
THE CONSERVATION OF MODERNIST URBAN ENSEMBLES: CASE STUDIES FROM AMSTERDAM

Nicholas J. Clarke

TU Delft, University of Pretoria

Urban conservation, notably in Western Europe, grew from a reaction to the large Modernist monofunctional sub-urban expansion projects and programmes aimed at rationalising messy multifunctional historic cities. Conservationists responded reactively by celebrating the diversity and multi-layered character of the historic city. In the Netherlands a pragmatic urban conservation approach was developed which found its most clear expression in the Town- and City renewal programmes of the last quarter of the Twentieth Century. Concurrent to this a new dynamic was emerging: an awakening appreciation of Modernist ensembles, built according to the principles of the Modern Movement and the CIAM. The same pragmatic approach has helped to ensure the conservation of these expansive areas, albeit through somewhat radical means. This paper explores in brief the history of the urban conservation movement in the Netherlands, following which novel approaches to the conservation of Modernist utopian townscapes will be presented through recent and current projects from Amsterdam.

Keywords

urban conservation, the Netherlands, modernist social housing ensembles, energy sustainability, Amsterdam, Landlust, Bosleeuw, Jeruzalem-Frankendaal, Slotermeer

How to Cite

Clarke, Nicholas J. "The conservation of Modernist urban ensembles: case studies from Amsterdam". In Carola Hein (ed.) *International Planning History Society Proceedings, 17th IPHS Conference, History-Urbanism-Resilience, TU Delft 17-21 July 2016, V.05 p.053, TU Delft Open, 2016.*

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7480/iphs.2016.5.1310>

INTRODUCTION

The physical extent of what is labelled as the historic urban environment is growing fast in the Netherlands where the appreciation of built environment heritage is expanding ever outward from the oldest parts of the inner cities to now include post-War¹ housing developments, constructed as part of the post-War Reconstruction programme. This provides new dilemmas for conservation and demands the development of new strategies to deal with this non-traditional heritage, a built heritage born from a period of intense housing shortage, which in turn inspired the achievement of a spatial efficiency embodied by the Modernist concept of the 'Existenzminimum'.

In practice, cultural value in itself has never sufficed as sole argument for urban-scaled conservation interventions. This pragmatism has formed the basis for the Dutch urban conservation tradition for more than 50 years. The Netherlands is in essence a middle-class society demanding that urban conservationists continually need to re-align and re-align their cause with social interests. Peter van Dun, a lifelong urban renewal conservationist, wrote in 1997 that: '[t]he history of the protection of city- and townscapes [in the Netherlands] shows that this was not so much concerned with built heritage, but rather with the recognisable living environment and a qualitatively high-end urban renewal strategy directed conservation policy.'²

To understand this paradigm it is useful present the evolution of this tradition in the Netherlands to explore its chief characteristics. Following this, case studies will highlight those factors that have recently emerged in the city of Amsterdam.

POST-WAR URBAN EXPANSION

The Netherlands underwent a massive reconstruction programme after the Second World War known as the post-War Reconstruction period, 'Wederopbouw', which lasted until the early 1970s. Post-War conservation efforts of historic urban centra in the Netherlands focussed on repair of individual monuments and recreation of destroyed urban character based on an aesthetic appreciation of traditional street profiles and characteristic 'faces'.³ Such examples can be seen in the provincial cities Rhenen and at Wageningen, where reconstruction was already initiated during the war. Reconstruction offered opportunities for sweeping modernisation, as was undertaken in Rotterdam.

Starting from the late 1940s, the Reconstruction focus shifted to new-build city expansion. The focus on new suburban townships, jeopardised the historic inner-city, already in a poor state due to the financial crisis of the 1930s and the ravages of war. This brought rapid urban expansion through the construction of new suburban townships. This period brought about a large-scale application of the urban design principles advocated by the CIAM, especially those advocated at its 1933 conference titled 'The Functional City' under the lead of Dutch architect and urban planner Cornelis van Eesteren and the subsequently composed 'La Charte d'Athenes'. Van Eesteren was to become principal planner for the City of Amsterdam, designing the 'Algemene Uitbreidingsplan, AUP' or general expansion plan. Starting from 1947, the national housing production programme became the focus of the Reconstruction, which at its peak in 1972 and 1973, produced 150 000 dwellings per annum.⁴

The first real Dutch urban conservation—and not reconstruction—driven project occurred in the late 1950s. The centuries-old fishing town Veere, a century old fishing port serves as example. This town was to lose its access to the open seawaters due to a large-scale waterworks programme. Conservation and restoration of both individual buildings and the urban fabric could be justified reprogramming Veere for tourism. Out-of-season Veere became a ghost town. The Veere experience was to become greatly influential in the urban conservation tradition of the Netherlands,⁵ becoming a hard-earned lesson of the urgency to ensure a functional and sustainable urban vitality over art-historical considerations.

