Developments in local public safety policy: a comparison between Antwerp and Rotterdam

Leader/introduction

This chapter discusses two cities that both have set trends in their respective countries in terms of local public safety policy: Antwerp and Rotterdam. Each city has developed new methods for confronting old and new safety problems, since traditional methods are long out of date. Both cities are (i) working on improving the level of cooperation between separate authorities and organisations and the cooperation with civilians, (ii) creating a structural approach to tackle the lack of safety rather than on tackling separate incidents, (iii) increasing the level of performance orientation and (iv) a more integrated approach to safety problems. However, besides these similarities, there are also differences between the two cities.

This chapter considers the new and existing ways in which the public administrations of Rotterdam and Antwerp have implemented local public safety policies, centring around the following research question: *How have local public safety policies developed in Rotterdam and Antwerp, and what are the similarities and differences between the two cities in terms of design and content of their policies and in terms of policy dynamics?* To answer this question, the principal characteristics of and developments in the local public safety policies are discussed as well as the role of the local administrations therein and the accompanying deployment of instruments and measures. This is followed by a systematic analysis of differences and similarities between the two cities in terms of their approaches to and policies for safety, after which a conclusion is presented. [1]

1 – Rotterdam
1.1 – From anti-vandalism to an integrated approach
Over the years, local public safety policy in Rotterdam has been characterised by a high level of continuity, albeit that more and more emphasis has been placed on policy implementation. The first anti-vandalism projects were launched as far back as 1980 (De Haan 1997). In 1992, the municipal council debated the necessity for a more cohesive public safety policy, which in 1993 resulted in a plan for an integrated approach aimed at reconquering the public domain. Thirteen problem areas were identified, including drugs problems, nuisance from hotels and cafes and problems with juveniles. External safety risks such as disasters and industrial risks were left out of the equation from the start (De Haan 1997: 77). Most of the responsibility for public safety policy was decentralised and transferred to the municipal districts, which were given responsibility for preparing safety plans for each neighbourhood. Those plans described the safety problems and risks, priorities and measures in each neighbourhood.

During the period from 1994 to 1998, Rotterdam opted for a citywide approach, with decentralised elements to respond to specific local problems. The neighbourhood safety plans were to be confirmed in sub-local triangles. The municipal administration signed

agreements with the municipal districts about the preparation of those plans, which were to be developed in the District Consultation Management (*Wijk Overleg Beheer*). By the end of 1995, almost sixty neighbourhood safety plans had been developed. Priorities were defined at the decentralised level, although marginal feasibility tests were performed centrally (De Haan 1997).

Regulating the public safety policies was the responsibility of the Public Safety Policy Team (*Beleidsteam Veiligheid*), which was made up of the members of the triangle and a project alderman for Safety, who had been appointed in the 1994-98 programme agreement. Together with the Mayor, he was responsible for public safety policy. That team formed the executive committee in charge of day-to-day administration of the integrated public safety policy. The Council Committee for Police and Safety was responsible for the implementation of the integrated public safety policy. Below the executive committee was the Steering Committee Safety (*Stuurgroep Veilig*), made up of the heads of the municipal departments most closely involved (public transport service RET, the Municipal Health Service GGD, police, Education and the Urban Development and Public Housing Department dS+V, the Public Prosecution Service and representatives from the municipal districts. In addition, an Integrated Public safety policy project leader was appointed, with project leaders for a number of citywide projects and neighbourhood safety plans. Starting in March 1996, quarterly integrated safety reports were published.

The policy developed from administrative prevention in the 1980s to neighbourhood-oriented prevention in 1990s. 'Bother' was replaced by nuisance; the motto of 'clean and whole' was expanded to include 'safe' (De Haan 1997: 93-94). The citywide approach in Rotterdam came into its own because fewer separate projects and measures were introduced.[2] Instead, the policy consisted more of a series of concrete and cohesive activities in neighbourhoods, with citizen involvement receiving a strong focus (such as in Opzoomeren). At the same time, the approach was more bottom-up, as is evident from the neighbourhood safety plans. In addition, more matters were arranged centrally: it was found that citywide policies were required for problems that could not be solved at the neighbourhood level. Rotterdam adopted a new line of policy in 1993, with special Council meetings, municipal consultations and a project alderman for Safety (De Haan 1997).

