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Appendix II  Survey questionnaire

The last three workshops organised, i.e. the workshop about the development of Amsterdam neighbourhoods: past and future, the workshop on Rotterdam Oud-Zuid and the workshops on gentrification in Rotterdam, were followed by a survey into the participants’ experiences. Below, the survey, the accompanying email and a short explanation about the portfolio approach are given. The email and survey, both translated from Dutch, are the ones sent after the workshop for Oud-Zuid in Rotterdam. For the other two workshops followed by a survey, the same email and survey were sent, but with names and dates adapted to the specific workshops.

Email to the participants

Dear participant,

On July 9, the workshop ‘Portfolio Rotterdam – Opportunities in Oud-Zuid’ was held, organised by dS+V. The aim was to identify the market dynamics and opportunities in Oud Zuid, in order discuss possible investment strategies.

We kindly ask you to answer some questions about the way you experienced the meeting. Which particularly interesting things do you recall from the workshop? This information is very useful to us, as it allows us to improve the organisation and substance of workshops to come. In addition to this, this evaluation is part of a doctoral thesis about the portfolio approach and its application.

Hopefully you can find the time (approximately 10 minutes) to express your experience in the questions. The findings will of course be handled confidentially.

Please follow the link below to start the web survey. Here, to refresh your memory, you will also find a short explanation of the portfolio approach¹, as well as the sequence of maps which you have seen in the workshop: www.linktotheportfoliosurvey.html

Thank you very much,
Perry Hoetjes, Universiteit van Amsterdam

¹ This explanation is given at the end
Survey questionnaire

About you
It is interesting for us to know how experiences differ for participants representing different types of organisations.

Question 1
I work for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal agency</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Housing association</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Other, i.e.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A In general about the organisation of the workshop
These are questions about how you experienced the structure and organisation of the workshop

Question 2
How often and how structured do you discuss spatial strategies in the city and opportunities of areas? (More than one answer is possible here)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure →</th>
<th>Very structured and with the help of information and data</th>
<th>More or less structured</th>
<th>In an informal manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every now and then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly if ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:

Question 3
The starting point of the workshop was to identify opportunities based on the market dynamics in Rotterdam Oud Zuid and to translate these to possible strategies. Did you find this a relevant topic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Very relevant</th>
<th>Don’t know/no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional comments:
**Question 4**
The workshop was attended by participants representing various organisations. To what extent did the workshop have a proper balance of organisations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Too many</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Too few</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing organisations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:

---

**B About the portfolio approach**
Do you find the portfolio approach a logical and comprehensible concept? For a short explanation click [here](#).

**Question 5**
What do you think of the idea of the city as a portfolio of neighbourhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>Not very useful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Don’t know/ no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional comments:

---

**Question 6**
What do you think of the internal logic of the concept? (i.e. the 2x2 matrix, by which he current market value and potential are distinguished)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incomprehensible</th>
<th>Rather confusing</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Very logical</th>
<th>Don’t know/ no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional comments:
Question 7
What do you think of the data that were used? (i.e. average transaction values per m² and their increase over 4 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely unsuitable</th>
<th>Problematic</th>
<th>Partially suitable</th>
<th>Suitable</th>
<th>Very suitable</th>
<th>Don’t know/no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional comments:

Question 8
Do you think the approach triggers a relevant strategic discussion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, because…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. About (shared) knowledge that was generated and other results
The next questions are about the possible results of the portfolio approach

Question 9
Did the maps confirm your perceptions of the relative positions and developments of neighbourhoods in the city, or did they surprise you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very surprising</th>
<th>Mostly surprising</th>
<th>Sometime surprising, sometimes confirming</th>
<th>Mostly confirming</th>
<th>Merely confirming</th>
<th>Don’t know/no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 10
Can you mention one or some examples of patterns that confirmed or surprised you in particular?

Question 11
Have any new or remarkable things been said with respect to possible or feasible strategies on neighbourhood or city level? If so, can you give an example. If not: Why not?
Question 12
How did you experience the way other organisations looked at the patterns showed and strategies discussed? Did this correspond to, or differ from your perceptions and ideas? Can you give one or more examples of things you noticed?

Question 13
Did anything in particular about the possible role of the municipality, the private sector, housing associations or other actors strike you as remarkable in terms of the (re)development of urban areas? If so, what?

Question 14
What did you find the most positive about the workshop in terms of substance?

Question 15
What could be improved in terms of substance?

Question 16
Would you like to make any additional comments?

This was the last question. Thank you very much for answering these questions!

Explanation of the portfolio approach
The portfolio approach is based on the idea that the city can be seen as portfolio of neighbourhoods. Since private and semiprivate actors have an increasing influence on urban developments in the city. Local governments need to realise that neighbourhoods’ opportunities are largely dependent on their appeal for private investors. Local government will sometimes try to join these private interests, but also invest in those areas the market is not interested in. In any case, these type of considerations requires a strategic approach In business literature, a similar problem has to be addressed: in which products should one invest or not? Here, portfolio instruments can be used, demonstrating how products perform and what are opportunities for growth. In this case, a translation of the so-called Growth-share matrix has been made and applied to the city and its neighbourhoods, as depicted in the figure below.
In this urban portfolio approach, the city is made up of neighbourhoods which are mapped by their position in the property market relative to other neighbourhoods. Property values are used as indicators of how neighbourhoods are doing now, while the value increase gives an image of their opportunities for development. Every neighbourhood is positioned either above or below the city average in terms of current property values and value increase. This results in a matrix with four ideal typical neighbourhoods: stars, cash cows, dogs, question marks:

- Stars: above average property values, above average value increase;
- Cash cows: above average property values, below average value increase;
- Dogs: below average property values, below average value increase;
- Question marks: below average property values, above average value increase.

Click here to see these four ideal typical neighbourhoods in portfolio maps from 1991 to 2005.