As historic Dutch cities decayed the drive for greenfield housing production started to take the back seat in favour of urban renewal processes. Starting in 1963, the first inner-city slum clearance demolition and rebuild schemes were undertaken. Following international example, these programmes aimed at recreating inner cities as Modern CBD's, completing the total Modernist reconstruction of the Dutch city. This urban renewal strategy was continued through the later 1969 Subsidy Scheme for Redevelopment and Reconstruction Plans and the subsidy scheme of the Ministry of Transport to encourage upgrade of urban traffic and transport facilities.⁶ The early 1970s saw the introduction of the term 'city renewal' into Dutch policy, and by 1973 subsidies were being made available to renovate listed urban monuments and ensembles,⁷ but this did not turn the general modernising tide.

Dutch political society was however coming of age and the imposed modernisations led to civic protest. In Amsterdam civic opposition to slum clearance climaxed on 24 March 1975 when then mayor deployed a force of 800 police officers to clear squatters ('krakers') from the Nieuwmarkt area in the heart of the inner city. The running battle that ensued marked the end of the city renewal program. From here onward the shift would be towards a mitigated approach in which residents would have more say in redevelopment plans. Concurrently the loss of urban identity brought by modernisation led to opposition from conservationists who had been in support of civic opposition movements. Urban conservationists, echoing general consensus, maintained the position that that '[i]ncreasing condensation and mono-functionality, buildings in the businesscentre [sic] rising out of scale, traffic-congestion, they all lead to an increasing erosion of the historic urban fabric.'⁸

That year, through the intervention of civic conservation societies, the Netherlands played host to the European Architectural Heritage Year, with as theme 'A Future for our past'. This led to the formulation of the Declaration of Amsterdam. This codified the principles of integrated conservation indicating that a broad consensus on the importance of urban conservation had been achieved. Conservation now focussed on the larger scale urban form, in a process of 'dynamic conservation,'⁹ in service of development. At the core of the Dutch urban conservation movement lies the idea of visual and functional diversity; that '...the historic urban environment provides an identifiable and livable [sic] environment...' and the belief that '...This identifiability, being an essential condition for a well-tempered environment, is eroding rapidly...'¹⁰

This shift was influential in the first formalisation of the Policy on Urban Renewal of 1977, which budgeted for urban renewal subsidies and instituted planning and programming cycles for housing maintenance and upgrades.¹¹ The Ministry of Housing and Spatial planning now focussed its attention on larger urban ensembles, morphology, urban identity and the preservation of functional use, utilising the protection of town and cityscapes, a pre-existent protection tool available through conservation legislation since 1961. Urban vitality through improvement of living conditions became the holy grail and Housing subsidies streams were redirected towards inner cities. Conservationists capitalised on this newfound source of funding and actively sought to partner with housing and urban programmes.¹² The concept of historic areas however remained defined in relation to the 'historic' inner city where the need for regeneration was concentrated. The 1981 version of the Policy on Urban Renewal explicitly stated that: 'Houses, buildings, streets, canals and squares of cultural-historical value are continually found in the oldest parts of the city.'¹³ [author's emphasis].

The subsequent 1985 law 'Wet op Stads- en Dorpsvernieuwing' (City and Town Renewal Act) provided for public investment in urban regeneration underpinned by a strong social agenda.¹⁴ An important aspect from the perspective of urban conservation was that this subsidy was distributed according to a formula which included the so-called 'historical factor'; meaning that areas with historical value received more urban renewal monies than neighbourhoods lacking an overt historical character. This formula was further weighted by including the number of valorised monuments within a local authority, as well as the number of pre-War dwellings and rental houses predating 1931 located in an urban renewal plan area, in the equation.¹⁵ Urban conservation had become an inseparable aspect of urban renewal.

The 'Beleid van Stadsvernieuwing in de Toekomst' (Policy of Urban Renewal in the Future, BELSATO) of 1991 grew from its predecessors but shifted its focus to the larger metropolitan regions, and importantly aimed at more than physical intervention in the built environment. This programme was initially thought of as a process with a finite end in 2005. However BELSATO was revised in 1995 to become a never-ending contiguous process, and was further codified in the 'Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing' (Policy on City Renewal) of 1997, which further institutionalised urban renewal processes, now focussing on larger metropolitan areas, in response to a weakening of social fabric in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century neighbourhoods. Through building renovation and demolition and new-build, this policy importantly sought to remodel the social composition of the extant urban areas by, amongst others, a differentiation of the housing stock.¹⁶ This was also the break-through moment for urban conservationists: town- and cityscapes were now no longer relegated to being merely culturally interesting parts of larger cities. They would now be utilized as basis for planning practice.¹⁷ In 2000 the 'Wet ter Stimulering van Integrale Stedelijke Vernieuwing' (Law for Stimulating Integral Urban Renewal) was passed which provided funding for investment in large Dutch cities to counter unemployment, poor housing quality and divestment through urban renewal.¹⁸ These strategies aimed mostly at improvement of neglected areas, inhabited by single-person households, with high unemployment and low rentals.¹⁹ At the core of the strategy was the ambition of *dwelling differentiation*, to attain the holy grail of sustained urban vitality.²⁰

