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At the beginning and end of the focus groups and focused-group interviews questionnaires were handed out to the participants where they were asked to answer a few questions. This chapter presents the results from those questions. First the results of the ex ante survey are described. The survey involved two questions that the participants were required to answer without having any (new) knowledge about the way station area developments are planned in Tokyo. The first question asked participants about their image of Tokyo and station area developments. In the second question they were asked whether they believed the Randstad/Netherlands\(^{58}\) could learn from station area developments in Tokyo. At the end of the focus groups and focused group interviews, thus when the participants had learnt (more) about how station area developments in Tokyo are planned, they were asked again to answer the two questions. In the first question participants were asked to what extent their image of Tokyo had changed. In the second question participants were asked again whether they believed that the Randstad/Netherlands could learn from station area developments in Tokyo. This time, however, they were also required to state their reasons for why they believed the Randstad could or could not learn from station area developments in Tokyo.

In this chapter the results of the ex ante survey are presented first. The results from the surveys are presented in the same order as in the previous chapter, i.e. Stedenbaan, Rotterdam Blaak, Zaancorridor and Koog Zaandijk. Following this the results of the ex post survey are presented. In the third and final paragraph some conclusions are drawn.

---

\(^{58}\) Although the focus of this research is on what the Randstad can learn from station area developments in Tokyo, it was considered more appropriate for this survey to address this question to the whole of the Netherlands, as potential lessons need not only be confined to the Randstad.
10.1 Results ex ante survey

At the beginning of each focus group and focused group interview the participants were asked to answer the following questions:
1. What is your image of Tokyo and station area developments?
2. Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

The first question was asked in order to find out if and to what extent the participants had foreknowledge about Tokyo and station area developments as such knowledge could influence their answer to the next question. The second question was asked to find out prior to the focus groups and focused-group interviews whether people thought that the Tokyo approach to station area developments could be used in the Randstad/Netherlands. The results from question 1 are presented first, followed by the results from question 2.

10.1.1. Results question 1

As for the first question, participants often came up with more than one image and many of the images mentioned by the participants seemed to be similar. Therefore they were aggregated into certain categories.

A Stedenbaan

The images mentioned by the participants in this focus group varied considerably. However, a few images were clearly more dominant than others. They were: different control mechanisms, intensive land use, and a well-functioning public transport system (see table 10-1). The following aspects were mentioned by the participants and seem to be related to ‘different control mechanisms’: coordination of functional programmes/internal coordination, strong control by government, focused on service, strong control and role of railway companies, limited control on spatial developments, one government that is responsible for the development of station areas, authoritarian control and less participation, strict parking policies, and privately owned railways. Interestingly many of the participants seemed to believe that Tokyo is strictly regulated. Regarding the intensive land use, all participants pointed out the high densities in which they believed living and working took place. Finally many aspects were brought up by the participants that could be related to the last and most dominant image, i.e. well-functioning public transport such as high frequencies, well-organized railway system, crowded stations, high train occupancy, and a coherent public transport system. To sum up, most of the participants considered Tokyo as a strictly controlled dense city with an efficient public transport system.
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Table 10-1  Results ex ante survey question 1

What is your image of Tokyo and station area developments?

Transfers are problematic
Intensive cooperation public-private sector
Divers and contrastive
Focus on quality
Overcrowded
Multifunctional programmes
Strong link land use and transport
Well-organized
Big city
Different control mechanisms
Intensive land use
Well-functioning public transport

| Number of answers (N=22) |

B  Rotterdam Blaak

In this focused-group interview the images highlighted were less varied which could be explained by the fact that the number of participants in this interview was fairly limited. Consequently, less varied images were brought up. The images that seemed to prevail were: big city and overcrowded (see table 10-2). Vibrant city and highly urban were grouped under the category ‘big city’. Lack of space for intensive developments and development pressure were grouped under the category ‘overcrowded’. Thus, the prevailing image of Tokyo brought forward in this focused group interview was that of a large and overcrowded city.

Table 10-2  Results ex ante survey question 1

What is your image of Tokyo and station area developments?