1.2 – 2001: the turning point
In 2001, a new shift in policy began. A series of developments, such as the Municipal Council elections and the rise of the Leefbaar Rotterdam political party, the formation of a new Cabinet and the murder of Pim Fortuyn, meant that safety became a highly topical issue both regionally and in the city of Rotterdam. Safety had to improve. Societal dissatisfaction was at a high level, and a sense of urgency arose that made it possible to adopt a new course.

In March 2001, a conference was held in Kaatsheuvel about safety and public safety policy in Rotterdam. At that conference, it was decided that a five-year programme

---

[2] This did not prevent Rotterdam's Mayor Opstelten from referring to safety-related policy activities with the somewhat belittling term of 'a project carrousel'.

would be drafted in order to ensure a structural improvement in safety and quality of living in Rotterdam. That five-year programme, 'Reinforcing the Safety in Rotterdam' (*Versterking veiligheid Rotterdam*, 'VVR') was published in October 2001. The municipal administration noted that the approach adopted in recent years had not achieved the targeted results, and that the goal had not been reached despite the efforts put forward. The primary objective is 'an improvement in the safety in the neighbourhoods and the city as a whole'. One condition for achieving this is an increased degree of social cohesion. Realising this objective calls for a more systematic approach to safety problems. (Rotterdam Audit Department 2005: 20)

After the municipal elections in 2002, improving safety became the municipal administration's highest priority. In 2006, Rotterdam was to be safer, and the city was not to have any more unsafe neighbourhoods. Realisation of the safety ambitions was based on the Five-Year Plan of Action adopted by the Municipal Council. That Plan of Action was a turning point in the method of working to make the city safer. A systematic, structural and integrated approach was adopted, with the intention of quickly achieving results that would be visible to the population (Nandoe 2006). The new approach to safety was four-pronged. The first branch was neighbourhood safety; for the remainder, the new approach consisted of the citywide tackling of the branches of violence, drugs, and youth and safety. The focus was on tackling the 700 most prominent nuisance-causing drug addicts and repeat violent offenders and a repressive approach to nuisance-causing and criminal juveniles (Safety Programme Department 2002: 15). In other words, the programme consisted of a combination of area-oriented and individual-oriented measures.

The target of the new policy was realising a break in the trend of how the population experienced their safety. The situation regarding safety and quality of living was qualified as 'serious'. In the policy, it was noted that the lack of safety was centred in a number of neighbourhoods that were characterised by negative spirals. Those neighbourhoods were made up primarily of cheap rental housing, and had a high level of unemployment and low average incomes and education levels. Many of those neighbourhoods were also polluted. As a result, they had become deprived. Consequently, the places of the individuals who had the opportunity to leave those neighbourhoods were taken over by underprivileged persons and problem groups. Social cohesion suffers in such neighbourhoods, and nuisance and crime increase (Municipality of Rotterdam 2001: 11). This led to the Rotterdam Act (*Rotterdamwet*), which states that in certain neighbourhoods people may only move into rental homes if they have income from employment or have been residents of Rotterdam or the urban region for six years or more. This law was aimed at limiting the influx of underprivileged individuals from other regions and so improve the situation in the neighbourhood, allowing it the chance to improve in both social and economic terms (www.rotterdam.nl 2007).

The focal point of the integrated public safety policy is on tackling problems at the level of the neighbourhoods. The municipal district is required to regulate the approach at neighbourhood level. The problems surrounding safety and quality of living in the neighbourhood are to be analysed and then translated into quantifiable targets and performance agreements. Civilians share in the responsibility for safety and for helping improve the level of safety, and have to be kept informed of the analyses regarding safety problems.

A characteristic of the manner in which Rotterdam tackles the lack of safety is the joining of forces of municipal districts, municipal services, the police, the Public Prosecution Services and, occasionally, other judicial authorities (such as the HALT office and the Child Care and Protection Board). Housing corporations, welfare institutions (including youth work and community work), schools and social service institutions are also active participants (Safety Programme Department 2002; Council for Public Administration 2002). The municipal districts have made arrangements with those bodies and institutions about their required performances in terms of enforcement, surveillance, management and maintenance. This integrated safety approach is completely different to the 'project carrousel' approach applied formerly, under which all manner of projects and activities were launched, yet often with disappointing results.

Other characteristics of the Rotterdam approach are the strict municipal control, the use of 'standard formats', the concrete and quantifiable targets and the accountability for results (Rotterdam Audit Department 2005). Municipal districts also regulate their partners based on performance agreements, in which they are assisted by the Safety Programme Department (*Programmabureau Veilig*). According to this concept, contract management and performance orientation, transparency and quantifiable results can provide sufficient incentive for improved performances.