Throughout the period discussed, urban conservationists had to continuously rely on aligned agenda's, such as social opposition to demolition of squatted buildings, fear of rental increases and gentrification²¹ as well and governmental ambitions of quality improvement and social engineering,²² to support their activities. Alliances had to be formed because, with the exception of outstanding architectural monuments, conservation is difficult to justify as an end in itself, making it difficult to validate spending public money. The conservation movement therefore focussed on the vitality of historic urban centres, promoting an integrated approach to urban development, in which conservation could piggyback on other drivers for investment and slipstreaming along in subsidy streams.

ENTER THE 'YOUNGER' MONUMENT

Despite the fact that younger areas from the period 1850-1940 were receiving some attention from the 1970s onwards,²³ urban renewal processes were mainly aimed at pre-War housing areas. This changed with 1997 Policy on City Renewal and the shift of the focus of urban renewal to larger metropolitan areas.

Urban renewal, with its associated demolition and new-build, reached its peak during the 1980s. At the same time a new dynamic was emerging and a new national programme, the 'Monumenten Inventarisatie Project' (Monuments Inventorying Project, MIP) was initiated in 1987. This aimed to identify culturally significant monuments constructed during 1850–1940. This 8-year programme essentially brought attention to the value and plight of those buildings, ensembles and neighbourhoods most affected by urban renewal processes: those dating to the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century. In Amsterdam this included the Gordel '20–'40 with its Amsterdam School architecture as well as including early Modern Movement housing complexes. These could be legally protected through a 1988 change in conservation legislation.²⁴ Both the civic movement and the national MIP took cognisance of the urban scale; in fact the identification methodology of the MIP started at the urban scale.²⁵ A selection process (the 'Monumenten Selectie Project', MSP) followed in 1991,²⁶ leading to the listing of numerous so-called 'younger' buildings as national monuments.

As a continuation of the MIP and MSP The City of Amsterdam's monuments care department compiled valuation maps for the Gordel '20–'40, published in 2000. These valuation maps indicate a grading per structure, supporting the City's 'Welstandsnota' (aesthetics policy), guiding the City's aesthetics committee. These include formally protected national monuments as Category I, and protected municipal monuments as Category II, but at

Category III level and lower these maps remain a planning tool, aimed at urban morphological control, retention of form, proportions, material, size, detailing and colouring.²⁷ Listing as on a valuation map does not imply legal conservation protection for larger areas, but allows for demolition and redevelopment of neighbourhoods motivated if of morphology and character are maintained.

SUSTAINABLE SIBLINGS: LANDLUST AND BOSLEEW. TWO CONTEMPORARY URBAN CINDERELLA'S

It so happened that when the European Foundation for Living (EFL) and housing corporation Eigen Haard launched a pilot project to investigate ambitious energy-upgrades in walk-up housing in Amsterdam, the inhabited municipal monument housing block at Landlust was at the top of the list of properties in need of renovation.²⁸ These blocks, designed by architects Gerrit Versteeg (sr. and jr.), had been listed as municipal monument. It was here that Landlust the urban principles of the CIAM and the Modern Movement were first applied in Amsterdam to the urban design of Merkelbach and Karsten. The Versteeg prototype developed for a part of Landlust was soon replicated, in slightly altered urban format, between 1938 and 1940 in another section of Bos en Lommer, an area now known as Bosleeuw Midden.