Different control mechanisms
Well-functioning public transport
Intensive land use
Overcrowded
Big city

| Number of answers (N=4) |
Section C: Zaancorridor

In this focus group Tokyo and station area developments evoked several different images. The ones that tended to dominate were: big city, different control mechanisms, and well-organized (see Table 10-3).

The following images were brought up by the participants and relate to the category of ‘big city’: large and dynamic, very crowded, large nodes with lots of different transport modes, highly urban context, large and massive city in which anything goes. Regarding the different control mechanisms, items were mentioned such as clear control through laws/regulations, different attitudes of government and private sector, greater interest of private railway companies to generate passengers, responsibility for a development is borne by the beneficiary, and central control. Interestingly the participants in this focus group did not stress the degree of land use control, as was done in the Stedenbaan focus group, but rather the way in which this control was carried out. Lastly some of the participants believed that Tokyo and station area developments were well-organized by pointing out that everything runs on time and is arranged well, it has an excellent public transport system, it has many passengers, is efficient, and is a metropolis that in its development of public transport nodes is ahead of the Netherlands.

Thus the prevailing image evoked by the participants in this focus group was that of a large metropolis that is well-organized and efficiently controlled.

Table 10-3  Results ex ante survey question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Number of answers (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomparable to the Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divers and contrastive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifunctional land use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong link land use and transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive land use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different control mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Koog Zaandijk

In this focused-group interview the number of participants was fairly limited. However, in contrast to the focused-group interview around Rotterdam Blaak, this did not prevent the participants from listing a large variety of different images. This could be explained by the different types of actors that were involved in the Interviews.
In Rotterdam Blaak the type of actors that participated in the focused-group interview predominantly stemmed from one group (i.e. private sector developers, representing the place (i.e. land use) side). In the case of Koog Zaandijk the types of actors were more diverse (i.e. public and private actors representing the node (transport) and the place). These differences in background might also have contributed to the greater variety of images. Interestingly, there was one image that seemed to outrank all the others which is the different form of control (see table 10-4). The following aspects mentioned by the participants were grouped under this category: large public funds, strong control by the government of station area developments, control through rewarding floor area density bonuses to the private sector and by land ownership around stations, transport and land use is in one hand, station developments benefit from coordination, good transfer, and a balanced area development, corridor-wise approach, and station area developments are a part of the competition/growth strategy of private railway operators. Interestingly the participants seemed to elaborate further upon what was said in the Zaancorridor focus group (i.e. the way in which control is carried out). However, only one of them had participated in this previous focus group. Could this be seen as a mere coincidence or were they perhaps informed by their colleagues who attended the previous focus group? Consequently, here the prevailing image was also that of an efficiently-controlled city.

Table 10-4  Results ex ante survey question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image of Tokyo and station area developments</th>
<th>Number of answers (N=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional design of nodes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-functioning public transport</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divers and contrastive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive land use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different control mechanisms</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total results question 1
When the results of each focus group and focused-group interview are merged into one table the following images tend to dominate participants view on Tokyo and station area developments: well organized public transport, metropolitan, intensive land use and a different form of control (see table 10-5). Interestingly, without having
any (new) knowledge about the way station area developments are planned in Tokyo, the dominant image that participants had of this was of government control. Is this perhaps something that the Randstad/the Netherlands are looking for?

Table 10-5  Overview results (A to D)

What is your image of Tokyo and station area developments?

- Incomparable to the Netherlands
- Functional design nodes
- Disciplined citizens
- Modern
- Clean
- Transfers are problematic
- Overcrowded
- Focus on quality
- Intensive cooperation public-private sector
- Divers and contrastive
- Multifunctional land use
- Strong link land use and transport
- Well-organized
- Big city
- Well-functioning public transport
- Intensive land use
- Different control mechanisms

Number of answers (N=42)

10.1.2. Results question 2

Regarding the second question, participants were asked in advance whether they believed that the Randstad/Netherlands could learn from Tokyo regarding the development of station areas. First an overview is given of the results for each focus group and focused group interview (see tables 10-6a through 10-6d), followed by a total overview of the results (see table 10-7).
Table 10-6a  Stedenbaan

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

- Perhaps
- Yes

Number of answers (N=22)

