>x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future perspective good</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future perspective possible</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future perspective minimal</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future perspective hard to determine</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude municipality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of continuation of vacation park</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of transformation to nature/other area</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of transformation to residential area</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude towards earnings model</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park owner should not benefit (to much) from transformation</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings model is irrelevant as long as it leads to spatial improvement</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual owners must contribute to transformation (to residential)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude towards housing of migrant workers on the park</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of (temporary) housing of migrant workers</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to (temporary) housing of migrant workers</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant or unknown</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison to area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby residents, companies, parks or others</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No nearby residents, companies, parks or others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in rural area</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in semi-rural area</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in urban area</td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR MUNICIPALITIES

This paragraph focusses on theories with regard to land development and transformation methods. As mentioned in the scientific relevance of this thesis, the transformation of vacation parks is a relatively new concept within spatial planning. Therefore, there hasn’t been conducted much research into the explicit transformation methods for vacation parks. These transformations are often more difficult as they have complex ownership situations (Geene, 2017) (Hazel, van de, 2017).

Development strategies

This paragraph offers an overview of possible development strategies for municipalities, which are usually applied to develop and plan real estate. Each development strategy differs in its exact approach or tool. The table (27) below shows six possible strategies for the development of land in the Netherlands (Muñoz Gielen, 2015). It briefly mentions the key-concepts and the degree of development control and financial consequences. While the table mentions large-scale development strategies for municipalities in the Netherlands, most of these can also be applied to smaller projects such as individual vacation parks. But it is also possible that the interviews result in the identification of other tools which are not mentioned below. In example: the use of temporary land use permits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development strategy</th>
<th>How does it work?</th>
<th>Development control</th>
<th>Financial consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Active land policy | - Municipality acquires all land and properties  
- Services the land and puts in the infrastructure  
- Readjusts land into building plots  
- Sells building plots to private developers and/or end-users | - Detailed master plan  
- Municipality in full control of location development  
- Free to select private developers | - Private developers owning land may refuse to sell or will ask high price  
- Cost recovery of infrastructure works via net income from buying and selling  
- Financial risks; unsold building plots, insufficient cost recovery |
| 2. Building claim model | - Similar to active land policy  
- Building claim agreement with private developers holding land | - Detailed master plan  
- Similar to active land policy, but building plots sales now restricted to developers holding building claims | - Financial risks: unsold building plots, insufficient cost recovery |
| 3. Organic development | - Municipality facilitates private developer initiatives and puts in the infrastructure | - Global master plan  
- Municipality no longer in charge of development process (phasing: plan content)  
- Hold out problems | - Financial risks: insufficient cost recovery |
4. Concession model
- Municipality conditionally facilitates private developer initiatives
- Global master plan
- Agreements with private developer(s) on development process
- Hold out problems
- None (or limited) financial risks for municipality

5. Urban land readjustment
- Private owners jointly decide to readjust land into suitable building plots
- Similar to organic development (although proactive role municipality possible as well)
- Financial risks: insufficient cost recovery

6. Do nothing
- Unsolicited proposals by private developers
- Municipality decides to support proposal or not
- Financial risks: insufficient cost recovery

| TABLE 28: OVERVIEW OF POSSIBLE LAND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES (MUÑOZ GIELEN, 2015) |

1. Active land policy
Active land policy is the most proactive form of governmental land development. The governmental body acquires all the land and properties is wishes to (re)develop. It services the land itself readjusts it into building plots. These plots are then sold to private developers or immediately to end users. The big advantage of this strategy for the government is that it has almost total control over the final land development. But it also has big financial consequences for the municipality, as they take on almost all the financial risk. After all, the municipality invests in the lands upfront and tries to recover the costs by the net income of the sale of the buildings plots. If the plots are not sold, for instance during a financial or real estate crisis, this can lead to insufficient cost recovery and a huge financial burden.