The EFL's ambition of the project was to achieve to passive house standards. Eigen Haard wished to differentiate her housing stock by increasing the size of the individual dwellings. Of principal concern was attaining the buy-in of the residents, not an easy task as Eigen Haard had then been awarded the National Tenants' Association's Black Goblet due to a perceived poor communication with inhabitants.²⁹

To change public and resident perception of the block a new narrative was required. Included in this was the project's envisaged energy sustainability investment, which would be offset against the already high energy costs. The block, which had remained nameless for most of its existence, was dubbed 'The Kings' Wives of Landlust'.³⁰ The original utopian vision of the block was resurrected as romantic ideal and an extensive consultation process was initiated, which included a newsletter. Each edition contained a section on the history and original utopian principles of the project. In the second newsletter heritage and energy featured side-by-side. Under the title 'Comfortable living and a low energy bill' the text presents the assumption that 'energy costs are rising exponentially and form an ever-growing part of living costs'.³¹ The energy argument, substantiated by calculation, could convince inhabitants that the increases in rental due to the renovation could be offset against the reductions in energy costs, while inhabitants who wished to remain would almost all be awarded with larger dwellings. This substantiated the total internal demolition of the block, and substantial insulation investment.³²

The adjacent text block entitled: 'An organic neighbourhood for social inhabitants' praised the original intention of the architects and the urban plan, as well as the aesthetic expression of the building. The newsletter also used the return of the first inhabitants to the block to stress that 'house rules are of all ages' and part of the heritage of this exceptional block.³³

Energy sustainability had become the driver onto which to hoist the extensive architectural restoration project. This was coupled with a strategic re-branding process in Category to create the required support for the project and a continuous education programme to instil a sense of the uniqueness of the building among its inhabitants.

While the renovation of Landlust was in full swing, the financial crisis of 2009 struck and the subsequent housing market crisis led to Amsterdam enforcing a full construction stop in 2010.³⁴



FIGURE 1 Koningvrouwen van Landlust, street façade shortly after completion in 2011



FIGURE 2 Koningvrouwen van Landlust, interior of a dwelling during renovation.



FIGURE 3 The Bosleeuw-Midden building, sibling of the Landlust block, shortly after the 2016 façade renovation.



FIGURE 4 Jeruzalem. The pilot renovation project



FIGURE 5 Jeruzalem. A 2016 photograph of a glazed front door with a poster, reading 'We live beautifully, Jeruzalem stays!'



FIGURE 6 The Sloterveer Airey buildings shortly after construction, once slated for demolition are now being renovated.

The Bosleeuw-Midden Block, having been slated for demolition, had for a number of years not received much maintenance. The 2010 demolition stop left the owner with an urgent problem: the physical intervention had become urgent and the inhabitants were not inclined to be particularly cooperative. The Aesthetics Commission of Amsterdam had identified the building as an integrated architectural ensemble and aesthetically important to the neighbourhood ('Category II'). The main complaints from inhabitants had been regarding the thermal comfort, state of maintenance, and general comfort of their dwellings. The problem now was to install insulation without the associated discomfort of relocating inhabitants. Additionally, an internal insulation installation would reduce the floor area of the dwellings, necessitating reconfiguration of the floor plans.

An innovative solution was developed: external façade insulation, disguised behind a veneer of brick tiles manufactured to resemble the original tiles. New windows and doors were installed forward to mimic the original relationship in the façade. Each dwelling was provided with its own gas-fired heating system, replacing gas furnaces in the main rooms, and solar panels installed out of sight on the roofs. New kitchens and bathrooms brought additional living comfort. This approach negated the need for long negotiations over relocation with inhabitants and retained the original image of the building, thereby conforming to the requirements of the protection the building enjoyed. The ideals of dwelling differentiation and material authenticity were abandoned in the face of more pragmatic considerations.

CONSERVING POST-WAR ENSEMBLES

Post-War housing areas were at most risk of sweeping urban reconstruction plans. In 1999 it was estimated that the rate of demolition of dwellings dating to 1940–1970 would average 25 000 per year,³⁵ was clear where the next conservation challenge lay.³⁶ The construction stop of 2010 slowed the demolition and new-build process, but it was only in 2010 that the City published the valuation maps for the extensions to the city relating to the Van Eesteren designed AUP in 2010, and allowing for the protection urban morphology.

For conservationists the year 2010 became significant. The pioneering Frankendal 'Siedlung'—nicknamed 'Jeruzalem' because of the flat roofs and white façades—was the first post-War ensemble listed as a national monument. The collaborative design had been designed by: Cornelis van Eesteren and Jacoba Mulder (urban design); Ben Merkelbach and Charles Karsten (later replaced by Piet Eling) advised by Mart Stam (architecture); and Mien Ruys and Aldo van Eyck (landscape). Frankendal had been internationally influential due to its demonstration of CIAM principles combined with new technology and typology and was now identified as a prime example of 'Existenzminimum' and Post-War industrialized construction. But the original project had implemented the Dotremont-Ten Bosch system, consisting of vertical concrete posts over which pre-fabricated concrete panels hang, covered by a lightweight concrete-channel flat roof. Now that Jeruzalem was a monument, conservation efforts had to focus on aligning the buildings with contemporary living standards and energy saving requirements.