Table 10-6b  Rotterdam Blaak

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

- Perhaps
- Yes

Number of answers (N=6)

Table 10-6c  Zaancorridor

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

- Perhaps
- Yes

Number of answers (N=11)
When comparing the individual results of the focus groups and focused-group interviews, the results from the Stedenbaan focus group stand out. There seems to be a strong conviction within this group that something can be learnt from station area developments in Tokyo. This can be explained by the fact that within the Stedenbaan focus group there were a number of participants that had foreknowledge regarding Tokyo and station area developments. These participants had either heard about station area developments in Tokyo before, and/or had already visited Tokyo and thus had experienced the situation first hand. Also, albeit to a lesser extent, there were participants in the Zaancorridor focus group that had some foreknowledge of Tokyo and station area developments. This might have considerably 'colored' their opinion in assessing the potential of Tokyo for developing station areas in the Randstad. In the focused-group interview concerning Koog Zaandijk, most participants had no pre-existing knowledge about Tokyo, and seemed therefore more hesitant towards the applicability of the Tokyo approach in the Randstad/Netherlands. Rotterdam Blaak was the only focused-group interview where none of the participants had any previous knowledge about Tokyo.

**Total results question 2**
Most of the participants from the focus groups and focused-group interviews seemed to believe that something could be learnt, while only a few actors expressed their doubts (see table 10-7). None of the participants seemed to reject the idea that something could be learnt from the Tokyo approach prior to the focus groups and focused-group interviews. Although it is interesting to see that most people believed something could be learnt, and thus seemed to be fairly positive about Tokyo, this does not mean that in fact something can be learnt from Tokyo. Most of the participants were either pre-selected by others, as was the case for Stedenbaan, or were selected on the basis of their (expected) interest and as such could be considered 'believers'. Consequently, the selection of the participants was not random and therefore one should be careful in generalizing the results.
10.2 Results ex post survey

At the end of each focus group and focused group interview the participants were asked to answer the following questions:

1. Has your image of Tokyo and station area developments changed? Yes/no, and in what way?

2. Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands? What can we learn, or why can’t we learn?

The aim of the first question was to find out what the participants had learnt from Tokyo. In other words, what aspects did they seem to find relevant? The second question was asked to find out whether the participants opinion about the potential of the Tokyo approach had changed. Furthermore, they were asked to clarify this in order to find out what elements the participants perceived as interesting from the Tokyo approach to explore further in the development of station areas in the Randstad. The latter question is considered the first step in assessing the potential of the Tokyo approach for the Randstad/Netherlands.

Below the results from question 1 are presented first, followed by the results from question 2.
10.2.1 Results question 1

The first question basically consists of two parts: 1a) whether the participant’s image has changed or not, and 1b) in what way? Therefore first an overview is given of the participant's responses to the first part. Then a more detailed description is given of the way in which their opinion changed.

Results question 1a

Table 10-8a Stedenbaan

Table 10-8b Rotterdam Blaak
When the individual focus group and focused-group interview results are compared with each other the results from the Stedenbaan focus group show the most diverse results. This could be, at least to some extent, related to the fact that there were a considerable number of participants in this group that had foreknowledge about Tokyo. This explains why some participants answered with ‘no’ or with ‘broadening/deepening’ when asked whether their image of Tokyo and station area developments had changed. The Zaancorridor focus group showed a somewhat similar pattern, as here there were also a number of participants that had some foreknowledge about Tokyo. Regarding the focused-group interviews, Rotterdam Blaak clearly stands out, as among most of the participants their image about Tokyo and station area developments had changed after being informed about the way station areas were developed in Tokyo. This is not surprising since this was the only group where none of the participants had any foreknowledge about Tokyo.
Most of the participants indicated at the end of the focus group and focused-group interview that their image regarding Tokyo and station area developments had changed (see table 10-9). There were, however, also a considerable number of participants who stated that their image had not changed. This was either because of pre-existing foreknowledge, or because their previously perceived image of Tokyo was confirmed afterwards. In addition, some participants indicated they had learnt more precise details about Tokyo and station area developments after they were informed about this in the focus group or focused-group interview. These were mainly the participants who had some foreknowledge about Tokyo.

