

10 Years Barometer Public Real Estate in the Netherlands

Jan Veuger

Professor Public Real Estate, NoorderRuimte Centre of Applied Research on Area Development, Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Groningen, 9747 AS, NL.

In 2007, the Ministry of Housing and Spatial Planning took the initiative to issue the building blocks for social: real estate for facilities. This has been the first attempt to deal with social real estate professionally as an asset. In 2008 the professorship of public real estate started with its first Barometer Social Real Estate. In 2009, I advocated in Real Estate Magazine that research into social real estate is necessary from the perspective of Corporate Real Estate Management (CREM) through new development models and more (PhD) research.

In anticipation of the municipal elections of 2010, research from the research group Municipal Real Estate showed that social real estate was not a matter for the election programs of the political parties. This was a prelude to the funded RAAK subsidy application towards a marketed municipal real estate for carrying out practice-oriented research. This research in 2011-2012 led to the completely externally funded research group Social Real Estate in 2012. After that, the Social Real Estate professorship profiled itself in different areas. Especially the attention of minister Stef Blok in 2014 when he received the first copy of the book Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Social Real Estate): Corporate Social Responsibility at our annual congress, the round table meeting with State Secretary for Health, Welfare and Sport Martin van Rijn in 2015 and the informal conversation with the Minister of Education, Culture and Science Jet Bussemaker in 2015 have given extra publicity in the media alongside the many publications of the lectorate. The debate in 2016 with civil society with the Prime Minister Mark Rutte with the handing over of the book Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Social Real Estate) 2016, a round table meeting in 2017 with Minister of Home Affairs and Kingdom Relations Stef Blok, aldermen and directors Real Estate of Municipalities in The Netherlands, have contributed to social and economic knowledge utilization for future and existing real estate professionals. At the PROVADA 2017 we co-organized the Shrink: Emptiness and Space for Innovation and Change session, where the Minister of the Interior and Kingdom Relations Ronald Plasterk gave his vision on this subject.

Social and economic knowledge

The societal and economic knowledge utilization of the Social Sciences research group has led, among other things, to the fact that the theme is fully integrated in the rapidly growing Real Estate & Estate Agency program at Hanze University Groningen and the NoorderRuimte Knowledge Center. The standard study book *Taxatieleer Vastgoed 2 (Valuation Real Estate)* for all higher professional education institutions in the Netherlands is also provided with a substantial chapter on the valuation of social real estate in 2015. In addition to the Innovation Workshops, the Honors Program, the Real Estate Lab and the NoorderRuimte Knowledge Center where many research projects with students have been successfully carried out. Other institutes such as the Amsterdam School of Real Estate, Odyssee University Brussels, KU Leuven, University Berlin, knowledge network Krimp Noord- The Netherlands, Fontys, HAN, Hogeschool Utrecht have given many guest lectures and expert meetings. The published and sold-out books *Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Social Real Estate)* in recent years are also being used as study material.

Internationally, the professorship is present annually at the congresses of the European Real Estate Society (ERES) with articles and lectures. The lectorate is also represented at other international conferences. In the past two years, we have also explicitly focused on international publications

because social real estate in the Netherlands has a unique international position on property of the government, healthcare, education and housing corporations. This has led in particular to many international Journal publications. Also the collaboration in various studies with Prof. Dr. Peter Boelhouwer and Prof. Marleen Hermans of Delft University about earthquakes and professional commissioning at municipalities, and Prof. Erwin van de Krabben with PhD students from the research group Annette van de Beemt and Dirk Kootstra about it respectively Professional property management at Dutch Municipalities and Funding system for primary education, contribute to the further professionalization of the Social Real Estate field. We are currently working on the RICS accreditation for the Real Estate & Brokerage study that gives students access to the international RICS certificate and membership. The results of this is expected in February 2018.

Future tasks in Social Real Estate

Looking at the future, there are two challenges that require attention. The first is the further valorization of the knowledge developed by the lectorate together with students, new and existing professionals, knowledge institutions in Innovation Workshops, Living Labs, Real Estate Lab, NoorderRuimte Knowledge Center (KCN), the recently started RICS Department of Social Real Estate, the RICS Department of Research & Innovation, Zorg Innovatie Forum (ZIF) a structural collaboration with NeVaP knowledge and innovation platform in the real estate sector (600 members), RICS Europe (125.00 members worldwide) and the accrued network of the Social Real Estate research group. International exchanges and publications in Journals also have ongoing attention. After a positive evaluation of the Social Real Estate lectorate in 2016, the lectorates for Social Real Estate and Real Estate were merged in 2017. The new assignment of the (Social) Property lectorate will therefore consist of two main themes: (1) Social Real Estate and (2) An agile real estate economy with disruption, blockchain and real estate. The second theme started at the Noordelijk Vastgoedcongres 2017 on 12 October, an initiative of Villa '96 - student association for Real Estate & Brokerage study - and the lectorate (Social) Real Estate.