1.3 – New executive programme for 2006-2010
In the coming years, the municipal administration will continue the current approach, while implementing a number of improvements (Safety Programme Department 2006: 8-9). A relatively new issue is integration and radicalism. The Municipal Executive announced what measures would be taken to counter radicalism, extremism and terrorist threats in the campaign programme 'Join in or be left behind: campaign programme against radicalisation and for opportunities for Rotterdammers'. Radicalism will not be given any chance, and a great deal of effort will be put into ensuring that all Rotterdammers can live together. 'People who decide not to participate – and so exclude themselves – will be dealt with strictly.' (Safety Programme Department 2006: 12)

To ensure that the policy can continue to be carried out properly, the Rotterdam Audit Department's 2005 report 'Being Safe, Feeling Safe' (*Veilig zijn, veilig voelen*) states that the position of the Safety Programme Department should be consolidated by making it a regular municipal department. This advice was implemented on 1 July 2006, when the Safety Programme Department and the Public Order and Safety division of the Administrative Department were combined to form the Safety Directorate.

1.4 – Instruments and measures
Rotterdam's integrated public safety policy has a highly diversified approach. This diversity is also visible in the use of instruments and measures. The principal instruments and measures are described below.[3]

Safety index

---

[3] For a more detailed overview of the use of instruments and measures, please refer to the two 5-year action programmes (Safety Programme Department 2002 and 2006).

The safety index is used for comparing the results achieved in the field of safety. The index shows what neighbourhoods are making progress, which are not, and where the situation is even deteriorating. Similarly to the AEX index or the CBS index, the safety index serves as an indicator, revolving around the developments over time and in relation to other neighbourhoods, rather than absolute values. The index was created by the Safety Programme Department, and provides information about the social safety at the levels of neighbourhoods, municipal districts and the city, by assigning figures to the city as a whole and to each separate neighbourhood. The index gives figures ranging from 1 (unsafe) to 10 (safe), and is divided into five categories: unsafe, problem, threatened, concern and safe.

The index is made up of eight elements: theft, drug-related nuisance, violence, burglaries, vandalism, clean and whole, nuisance and traffic. Each element is based on objective data from police records (the number of reports) and subjective information generated by a large-scale population study among 13,500 Rotterdam citizens (Municipality of Rotterdam 2006). The latter factor is determined by the percentage of the neighbourhood residents who feel that a problem regularly occurs in their direct vicinity, and by the percentage of the population who claim to have been victims in their own neighbourhoods.

Area-oriented approach
For the area-oriented approach, the following three instruments and measures are visibly the most characteristic:

The first is the concept of 'Coordinated approach to surveillance, intervention and enforcement'. Taking as the point of departure the experiences from previous years gained from the use of intervention teams and Municipal Personal Records Database teams and the cooperation and exchange of information between departments concerned with surveillance, intervention and enforcement, coordinated system of surveillance and enforcement will be introduced during the coming years (Safety Programme Department 2006: 15). This system will be usable for all manner of purposes, ranging from unauthorised occupancy to overdue maintenance.

The second is 'Street surveillance': a surveillance model will be introduced on the streets that will serve to greatly improve the cooperation between the police, City Surveillance, private safety firms, public transport authority RET, municipal districts and refuse collection authority Roteb for a clean, whole and safe environment. The priorities and deployment of the various partners will be based on current information about the various problems. The supervision should result in a more effective approach to surveillance and enforcement on the streets (Safety Programme Department 2006: 6).

The third is 'Tackling building-related /Intervention teams'. Intervention teams, as they are known, will carry out integrated inspections. They will provide solicited and unsolicited crisis management at the local level (Harchoui 2004: 3). The intervention teams constitute a special form of surveillance, for example conducting integrated inspections to check for unauthorised occupancy or over-occupancy and other problems. They are made up of staff from the police, the municipal district, City Surveillance and possibly other partners as well, such as social services, housing supervision authority Woningtoezicht, regional energy company Eneco and drug addict care institutions. Their focus is on inspecting occupants, living conditions and landlords. They enter homes. Any

instances of abuse detected result in immediate action by the representatives of various services. Particular attention is devoted to slum lords by municipal services, using what is termed the Alijda approach (Safety Programme Department 2006: 7). The Alijda approach involves tackling mala fide landlords and facilitators of mala fide practices, such as civil-law notaries and mortgage loan providers. The intervention team also offers actual assistance to the residents they visit. For example, children are registered for sports passes, and the assistance of the Social Affairs and Employment Department is called in to have the benefits agency pay the rent directly or to explain special financial arrangements, such as debt rescheduling (De Goede *et al.* 2005: 13). Similarly, people are referred to therapy for drugs problems. The data are gathered and entered into a computer system, together with records of the arrangements made with the residents (www.stadskrant-rotterdam.nl 2004).