**Results question 1b**

A **Stedenbaan**

In the Stedenbaan focus group the participants indicated various ways in which their image about Tokyo and station area developments had changed. The most prevalent images were the following: the role of the government, coordination between transport and land use, and the control mechanisms used (see table 10-10). Regarding the role of the government the participants learnt that scarcity is created by the government, the development of Tokyo is led by growth and scarcity, how the market is regulated, that mixed usage is regulated, and that scarcity is created around stations. Concerning the coordination between transport and land use participants mentioned things such as land use developments are more related to the development of the railway system than initially thought, the public and private sector have more understanding of how a balance between transport and land use is created. Regarding the planning instruments participants mentioned things such as prioritizing station areas, stimulating public
transport by fiscal and financial incentives, how planning instruments can be applied in the Netherlands, and regulating densities through zoning.

Table 10-10  Results ex post survey question 1b

What is your image of Tokyo and station area developments?

B Rotterdam Blaak

The participants seemed to have mainly gained knowledge about the role that the government plays in Tokyo (see table 10-11). They learnt things such as how privatization can be successful, the governmental organization of Tokyo, and how developments are being created in Tokyo.

Table 10-11  Results ex post survey question 1b

In what way has your image of Tokyo and station area developments changed?
C Zaancorridor

The participants in this focus group seemed to have mainly gained knowledge about the role the private sector in Tokyo (see table 10-12). The following aspects were mentioned: high influence of private sector, did not know it was this extreme, and the central focus of private railway companies on generating synergies between their transport, real estate and retail activities.

Table 10-12 Results ex post survey question 1b

**In what way has your image of Tokyo and station area developments changed?**

- Planning instruments
- Coordination of transport and land use
- Role government
- Organisation of the railway sector
- Role private sector

![Number of answers (N=11)]
The participants seemed to have learnt several things from Tokyo. They were: the planning instruments used, and the way the government and the private sector were involved in developing station areas. However, none of these things seemed to prevail over the other (see table 10-13).

Table 10-13  Results ex post survey question 1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning instruments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total results question 1b**

When the results of each focus group and focused-group interview are merged, it becomes clear that the participants mainly gained insight into the way the government and private sector are involved in station area developments in Tokyo (see table 10-14). In addition, participants also seemed to have a better image of the planning instruments used and the way transport and land use developments are coordinated in Tokyo. Consequently, it will be interesting to see whether the participants also think that something can be learnt from these aspects in Tokyo. The results of the next question should make this clear.
10.2.2 Results question 2

The second question basically consists of three parts: 2a) whether the participants believed they could learn from Tokyo and 2b) what they thought could be learnt, or 2c) why they thought nothing could be learnt. First an overview is given of the participants’ responses to question 2a. Then their explanations are described in more detail. The latter, in particular is important in finding out what can be learnt from Tokyo.

Results question 2a
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Table 10-15b  Rotterdam Blaak

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

Yes

Number of answers (N=4)

Table 10-15c  Zaancorridor

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

Yes

Number of answers (N=11)

Table 10-15d  Koog Zaandijk

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

Yes

Number of answers (N=5)
Koog Zaandijk
In comparing the focus groups and focused-group interviews with each other, the focused-group interviews clearly stand out regarding their answer to question 2a. All the participants seemed to believe that, after the approach followed in Tokyo was explained to them, something could be learnt from Tokyo in the Randstad/Netherlands (see table 10-15a-d). However, at the end of both focus groups there were still some participants that expressed doubts about the applicability of the Tokyo approach to the Netherlands.