Jeruzalem-Frankendal—owned by different housing corporations—had only narrowly escaped demolition to make way for a new energy-neutral housing scheme through the activism of its own inhabitants. But the directive to create an energy-neutral neighbourhood remained. This catalysed a radical pilot project to test future scenarios for the ensemble as an integral part of a larger energy-neutral neighbourhood. The uninsulated dwellings, aesthetically jeopardised by unsympathetic renovations carried out in the 1990s, were severely lacking with regards current standards of energy and climate management and occupant comfort. The first and largest challenge to be overcome was presented by the thermal weakness of the facades, consisting of prefabricated concrete panels on the exterior and a thin masonry diaphragm on the inside. Altogether, these challenges led to dilemmas where and how to apply new layers of insulation while keeping the same facade appearance without reducing the sizes of the tiny interiors. The controversial decision was made to replace the original pre-cast façade panels with new, thinner, purpose-made panels of a similar appearance to providing the required space for cavity insulation.

Despite the architectural success of the project, its cost proved to be prohibitive and no follow-up was undertaken.

To conservationists it became evident that a social consensus for the preservation of post-War neighbourhoods and the resultant financial investment needed to be generally engendered. Conservationists in Amsterdam set out to educate the public in general.³⁷ The Van Eesteren Museum, founded in 2010, which was established as an indoor museum, an open-air urban collection of buildings in their urban context and a museum dwelling dating from the 1950s. Only its physical morphology of this 'museum' has been identified as valuable in municipal policy documents, the so-called valuation maps. These does not protect the physical buildings themselves and until recently, large parts of the museum, such as the Airey-Nevamo prefab system housing blocks located there, were to be demolished and replaced with new housing of a morphologically similar nature. The effect of the museum on the man on the street in the neighbourhood seems limited. Visitors to the museum mostly consist of architects and students. Local inhabitants are rarely seen here.³⁸

This postponed the slated demolition as part of the standard practice for urban renewal in the post-War neighbourhoods, including Sloterveer in Amsterdam's Western Garden Townships.³⁹ This meant that the housing corporations that owned and managed this stock had to redress the years of outstanding maintenance in neighbourhoods slated for demolition and deal with irate tenants who had taken their poor living conditions as a temporary fact, soon to be alleviated. However, the crisis proved to be a godsend for urban conservationists. Simple crisis economics now called for a new perspective: the demolitions halt lead to a reappraisal of the qualities of the existing housing. When plans had to be shelved, ProWest, an association for the protection of the character of Amsterdam's Western Garden Suburbs, and Heemschut Amsterdam, a civic conservation body, seized this new opportunity. In an open letter directed at the Amsterdam Municipal Council, they argued that the construction stop could have positive consequences for cultural heritage, green infrastructure, liveability and the social structures of these neighbourhoods.⁴⁰ This should be read in the context of the urban renewal programme, which aimed at improving liveability, social structures and the open space network. Where formal protection existed, traditional conservation processes could be followed. Where this was not the case, the financial crisis of 2009 dramatically altered approaches to urban renewal, to the advantage of the conservationist cause who had already been agitating for a new perspective.

In 2011 plans were prepared for the demolition of 141 Airey-dwellings in Sloterveer. Through the financial crisis and lack of alternative accommodation of the inhabitants, the owner of the dwellings, Eigen Haard, came to the conclusion in 2015 that this was not a feasible option. In a move widely lauded by conservationists and inhabitants the decision was made to renovate the dwellings instead. Learning from Jerusalem, the intervention will not replace the original façade panels, but rather insulate the cavities. In Sloterveer other corporations are now following suit and this approach will now also be applied in Jerusalem itself where inhabitants of blocks that are still not protected are agitating for their dwellings to also become part of the national monuments ensemble. In this project the twin-strategies of creating vitality through dwelling differentiation have been let loose. In a 'back-to-first-principles' strategy, the original sobriety and mono-functionalism of these neighbourhoods are now expressed as having a value all of their own, and their resonance with the social ambitions of sobriety and sustainability are being utilised as carriers of conservation.