2. Building claim model
The building claim model is very similar to the active land policy strategy. Again, the municipality services the land and provides infrastructure and building plots. However, the building plots are sold exclusively to private developers holding building claims. This lowers some of the financial risk as the building claims are secured upfront. However, the private developers are not always obligated to buy the plots.

3. Organic development
Organic development, or sometimes called “do-it-yourself” planning, is a strategy in which the end users of the lands are much more involved and in control of the final land development. The government acts more like a facilitator or mediator in the process. The municipality takes on slight financial risk by putting in the infrastructure, and aims to recover these costs in the form of a tax or by selling the plots. The municipality is not in control anymore of the development process such as phasing or the plan content.

4. Concession model
With this development strategy, the conditionally facilitates private developers initiatives. The private developers service the land themselves, thus saving the municipality financial costs and risk. The municipality works with a global master plan and has agreements with the private developers over the
development process. However, hold-out problems can still occur as the private developers do not want to sell plots or houses when the prices are low.

5. (Urban) Land readjustment
Several theories regarding (urban) Land readjustment can be used to structure the first chapter of the master thesis. Land readjustment refers to “a procedure in which the structure of boundaries and facilities within the chosen area is transformed, but the old owners still keep the land” (Larsson, 1997, p.141). Many research has yet been conducted to land readjustment. Often the finance aspect of land readjustment projects proves to be difficult. One of the ways to finance urban land readjustment is by Value capture tools. As a result of land readjustment an increase of the environmental and property value can be expected. This phenomenon is a prerequisite for value capture. Value capture “can be described as a method whereby additional land value is extracted as a result of public investment into community infrastructure” (Lombard, Behrens & Viruly, 2016, p.58-59). However, LR tools are not only applied in urban areas, but also in rural places. They can provide solutions for problems regarding the vacant or deteriorated real estate in rural areas due to the decline of the population. It offers potential to redevelop (vacant) real estate in town centres. In order to keep the town centres liveable, there has been a switch from new land developments in the outskirts of town, to redevelopment of the urban centre. And this is not only in the Netherlands. Land readjustment is witnessing a revival in academic literature, and at the same time becoming popular with international development organizations such as UN-Habitat or the World Bank (Munoz Gielen, 2015). However, the degree to which the government has the power to “force” the redevelopment of the land varies in each country. In the Netherlands, the municipality can force a proposed land readjustment plan as long as the majority of the local land owners support the plan, the intended plan is economically feasible and all legal guarantees are full-filled. The municipality is responsible for securing the necessary development costs (Munoz Gielen, 2015). The principle is that property owners of deteriorated areas jointly redevelop the land. All property rights are brought in and redistributed with the main aim of improving and financing the spatial plans (Van der Stoep et al, 2013). At the start of the process, all the value of all property is measured. The value increase of the proposed redevelopment of the land is captured and used to finance the transformation. Fragmented land ownership however, makes this a difficult and sometimes slow process (Van der Krabben, Lenferink, Martens, Van der Stoep, & Portier, 2013). Hold-out problems can occur, in which some of the land owners do not wish to participate. However, one of the most important factor for the success of (urban) land readjustment is often the finance aspect. The principles to which LR is structured requires land owners to invest in the area upfront in order to achieve a value increase of the land. And with a government moving towards a more passive land development strategy, this often means private parties will have to invest in (certain aspects of) the redevelopment. In the Netherlands, the development contribution is either negotiated between municipality and land owner, or otherwise forced. Negotiated development contributions however have the preference as the municipality has the chance to retrieve additional costs (Munoz Gielen, 2015).

6. Do Nothing
The baseline option for an area development is to not intervene. In the case of land development strategies this means that the government or land owner will refuse to intervene itself and instead wait for unsolicited proposals from private project developers. This can be the cheapest option as it
does not require any investments. However if lands are already purchased with loaned money it can also be disadvantageous.