Total overview question 2a
Based on the results from all of the focus groups and focused group interviews, it could be concluded that most participants seemed to think that something could be learnt from Tokyo (see table 10-16). However, as was mentioned in the previous chapter and is stressed again here, the participants were not randomly selected. Instead they were selected by the co-organizer or by the researcher concerned with their supposed interest in the approach followed in Tokyo for developing station areas. Therefore, one should be cautious in drawing general conclusions from these results as the participants attending the focus groups and focused-group interviews seemed to be ‘believers’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of answers (N=42) |

table 10-16

Results question 2b
A Stedenbaan
When the participants were asked about what the Randstad could learn from Tokyo most of them seemed to indicate aspects that could be either related to the control mechanisms used or to the development of station areas (see table 10-17). Regarding the control mechanisms used, aspects such as control by FAR-regulations,
prioritizing station areas, flexibility in planning, stimulating public transport by fiscal and financial incentives, approach for redeveloping station areas, planning processes provide the conditions, centralizing demand, and more insight into control options were mentioned. As for the development of station areas the following points of interest were indicated: selecting functional profiles, mixed use of space in station areas, profiling stations is useful, quality and identity of public space, thinking about functional programmes, scarcity and diversity, amenities available around nodes, content of station area development processes.

Table 10-17  Results ex post survey question 2b

What can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

- Coordination of transport and land use
- Thinking in target groups
- Cooperation of the public and private sector
- Artificial creation of scarcity
- Organization of the public transport system/product
- Design of station areas
- Control mechanisms used

![Bar chart showing results](chart.png)

Number of answers (N=22)

B Rotterdam Blaak

The participants in the Rotterdam Blaak focused-group interview seemed to be mainly concerned with issues such as the coordination of transport and land use, and the control mechanisms used (see table 10-18). As for the coordination of transport and land use, it was mentioned that in Tokyo an integral area strategy focusing on railway corridors results in higher quality station areas. Regarding the control mechanisms used aspects were mentioned such as different way of directing developments by the government, triggering the private sector by a bonus system to increase the spatial quality.
The participants in this focus group mentioned the same aspects as in the previous focus group. They seemed to be convinced that most could be learnt from the control mechanisms used in Tokyo and the way in which they develop station areas (see table 10-19). As for the control mechanisms the following items were mentioned: way of control, applicability instruments, instruments are used for realizing integral incentives/developments, flexible regulations, and the flexible attitude of the government. Regarding the development of station areas the following aspects were mentioned: intensification, integrated approach of surroundings (station versus station area), establishing functions around stations to promote counter-peak traffic flows.

**Table 10-19 Results ex post survey question 2b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the public transport system/product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking in target groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of transport and land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of the public and private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of station areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control mechanisms used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Number of answers (N=11)
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D Koog Zaandijk

The participants attending this focused-group interview listed, in comparison to the other groups, a much larger variety of aspects that they believed the Randstad/Netherlands could learn from. The most popular aspects were issues related to public-private sector cooperation, followed by the control mechanisms used, and the coordination between transport and land use (see table 10-20). Regarding the public-private sector cooperation the following aspects were mentioned: shared urgency, government closely cooperating with the private sector, cooperation with respect to public facilities, and an awareness of when to invest in what. As for the control mechanism used the following aspects were mentioned as possible points of interest for the Randstad/Netherlands: clear division of responsibilities and knowing which incentives to use for activating a particular actor. In regards to the way in which transport and land use is coordinated in Tokyo, the participants believed that drafting an area corridor and making better use of development opportunities was something that could be learnt from.

Table 10-20  Results ex post survey question 2b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the public transport system/product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of station areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of transport and land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control mechanisms used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of the public and private sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total overview question 2b

When the results from the focus groups and focused group interviews are integrated into one table it becomes clear that the participants attached most potential to the control mechanisms used in Tokyo for use in the Dutch context (see table 10-21). This is a rather interesting finding as it suggests that there is something wrong with the current state of the Dutch control mechanisms. Apparently, the participants seemed to feel that the current control mechanisms used in the Randstad/Netherlands are either inefficient or not sufficiently equipped for directing station area developments.
Results question 2c
Last but not least, there were also some participants that believed that nothing could be learnt from Tokyo. They stated that the main reasons for this were different spatial context, incomparability of Tokyo with the Netherlands regarding its size and population densities, and different culture (see table 10-22). Regarding the spatial context, participants argued that in their view the differences in densities and population made Tokyo incomparable with the Randstad. Regarding the difference in culture, participants stated that the culture of Tokyo/Japan was too dissimilar to that of the Randstad/Netherlands, and the approach used in Tokyo was considered a personalization of its culture and therefore not applicable in the Dutch context. The participant who believed that Tokyo and the Randstad were incomparable did not add any further comment to this.