Individual-oriented approach
Another instrument is the individual-oriented approach, aimed at subject groups such as addicts, repeat offenders illegal immigrants and criminals or nuisance-causing juveniles. Lists are compiled of these groups, describing any previous penal or social records. Any person on these lists may opt for care or penal treatment. For example, there is a list of 755 nuisance-causing drug addicts ('PGA drugs'), a list of 1000 nuisance-causing and criminal juveniles ('PGA youth'), a list of repeat offenders (approx. 500 names) ('PGA violence'), with specific details for PGA Antillean juveniles (since 15 March 2005), and a list of criminal illegal immigrants.

City marines
One instrument that is used primarily for area-oriented activities, but that is also used for the individual-oriented approach, is the concept of city marines. The municipal administration has deployed city marines in neighbourhoods designated as unsafe in the safety index. The city marines are described as '... experienced civil servants who work in the least safe neighbourhoods, and whose job it is to improve the cooperation between municipal services, the police force, the judicial authorities and other bodies' (Municipality of Rotterdam 2003: 125). The job profile specifies that marines are authorised to intervene at the very highest level to ensure progress in safety-related programmes. Marines provide surveillance, identify, consult, guide and report, yet are not responsible for implementing the programmes. That responsibility lies with the various municipal services, the police force, the judicial authorities and other bodies (Municipality of Rotterdam 2002: 39). They work for the Municipal Executive, with the Steering Committee Safety serving as the initial administrative platform. City marines are authorised to implement the regulating role of the Steering Committee Safety; in the words of the Municipal Executive, the city marines both facilitate and enforce. Their tasks, responsibilities and powers remain undefined, and the authority of the citywide Steering Committee Safety serves as the 'big stick' for the marines (Rotterdam Audit Department 2005: 11). Their task is to improve the quality of living in the principal deprived areas, known as 'hot spots'.
The social and safety problems in the hot spots are tackled using integrated inspections in the hot spots aimed at tackling over-occupancy, fraud, illicit use and nuisance and the

deployment of social services. At the same time, investments are being made in the home supply and public spaces in these spots.

City marines coordinate the deployment of municipal services. They do have a strong result-oriented focus, but do not have regulatory power. In addition to the area-oriented marines, Rotterdam also has two theme-oriented marines: one for juveniles and one for personal approach to nuisance-causing addicts. There are nine of these super civil servants in the entire municipality. (Municipality of Rotterdam 2004: 139)

Performance orientation
As noted above, Rotterdam's approach is characterised by a strict citywide regulation that uses 'standard formats'. Concrete and quantifiable targets are defined. Accountability for the results is an important feature of the Rotterdam model (Rotterdam Audit Department 2005). The municipal districts also regulate their partners, based on the performance agreements specified. They are assisted by the Safety Programme Department. This first characteristic is that of a strong local government, with the power to regulate and enforce. In this concept, contract management and performance orientation, transparency and quantifiable results may serve as the incentive for improved performances. This assumption shows the influence of New Public Management (Marks *et al.* 2006: 92).

2 - Antwerp
2.1 – From too many makability ambitions to modest and concrete ambitions
According to the municipal programme Leefbare Stad (2003-2007), the municipal administration's aim is to create a habitable and dynamic city. Besides urban living, health and societal composition, safety and the public domain are also items that are high on the agenda. Antwerp wishes to be a safe living environment in which the physical, psychological and material integrity of each person is ensured (Municipality of Antwerp 2003: 41). Methods used for increasing safety have to correspond to the measures taken at the supra-local level (European, federal, Flemish and provincial); this is referred to as vertical embedding. At the same time, the needs at neighbourhood level are also important (horizontal embedding); the city hopes to achieve consultation and partnership with individuals, clubs and associations, the public sector and the private sector. The Municipality of Antwerp have concluded an administrative agreement with the police, under which 21 police projects are defined. The police force concentrates on consolidation (embedding and completing current projects), focus (selection of highest priorities) and communication (the police's image to be based on facts rather than impressions).