The second challenge is the new challenges for social real estate that come from the publications as experts have now looked at the Barometers of Social Real Estate in the past 10 years. A number of challenges are (10 years Barometer Social Real Estate 2017, Veuger et al 2017: 5-8):

- We think it is important that organizations that manage public real estate do so in a manner that can count on political and social support and that fits in with changing social attitudes (for example about sustainability) and needs (eg other forms of housing, education and healthcare). Applies to central government and also to public institutions that can make real estate decisions with a large degree of autonomy, such as care or educational institutions (Montfort, van der Maas, Noort-Verhoeff and van der Zanden, 2017).
- Almost all municipalities are working on the professionalization of their commissioning role and, for example, carry out pilots with new forms of cooperation. They recognize the need for a better securing knowledge about new forms of commissioning, because they are faced with a strong dynamic market in this area. Competency development is one of the most obvious jumping themes (Hermans, Huizing, Amesz and Veuger, 2017).
- The most important current challenges for the municipal real estate portfolios are making the entire property portfolio more sustainable. The impact of the rapid technological developments and the increasingly strategic role that municipalities want from the principle 'back to the core tasks' (Wildenberg, 2017).
- The distinction between sector-specific and more generic knowledge, data and learning points is an important point of attention (Voort, 2017).

- Seen in this way, there are indeed opportunities for taking on the sustainability of educational housing in the short term. This does not alter the fact that the funding of new construction in the PO and VO falls short and reformed (Postema, 2017).
- The question seems to me how organizations in social real estate can combine the advantages of small organization with purchasing and expertise benefits on a larger scale (Koolma, 2017).
- A related question is that of the trade-off between outsourcing and in-house management. Which combination of activities yields added value? (Koolma, 2017).
- It would be better if there were separate measurements to estimate return on investment and social return on investment. However, measuring social real estate is still in its infancy (Koolma, 2017).
- Furthermore, I would like to argue for more research into how administrators, managers and frontline workers make their decisions regarding to social real estate (Koolma, 2017).
- In order to regain control capacity (in the care for the elderly) or not to lose (education), without going back to the supply management as it was, in principle two ways are open. Firstly, strengthening the spatial track, for example by means of an environmental vision (drawn up by cooperating municipalities) on the facilities structure and in connection with the housing vision. Secondly by sectoral funding as the starting point for spatial control, but in a new way, as is the case with the decentralization in education (Tennekes, 2017).
- The quality of real estate and facility management will be able to further improve by (even) more to carry out high-quality research in which the added value of real estate and facilities for users and owners can be demonstrated even better (Mobach and Himmans, 2017).
- The experiences from the first year of the municipal benchmark form, as it were, a road book for digitization and integral real estate management (Jansen 2017).
- To be able to think in an efficient and effective way about the challenges resulting from demographic transition and selective migration patterns (facilities, mobility, housing, heritage, etc.) among other things, a change in thinking is necessary. From thinking about a complete core to thinking about a complete region (Bulder 2017).

Sources

- Beemt – Tjeerdsma, A, van den en J. Veuger (2017), *Gemeenten actief aan de slag met portefeuille en organisatie (Municipalities actively work with portfolio and organization)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Bulder. E.A.M. (2017), *De responsieve regio. Van complete kern naar complete regio (The responsive region. From complete core to complete region)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Hermans, M.H, D. Huizing, J. Amesz en J. Veuger (2017), *Gemeenten als opdrachtgevers in de bouw: zoekt en gij zult vinden. Diffuse inbedding van opdracht gevende rol in gemeentelijke organisaties (Municipalities as clients in construction: seek and you will find. Diffuse embedding of commissioning role in municipal organizations)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).

- Janssen, I. (2017), *Van vastgoedbenchmark naar business tool. Een digitaal dashboard voor integrale vastgoedsturing bij gemeenten (From real estate benchmark to business tool. A digital dashboard for integrated real estate management at municipalities)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Koolma, H.M. (2017), *Het zwijgen in de steen. Woningcorporaties in maatschappelijk vastgoed, trends en agenda-onderzoek (Silence in the stone. Housing corporations in social real estate, trends and agenda research)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Mobach, M.P. en R. Himmans (2017), *Het management van vastgoed en faciliteiten (The management of real estate and facilities)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Montfort, C.J. van, O.D. van der Maas, C.C. Noort-Verhoeff en M.J.M. van der Sanden (2017), *De zorg voor doelmatigheid en draagvlak (The care for efficiency and support)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Postema, D.J. (2017), *Vastgoedopgave onderwijshuisvesting (Real estate assignment for educational housing)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Tennekes, J. (2017), *De implicaties van vraagvolgende bekostiging voor voorzieningenplanning. Vastgoedstrategieën en ruimtelijke sturing in ouderenzorg en primair onderwijs vergeleken (The implications of demand-based funding for facility planning. We compared real estate strategies and spatial management in care for the elderly and primary education)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Voordt, D.J.M. van der (2017), *Thema's en trends in tien jaar zorgvastgoed. Een analyse van de Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed 2008-2016 (Themes and trends in ten years of healthcare real estate. An analysis of the Barometer Social Real Estate 2008-2016)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).
- Wildenberg, W. van den (2017), *Op weg naar toekomstbestendig gemeentelijk vastgoed. Van centralisatie en basis op orde naar strategische portefeuillesturing (Towards future-proof municipal real estate. From centralization and basic order to strategic portfolio management)*. In Barometer Maatschappelijk Vastgoed (Barometer Social Real Estate) 2017 (Veuger et al.).