Table 10-22 Results ex post survey question 2c
10.3 Conclusion

In this chapter the results of the ex ante and ex post surveys have been discussed. The participants were required to answer four questions, two at the beginning and two at the end of each focus group and focused-group interview. At the start, thus without having any (new) knowledge about the way station areas are planned in Tokyo, the participants were asked two questions. The first question asked participants about their image of Tokyo and station area developments.

Most participants seemed to have a pre-established image of Tokyo as a rather large city characterized by intensive land use and a well-functioning public transport system. In addition, many participants regarded Tokyo as an efficiently and strictly controlled city.

The second questions asked participants if they believed the Randstad/Netherlands could learn from Tokyo. Most of the participants seemed to be convinced that something could be learnt from Tokyo. Moreover, at the start of the focus groups and focused-group interviews there was not a single participant who rejected the idea of learning something from Tokyo. This can be explained by the fact that the selection of the participants was not random as people were selected on their (expected) interest and as such could be considered ‘believers’. However, there were some differences that could be distinguished among the focus groups and focused-group interviews. In particular, the Stedenbaan focus group stood out, as the participants seemed to be really convinced about the potential of the Tokyo approach for developing station areas in the Randstad/Netherlands. At the same time, however, it was acknowledged that many of the participants attending this focus group had some prior knowledge about Tokyo which might have ‘coloured’ their opinion. In the Zaancorridor focus group the participants also seemed, for similar reasons, quite sure about the potential of Tokyo for developing station areas in the Randstad/Netherlands. Basically, the participants that attended the focused-group interviews seemed to have most doubts about the applicability of the Tokyo approach for the Randstad/Netherlands. This could be explained by the fact that the participants in these interviews had no or little foreknowledge about Tokyo.

At the end of the focus groups and focused-group interviews the participants were asked the same questions again with the purpose of finding out to what extent the participants’ opinions had changed. Regarding the question about whether their image of Tokyo and station area developments had changed, most participants seemed to confirm that they had learnt something new. This seemed to be most clear in the case of Rotterdam Blaak, which was not surprising as this was the only group where none of the participants had any pre-existing knowledge about Tokyo. The participants mainly learnt new things about the way the Japanese government and the private sector are involved in the development of station areas. In addition, the participants seemed to have gained new knowledge about the planning instruments used and about the way transport and land use is coordinated in Tokyo.
Regarding the second question, i.e. whether they believed something could be learnt from Tokyo, some changes can be observed between the answers given at the beginning and at the end of the focus groups and focused group interviews (see table 10-23). There seemed to be a stronger conviction among the participants at the end of the focus groups and focused-group interviews that something could be learnt from Tokyo. Some of the participants who had initially expressed doubts about the applicability of the Tokyo approach in the Randstad/Netherlands were more convinced of this by the end of the focus groups and focused-group interviews. However, there were also some participants who had initially expressed doubts about whether something could be learnt from Tokyo in the Randstad/Netherlands, but in the end no longer seemed to believe in this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10-23</th>
<th>Overview results at the beginning and end of the focus groups and focused-group interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can we learn from Tokyo in the Netherlands?

When the participants were asked about what they believed could learnt from Tokyo, it was rather surprising to see that in all but one of the focused-group interviews the control mechanisms used in Tokyo were most often mentioned as something that could be of particular interest for the Randstad/Netherlands. The results suggest that the participants believed that either control mechanisms are lacking in the Randstad/Netherlands or that the present ones do not work efficiently enough. As such, Tokyo could be considered as a source of inspiration in the search for new or improved instruments that could help to launch developments around stations in the Randstad/Netherlands. In the focused-group interview organized around the station area of Koog Zaandijk, the close cooperation between the public and private sector in Tokyo was considered most important to further explore in the Randstad/Netherlands.
Now that the Tokyo approach has been tested in a number of Dutch case studies, the first step in assessing the potential of the Tokyo approach has come to an end. The findings from the focus groups, focused-group interviews and surveys will be further explored in the next chapter.