A PRAGMATIC DYNAMIC TRADITION

In the Netherlands, urban conservationist has remained flexible in its principles and utilised opportunities wherever they arose, be that urban renewal programmes or development stops. Adaptive reuse has become the norm, with conservation values being sacrificed to find a dynamic balance between the past and the future. The conservation of Modern Movement architecture poses many problems to conservationists; these include the conservation and restoration of materials. When dealing with larger Modern Movement housing areas, the traditional conservationist arguments of vitality, identity, age and material authenticity fail to impress and the diversification housing stock ideal has, by needs, largely been late go. The Netherlands remains a middle-class society and public opinion remains one of the most important tools in urban conservation. Re-branding of the image of an area—which included re-applying its original utopian intentions as relevant and sustainable—has successfully been employed to maintain cultural historical identity, authenticity and urban qualities. The financial crisis brought a new social sobriety to the Netherlands. This could be aligned to the sobriety of the ‘Existenzminimum’ principles of the Modern Movement and with the drive to sustainability and energy use reduction. These are new arrows in the quiver of urban conservationists. The strength of the Dutch urban conservation movement lies in its pragmatic search for aligned interests to meet its dynamic conservation aims.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Nicholas Clarke, a South African-born architect, obtained his professional degree from the University of Pretoria. He continued his studies at the University of Cambridge, where he earned a master's degree in Environmental Design in Architecture. He has practiced as an architect in South Africa and served as lecturer at the University of Pretoria. He is active in the field of World Heritage, having undertaken a number of Reactive Monitoring Missions on behalf of ICOMOS. He has co-authored and co-edited various books. He is currently registered as a PhD candidate at the Delft University of Technology.

Endnotes

- 1 The Netherlands remained neutral during the First World War. It is common practice to refer to housing constructed after the Second World War as ‘post-War’.
- 2 ‘De historie van de bescherming van stads- en dorpsgezichten toont aan dat niet zozeer de zorg voor het gebouwde erfgoed, maar de aandacht voor een herkenbaar leefmilieu en een kwalitatief hoogwaardige stadsvernieuwing richtinggevend zijn geweest voor het monumentenbeleid.’ Peter van Dun, “Vijftig Jaar Stedenbouwkundige Monumentenzorg,” in *In Dienst Van Het Erfgoed*, ed. Peter Don (Zwolle: Waanders, 2004), 167.
- 3 Marieke Kuipers, “Dutch Conversations in Conservation,” in *Eine Zukunft Für Unsere Vergangenheit. : Zum 40. Jubiläum Des Europäischen Denkmalschutzjahres (1975 - 2015) / a Future for Our Past. : The 40th Anniversary of European Architectural Heritage Year (1975 - 2015)*, ed. Michael Falser and Wilfrid Lipp (Berlin: Bâbler, 2015), 241.
- 4 Noud de Vreeze, ed. 6, *5 Miljoen Woningen: 100 Jaar Woningwet En Wooncultuur in Nederland* (Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 2001), 60.
- 5 Van Dun “Vijftig Jaar Stedenbouwkundige Monumentenzorg,” 168–69.
- 6 Hugo Priemus and Gerard Metselaar, *Urban Renewal Policy in a European Perspective: An International Comparative Analysis* (Delft University Press, 1992), 60.
- 7 Van Dun, “Vijftig Jaar Stedenbouwkundige Monumentenzorg,” 174.
- 8 Peter van Dun and Rob Doctor “The Urban Heritage as a Cultural, Social and Economic Asset. A Concise Manual to Planning the Existing Urban Environment,” (s.l.: The Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs, 1993), 3–4.
- 9 Kuipers, “Dutch Conversations in Conservation,” 242.
- 10 Van Dun and Doctor, “The Urban Heritage as a Cultural, Social and Economic Asset. A Concise Manual to Planning the Existing Urban Environment,” 4.
- 11 Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, *Stadsvernieuwing Gemeten : KWR 2000 Maakt Balans Op* (Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, 2002), 43.
- 12 Van Dun, “Vijftig Jaar Stedenbouwkundige Monumentenzorg,” 174–75.
- 13 ‘Woningen, gebouwen, straten, grachten en pleinen van cultuurhistorische betekenis vindt me steeds in de oudste stadsdelen.’ Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, *Nota over de Stads- en Dorpsvernieuwing* (Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, 1981), 11.
- 14 Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, *Stadsvernieuwing Gemeten : KWR 2000 Maakt Balans Op*, 43.
- 15 Priemus and Metselaar, *Urban Renewal Policy in a European Perspective: An International Comparative Analysis*, 60.