Antwerp has never lacked draft texts discussing integrated safety, although at the same time it has never had a joint vision shared by all the relevant parties (City Safety Plan 2004: 16). Such a vision is a necessary condition for realising the city's strategic ambitions, which are improving the effective level of safety, improving the perceived level of safety, and reducing nuisance. The City Safety Plan is an administrative annex to the Zonal Safety Plan (see elsewhere in this chapter); it sets out its own administrative views on safety that revolve around the priorities of the partners of the Zonal Safety Council, formalising the city's involvement with those priorities.

The municipal administration considers an endorsed vision to be necessary, as well as a translation of that vision into clear operational objectives and forceful actions and

measures. Implementation should be based on a solid vision. Previously, the solution put forward was a comprehensive integrated policy. However, since 2004, the approach has been to adopt core policies, and rather than to define matters as broadly and completely as possible, to focus on a number of substantive themes, together with the city's strategic safety partners (City Safety Plan 2004: 16). Evaluations showed that there was no lack of good practices. Yet the policies were fragmented, and there was no clear coordination. The concept of 'integrated' was assigned too broad a definition, with 'too many makability ambitions' (City Safety Plan 2004: 2). A range of separate projects had been introduced, financed by various policymaking levels and carried out by different municipal departments and third parties (City Safety Plan 2004: 32)

Public safety policy benefits from increased controlling capacity and coordinating power (City Safety Plan 2004: 2). From the side of the city, thought regulation was to be replaced by action regulation. The process called for defining core items of the city's public safety policy and priorities that everyone endorses. The municipal administration should steer, not row. The implementation of the City Safety Plan calls for a two-pronged tactic for tackling hotspots: an area-oriented approach and a subject group approach (see 2.3).

In order to realise these ambitions, the following principles were defined for the organisation and allocation of responsibilities between the safety partners (City Safety Plan 2004: 18-19). Firstly, each of the separate partners' tasks and responsibilities were to be defined. Secondly, information exchanges between the partners and a better system of registering activities were required. Thirdly, neighbourhood-specific police forces were essential. Fourthly, the municipal administration had to steer, not row.

The administrative part of the Safety Core Policy is created by a project unit, which falls under the direct authority of the alderman for Integrated Safety, in close coordination with the Mayor. The Mayor is responsible for neighbourhood control, subject group control, and the translation of citywide programmes into plans of action. The Integrated Safety project unit is responsible for controlling the implementation of those plans of action, once they have been approved by the Municipal Executive. That unit enters into service agreements with relevant business units.

2.2 – Zonal Safety Plan
The Zonal Safety Plan 2005-2008 is the strategic plan for the Antwerp police zone, and covers a four-year period. That plan defines three principles, which together constitute the Chief of Police's mission. Firstly, the police's actions are to be based on the needs, expectations and concerns, from all layers of the population, that cause threats or take on worrying forms or are disruptive. Secondly, the police force should focus on working efficiently and effectively, based on the five basic tenets of community-oriented police care (*viz.* external orientation, justification, problem-solving ability, partnership and skilled involvement). Thirdly, the police should integrate and cooperate with other actors in the integrated public safety policy, based on full partnership.

The plan was drafted by the Zonal Safety Council, which detailed the integrated public safety policy with the assistance of theme-based work groups with representatives from relevant partners. The aim is to give clearer direction than was previously the case to safety and public safety policy (Municipality of Antwerp 2005: 2). The actors in the Zonal Safety Plan focus their efforts on an integrated and comprehensive operation, with

room for consultation, partnership, cooperation and coordination. The integrated operations of the police are based on 'community policing' (Municipality of Antwerp 2005: 2). Neighbourhood operations are a tool used to achieve that, and involves district operations, prevention, a visible presence on the streets based on the principles of Visible, Approachable and Reachable ('ZAC', from the Dutch *zichtbaar, aanspreekbaar, contacteerbaar*), specific operations revolving around local problems and follow-up to low-priority requests for intervention ('the Blue Line') (Municipality of Antwerp 2005: 8).

Since the reforms in the police force, the police have been defining priorities in their activities, together with the Public Prosecution Service and the municipal administration. The partners in the Zonal Safety Council record the priorities. The priorities for 2005-2008 include reducing nuisance, limiting juvenile delinquency, reducing burglaries from homes and cars and robberies, and improving traffic safety (Municipality of Antwerp 2005: 21).

2.3 – Instruments and measures

Antwerp's public safety policy involves a wide range of instruments and measures. Again, it involves a combination of area-oriented and individual-oriented approaches, centralised and decentralised projects and prevention combined with a repressive approach.