Application of the theories on the thesis
The methods and strategies as described in this paragraph provide background information for the researcher on possible transformation methods. This background information allows the research recognize and understand the applied methods. The layout of figure 14 is applied in the analysis of the transformation methods, to provide a clear overview of the methods applied.
APPENDIX 9: POLICY VISION

As mentioned before, the set of instruments together form the **policy vision**. The choice for a certain policy vision can be based on two types of perspectives. The first perspective is the **instrumental, functional perspective** on policy instruments. This approach states that the instruments should be chosen by evaluating and comparing certain criteria with each other (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). Such criteria might include their effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy and political support. The **effectiveness** is the degree to which the analysed policy instrument achieves the predetermined policy goals, in comparison to the other possibilities. The **efficiency** focusses on the feasibility, sustainability, practicability and the costs of the instrument, in comparison with the other possibilities. The **legitimacy and political support** is judged by the political and communal support for the instrument (Verhoest et al., 2003). The second perspective focusses on the **contextual aspects** of the choice. This states that policy instruments are chosen on the specific preferences or assumptions of individuals or organisations (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). Linder and Peters (1989) distinguish three types of context factors which can influence choice for a certain policy instrument. The first one are the factors on a macro-level, like the political system in which the choices are made. The second one are factors on meso-level and are linked to the policy environment in which the choices are made or the specific problem which is addresses. The third and last factor are at micro-level, focus on the personal characteristics and views of the policymaker. There can be distinguished four types of policy visions;

- The rational approach;
- The network approach;
- Control from a distance with strategic dialog or performance management; and
- Control by values.

**The rational approach**
The rational approach vision assumes that the applied instruments are the logical result of problem identification and policy making. Once the problem is identified, the governmental bodies should make clear choices with regard to the goals, means and ambitions in terms of time. Once these are decided on, the adequate instruments should be identified and applied to reach the desired situation. The effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy of the instrument should also be taken under consideration. Advantage of this approach is that it creates conditions for the government to apply certain juridical, economic and juridical instruments. Disadvantage is that the rational approach is almost entirely top-down based, with few possibilities for bottom-up initiatives (Korsten, 2005). This conflicts with the changing position and role of the government in contemporary society, which is making a shift from government to governance (see paragraph; governance).

**The network approach**
The network approach assumes that (policy) changes should be realized in a collaboration between actors, which are all dependent on one another. Actors should be brought together and become the problem owners together. It is key that the actors see that cooperation can lead to benefits for all. In order to book progress, not only the goals should be unified, but also the available resources such as budget, power and expertise. This means that there is no top-down mentality, as the government and other actors are considered to be equal in the process. Because of this it is fundamentally different than the rational approach. Disadvantage of this approach is that it is time-consuming and requires an
unbiased and independent process architect to gain progress (Korsten, 2005). The policy network approach (Rhodes, 1990) focusses on the interrelations of these actors, and distinguished four key elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy network element</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>How do formal rules regulate interactions between actors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource distribution</td>
<td>Which resources are available to each stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>How are the actors dependent towards each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Power dependence and hierarchy between actors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 29: Elements of the Policy Network Approach (Rhodes, 1990)**

*Control from a distance*

The third approach, controlling from a distance, focusses mainly on the interrelations of organisations. This approach finds it origins in the field of education, in particular in redefining the relation between the ministry and the institutions for higher education. As a result universities became independent entities with autonomy of their own. The ministry and the universities agree on certain policies and goals for a given period of time, and the universities give feedback to these set goals. With this approach, problems are exchanged and discussed as parties are aware of their interdependence. Disadvantage of this approach is that it is mainly applicable on inter-organisational settings (Korsten, 2005).