- 16 Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, *Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing*, (Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, 1997), 46–47.
- 17 Van Dun, “Vijftig Jaar Stedenbouwkundige Monumentenzorg,” 167.
- 18 Ecorys Nederland, *Evaluatie Investeringsbudget Stedelijke Vernieuwing 2000 T/M 2004 (Isv1)* (Rotterdam: Ministerie van VROM, 2006), 11.
- 19 Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, *Stadsvernieuwing Gemeten : KWR 2000 Maakt Balans Op*, 45.
- 20 Just after the 1997 Policy on City Renewal the Belvedere programme was initiated in 1999. It was in force until 2009 and was sponsored by no less than four individual Dutch ministries. This programme was not specifically aimed at the urban environment; its ambition was to align cultural history with spatial planning in a general sense through positioning cultural heritage inspiration for the development of the larger Dutch landscape in general.
- 21 Refer to the case study on the Rotterdam neighbourhood Hoogvliet: RJ Kleinhans et al., *Terugblikken en Vooruitkijken in Hoogvliet: 15 Jaar Stedelijke Vernieuwing en de Effecten op Wonen, Leefbaarheid en Sociale Mobiliteit* (Delft: Delft, 2014).
- 22 This continuously revised process, a mix of demolition and new-build and upgrades, had led to a national improvement in housing quality. In 1985 it was estimated that 19% of all Dutch housing was of a poor quality; by 2000 it was 1%. Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, *Stadsvernieuwing Gemeten : KWR 2000 Maakt Balans Op*, 11.
- 23 Marieke Kuipers, “Een Weerbarstig Onderzoeksveld Ontgonnen,” in *Jaarboek Monumentenzorg 1994. Monumenten Van Een Nieuwetijd. Architectuur En Stedebouw 1850-1940.*, ed. Y. Attema and R. K. M. Blijdenstijn (Zwolle: Waanders 1994), 9.
- 24 In that same year Docomomo International was founded in the Netherlands as an expert civic group to advocate for the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement.
- 25 Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, *Handleiding Inventarisatie Jongere Bouwkunst en Stedebouw (1850-1940)* (Zeist: Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, 1987), 11.
- 26 Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, *Handleiding Selectie en Registratie Jongere Stedebouw En Bouwkunst (1850-1940)* (Zeist: Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, 1991).
- 27 Gijs Bolhuis et al., *De Atlas Gordel: 20-40* (Amsterdam: Stedelijke Woningdienst Amsterdam, 2000), 59.
- 28 Personal communication, Cees Stam, Eigen Haard, 17 March 2016.
- 29 Vereniging Eigen Haard, *Reactie Eigen Haard Op Uitreiking Zwarte Bokaal*, <http://www.opennieuwsbank.nl/bericht/2005/11/30/E077-eigen-haard.html>.
- 30 An erroneous reference to the names of the wives of Prince William of Orange who himself was never a king.
- 31 Vereniging Eigen Haard, *De Koningsvrouwen Van Landlust. Nieuwsbrief, Vol. 2* (Amsterdam: Vereniging Eigen Haard, 2008),
- 32 The recent drop in energy prices has negated many of the financial gains the interventions were supposed to bring and Eigen Haard continues to subsidise rentals out of its own coffers to this day. Personal communication, Cees Stam, Eigen Haard, 17 March 2016.
- 33 Vereniging Eigen Haard, *De Koningsvrouwen Van Landlust. Nieuwsbrief, vol. 8* (Amsterdam: Vereniging Eigen Haard, 2011),
- 34 Tom Damen “Bouwstop in de Hele Stad,” *Het Parool*, 2 July 2010.
- 35 Estimation by Damen Consultants, cited in Hereijgers et al., *De Naoorlogse Stad: Een Hedendaagse Ontwerppogave*, 30.
- 36 This manifest itself in the publication of a number of books such as A. Hereijgers et al., *De Naoorlogse Stad: Een Hedendaagse Ontwerppogave* (Rotterdam: NAI, 2001), and S Mussert and H.F.L. Ottens, *Strijd Om De Stad: Sociale En Economische Integratie in De Stedelijke Samenleving* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002).
- 37 A historic example of such a programme was the post-War ‘Goed wonen’ (Living well) project, an education programme pioneered by architects and designers in an attempt to educate the working classes in ‘modern living’. Refer to: Noud de Vreeze and Coosje Berkelbach, *6,5 Miljoen Woningen : 100 Jaar Woningwet En Wooncultuur in Nederland* (Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 2001).
- 38 Personal communication, Van Eesteren museum co-worker, Marieke van der Mark, 18 March 2016.
- 39 These include the so-called Westentree-, Aireystrook-, and Roland Holstbuurt neighbourhoods. Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsdeel Nieuw-West, *Vernieuwing Slotermeer: Door in Een Ander Tempo* (Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsdeel Nieuw-West, 2011).
- 40 Vereniging Promotie Westelijke Tuinsteden ProWest. *De Bouwstop als kans voor het Amsterdamse Erfgoed*. (Amsterdam: Vereniging Promotie Westelijke Tuinsteden ProWest, 2010.) Open letter to the City of Amsterdam Municipal Council.