*Control by values*

The fourth and final approach is control by values. Governmental interventions are always based on certain values, for instance with regard to healthcare, justice, or nature preservation. In example; if the government prohibits the dump of chemical waste in open water, it does so from the value of public health. In order to control by values, the government should emphasize these values towards the public by showing leadership and desirable behaviour. This approach can be applied both in top-down and bottom-up management. However if a government shifts toward a rather facilitating role, the degree of control by value decreases. Disadvantage of this approach is that policy change can only be achieved by influences and inciting cultural change (Korsten, 2005).
APPENDIX 10: SYSTEM ANALYSIS

Causal analysis

Causal analysis and casual diagrams in particular are important tools for representing the feedback structure of systems (Sterman, 2000, p. 137). Causal diagrams consist of two main elements; variables and arrows. The variables can be either “hard” (example given; amount of visitors or expenditure) or “soft” (perception, appreciation or “good will”). The arrows illustrate the relations between variables, and the positive or negative influence they have on each other. This influence is called the polarity between variables. The influence can be either corresponding, which means that an increase (or decrease) of variable x leads to an increase (or decrease) of variable y, or opposite, which means that an increase (or decrease) of variable x leads to a decrease (or increase) of variable y. It is also possible that variable y has, in turn, an effect on variable z. And variable z might be, through a dynamic chain process of cause and effect, traced back to the starting variable x. This is called a “feedback loop”. A loop is a closed path of cause and consequence. Theoretically speaking, each variable in the loop can be considered the starting variable. Freeman and Sherwood (1970) have pleaded in favour of the translation of assumptions underlying a policy into an explicit “impact models”. According to them, such impacts-models should include three causal hypotheses, respectively about (1) the causes of the policy problem, (2) the effects of the policy on the causes of the policy problem, and (3) the effects of the policy on the policy problem itself. Leeuw (1983) moves in the line of Freeman and Sherwood when he remarks that the theory underlying a policy is found by making the policy assumptions explicit or by reconstructing them. He formulates the following method-rules: (a) Write out the effect which is to be attained with the policy measure (= the objective variable) as precisely as possible. Draw up an inventory of the policy measures (the measure variables) in categories with the help of behaviour mechanisms on the ground of which an effect is expected. Formulate the connections between the variables from (a) and (b) in ‘if-then’ statements or statements of proportion. In doing so, use as much written information from the part of the government about the categories of policy measures to be analysed as possible. Finally, try to bring the statements from (c) together in a system in which one statement is deduced from another. Draw up criteria with the help of available literature used for screening the (policy) theories.

![Causal analysis model example](image-url)
**System diagram**

System diagram modelling provides a clear method to visualize the forces at play for a certain problem solving process. At the centre of the model is the current system which is not functioning optimally, and on which the government wants to intervene. The diagram reasons from the perspective of the problem owner, for instance a municipality, whom set certain goals which they want to achieve. These goals are also influenced by other actors such as citizens, companies, etc. At the left of the model is the external context, which include the variables or driving forces that influence the system and possible future scenarios. The municipality has all sorts of communicative, juridical and financial instruments to regulate or influence the system. These instruments combined are the policy vision on the system and form the core of the intervention. As a result of these interventions the system changes. The new system can be evaluated on certain set criteria, to determine if the new system produces the desired outcome (the goals of the municipality) (Hoogerwerf, 1993).

**Figure 49: System diagram**
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**Figure 50: Example of influence tree for actor objectives on policy instruments**
APPENDIX 11: OVERVIEW OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE PROBLEM AND POLITICAL CONTEXT ON THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One owner</td>
<td>Mixed ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Nuisance</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Future perspective - Stated</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Future perspective - Perceived</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Attitude towards transformation</td>
<td>Policy instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation of park</td>
<td>Transformation to nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Attitude towards earnings model</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No financial benefits</td>
<td>Financial benefits irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Leading role in process</th>
<th>Policy instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park owner</td>
<td>Park residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No transformation   
No transformation   
Land-readjustment

**Table 30: Overview of the influence of the problem and political context on the policy instruments**
APPENDIX 12: DEMARCATION OF DEFINITIONS