Bibliography

- Bolhuis, Gijs, Helene Hartman, Erik Mattie, Renate Meijer, Marinus Oostenbrink, Marina Roosebeek, Jeroen Schilt, and Vladimir Stissi. *De Atlas Gordel: 20-40*. Amsterdam: Stedelijke Woningdienst Amsterdam, 2000.
- Damen, Tom. “Bouwstop in De Hele Stad,” *Het Parool*, 2 July 2010.
- De Vreeze, Noud, and Coosje Berkelbach. *6,5 Miljoen Woningen: 100 Jaar Woningwet en Wooncultuur in Nederland*. Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010, 2001.
- Duiker, J. “Naar Aanleiding van de Nieuwe Bebouwingswijze in het Uitbreidingsplan “Landlust” in Amsterdam-West.” *De 8 en Opbouw 4*, no. 19 (1933): 165-68.
- Ecorys Nederland. *Evaluatie Investeringsbudget Stedelijke Vernieuwing 2000 T/M 2004 (Isv1)*. Rotterdam: Ministerie van VROM, 2006.
- Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsdeel Nieuw-West. *Vernieuwing Slotermeer: Door in Een Ander Tempo*. Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsdeel Nieuw-West, 2011.
- Hereijgers, A., M. Pflug, G. Wallagh, E. van Velzen. *De Naoorlogse Stad: Een Hedendaagse Ontwerppogave*. Rotterdam: NAI, 2001.
- Kleinhans, RJ, Lex Veldboer, Wenda Doff, SJT Jansen, and M Van Ham. *Terugblikken en Vooruitkijken in Hoogvliet: 15 Jaar Stedelijke Vernieuwing en de Effecten op Wonen, Leefbaarheid en Sociale Mobiliteit*. Delft: Delft University of Technology, 2014.
- Kuipers, Marieke. “Dutch Conversations in Conservation.” In *Eine Zukunft Für Unsere Vergangenheit: Zum 40. Jubiläum Des Europäischen Denkmalschutzjahres (1975 - 2015)/A Future for Our Past: The 40th Anniversary of European Architectural Heritage Year (1975 - 2015)*, edited by Michael Falser and Wilfrid Lipp, 238–48. Berlin: Bäßler, 2015.
- Kuipers, Marieke. “Een Weerbarstig Onderzoeksveld Ontgonnen.” In *Jaarboek Monumentenzorg 1994. Monumenten Van Een Nieuwetijd. Architectuur En Stedebouw 1850-1940*, edited by Y. Attema and R. K. M. Blijdenstijn. Zwolle: Waanders 1994.

- Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer. *Nota over de Stads- en Dorpsvernieuwing*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, 1981.
- Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer. *Nota Stedelijke Vernieuwing*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, 1997.
- Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer. *Stadsvernieuwing Gemeten : KWR 2000 Maakt Balans Op*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer, 2002.
- Musterd, S., and H.F.L. Ottens. *Strijd om de Stad: Sociale en Economische Integratie in de Stedelijke Samenleving*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002.
- Priemus, Hugo, and Gerard Metselaar. *Urban Renewal Policy in a European Perspective: An International Comparative Analysis*. Delft University Press, 1992.
- Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg. *Handleiding Inventarisatie Jongere Bouwkunst en Stedebouw (1850-1940)*. Zeist: Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, 1987.
- Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg. *Handleiding Selectie en Registratie Jongere Stedebouw en Bouwkunst (1850-1940)*. Zeist: Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, 1991.
- Vereniging Promotie Westelijke Tuinsteden ProWest. *De Bouwstop als kans voor het Amsterdamse Erfgoed*. Open letter to the City of Amsterdam Municipal Council. Amsterdam: 2010. Accessed February 2016. http://www.prowest.nl/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=62&Itemid=29
- Van Dun, Peter. "Vijftig Jaar Stedenbouwkundige Monumentenzorg." In *In Dienst Van Het Erfgoed*, edited by Peter Don. Zwolle: Waanders, 2004.
- Van Dun, Peter, and Rob Docter. *The Urban Heritage as a Cultural, Social and Economic Asset. A Concise Manual to Planning the Existing Urban Environment*. The Hague: The Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs, 1993.
- Vereniging Eigen Haard. *De Koningsvrouwen Van Landlust*. Nieuwsbrief. Vol. 2, Amsterdam: Vereniging Eigen Haard, 2008. Newsletter.
- Vereniging Eigen Haard. *De Koningsvrouwen Van Landlust*. Nieuwsbrief. Vol. 8, Amsterdam: Vereniging Eigen Haard, 2011. Newsletter.
- Vereniging Eigen Haard. *Reactie Eigen Haard Op Uitreiking Zwarte Bokaal*. Accessed February, 2016. <http://www.opennieuwsbank.nl/bericht/2005/11/30/E077-eigen-haard.html>.

Image Sources

- Figure 1: ArchiVolt architects digital archive.
- Figure 2: ArchiVolt architects digital archive.
- Figure 3: NJ Clarke, 2016.
- Figure 4: NJ Clarke, 2016.
- Figure 5: NJ Clarke, 2016.
- Figure 6: City of Amsterdam Archive. Image reference: 5293FO004966