This research is executed in the Netherlands. However, for academic purposes, this thesis is written in English. This is sometimes cause of a mismatch in definitions or phrasing. After all, Dutch spatial planning and governmental systems vary from other countries and is home to a certain jargon. As a result, some of the juridical terminology got lost in translation. This paragraph alphabetically lists these Dutch definitions and concepts and the corresponding attempts to translate them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch Definition</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambtelijk apparaat</td>
<td>Municipal officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beleidsinstrumenten</td>
<td>Policy instruments/policy tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestemming</td>
<td>Land destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestemmingsplan</td>
<td>Land-use plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezettingsgraad</td>
<td>Occupancy rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV</td>
<td>Private limited-liability construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravans</td>
<td>Mobile homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College van Burgemeester en Wethouders</td>
<td>(College of) Mayor and councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebiedsmakelaar</td>
<td>Area broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebiedsontwikkeling</td>
<td>Areal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedoogstatus</td>
<td>Permit for legal residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handhaving</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampeerplaatsen</td>
<td>Camp sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maatwerk</td>
<td>Customized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omgevingsvergunning</td>
<td>Areal permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programma van eisen</td>
<td>Program of requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuur visie</td>
<td>Areal vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturingvisie</td>
<td>Policy vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakantiewoningen</td>
<td>Recreational cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaststellingsovereenkomst</td>
<td>Declaration agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereniging van eigenaren</td>
<td>Association of home owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergunningsvrij (bouwen)</td>
<td>Permit-free (construction/renovation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volmacht</td>
<td>Power of attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woningbouwcooperaties</td>
<td>Housing cooperatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 13: RESEARCH MODEL

**Figure 20: Extended Conceptual Model of the Research**
APPENDIX 14: CRITICISM ON THE TALC-MODEL

There has been considerable discussion about the accuracy of the TALC-model in illustrating the mature stages of destination development and whether there needs to be additional stages added to the model. Agarwal (1994; 1997; 1999; 2002) in particular has argued about the insertion of additional stages which take in account the series on restructuring efforts which are inaugurated before the decline phase sets in. She labels this phase re-orientation and states that it should be added between the stagnation and post-stagnation stages of the TALC-model to represent continued efforts at restructuring (figure 10). This reorientation phase is a process in which the resorts will attempt to take steps to counter the future decline in image or appeal to visitors. In many cases this means that the resort will attempt to go “up-market” or become more sustainable (Butler, 2011). Priestley and Mundet (1998) also discussed the need for additional stages in the model, in particular post-stagnation and reconstruction stages, along very similar lines to Agarwal. Baum (1998) suggested that there might be a need for an additional stage to be added at the end of the cycle. He argues that if re-orientation had taken place, but was unsuccessful in terms of rejuvenating the tourist area or attracting a new market, a stage of re-invention might take place. During the re-invention stage a resort of tourist area might consider changing the nature of its offerings entirely. Baum also mentions an alternative final stage, namely the exit stage. This would occur if the tourist area acknowledged that it lacks a future perspective in tourism and therefore decides to completely cease its activities.

Little research has also been conducted yet on the possibility of multiple life cycles working in the same area. The overall tourist development can be deprived from the development of the various smaller market segments. These segments can be at different stages in an area at any point in time, as some markets will be growing while others decline (Butler, 2011). And this is the same for products or attractions in an area. The TALC curve mirrors the overall aggregated pattern of these separate tourist market segments development and combines them to one S-curve. Or any other sort of curve. This
was first illustrated by Zimmerman (1997) who suggested that there are different cycles for different forms of tourism or individual activities. He illustrated this with a figure (11) showing patterns of activity popularity or life cycles from 1860 to 2000.

**Figure 11: European Tourism Products – A Product Life Cycle Approach (Zimmermann, 1997)**
APPENDIX 15: TIMELINES TRANSFORMATION PROCESSES
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APPENDIX 16: RESEARCH MODEL