The Safety Project Unit

The Safety Project Unit regulates all outsourced projects, and measures the results of those projects against effort indicators. The Safety Project Unit is responsible for external project implementation. It has developed a safety and nuisance index: a mix of objective crime figures per neighbourhood and objective nuisance data (fly tipping, condemned houses) and subjective nuisance data based on key respondents. At the federal level, the Project Unit participates in the biannual safety monitor. The combination of objective data and a professional view provides sufficient clarity about the developments in safety levels.

Area-oriented approach

Based on the nuisance analyses, 13 neighbourhoods have been defined where the neighbourhood coordination project operates (www.antwerpen.be 2006a; City Safety Plan 2004: 20-21). Neighbourhood coordinators focus on social and physical nuisance, societal problems, lack of safety and perceived lack of safety. They have no regulatory power, but they bring together all possible departments, projects, residents' associations and initiatives. This provides sufficient exchange of information and coordination between the parties involved (www.antwerpen.be 2006a). An approach is defined that is specific to the problems in that particular neighbourhood. The departments and organisations form neighbourhood teams and surveillance networks to define scenarios describing actions and measures to reduce the level of nuisance and improve the quality of living in the neighbourhood, under the auspices of the neighbourhood coordinator. The neighbourhood coordinators use a simple model, known as the SafetyMix, as a coordination instrument for systematically identifying suggestions for improvement in the area of reducing nuisance and improving the quality of living. Relevant information from

the SafetyMix can also be discussed at higher levels, such as in the Zonal Safety Council (City Safety Plan 2004: 21-24).

An extension of full-time neighbourhood coordination is the system of temporary Neighbourhood's Turn ('*Buurt aan de Beurt*') campaigns to increase the visibility of the neighbourhood coordination. These campaigns are used to draw people's attention to the themes of a tidy, whole or repaired, safe and pleasant neighbourhood, using informative and sometimes humorous methods. Various actors, such as municipal services, the police and residents get together to improve the neighbourhood's appearance. During these week-long campaigns, special attention is devoted to traffic safety and various forms of nuisance, while anything on and around the street that is broken is repaired and the neighbourhood is cleaned up. At the same time, various organisations in the neighbourhood arrange sociable initiatives. The idea is that the communal approach will ensure that the neighbourhood will remain tidy, safe, repaired and friendly after the campaign. The Neighbourhood's Turn team set about in sixteen neighbourhoods in 2006 (www.antwerpen.be 2006b).

Besides these neighbourhood actions, the controversial 'X-stra!' project is also used to tackle hotspot. Under 'X-stra!', house calls are paid, to inspect the living conditions and to determine whether everything is all right in terms of work, living, wellbeing and integration. The door-to-door checks serve a repressive as well as a social purpose. A striking example is the immediate repatriation of eleven individuals who did not have valid residency permits, despite this aspect having been removed from the project by the alderman (*Het Nieuwsblad* 2006; *Tijd* 2005a). This campaign caused a great deal of discussion about privacy and confidentiality (*Tijd* 2005b).

Individual-oriented approach; subject group regulation
Perpetrators and high-risk groups are tackled using subject group regulation. Explicit perpetrator and client regulation, file creation and case management have been introduced. Juvenile repeat offenders, juvenile hangers-on, Balkan children, repeat offenders with addictions, high-risk families and litterers are the subject groups defined (City Safety Plan 2004: 25-27). For each of these six subject groups' plans of action are designed for tackling perpetrators. Each juvenile discussed is placed in a process with a contract laying down measures and actions. Some plans are simple, such as providing more forcefulness to the methods for tackling juvenile repeat offenders and hangers-on, by imposing home detention as a form of punishment. Other subject groups require more stringent policy efforts, for example children whose residency status is unclear such as Balkan children. The approach also has to take account of human rights ethics and repatriation policies (City Safety Plan 2004: 25). The coordination instrument used is the Safety Path Terminal (*Veilig Traject Terminal*, or 'VTT'). A VTT path is defined based on an individual-oriented approach, and can be monitored through a centrally managed case management system. VTT is used to coordinate criminal-law and educational interventions (City Safety Plan 2004: 27-29).

Problem juveniles are the largest subject group for which the system of case management has been introduced. They do not require major policies, but rather micro management, i.e. management at the level of individual cases. The Project Unit is working on approximately 200 files. Each hotshot is sent a letter and receives a visit from the municipal administration. They are not obliged to accept the offer, but if they do not

the Project Unit will contact the Public Prosecution Service, which can then impose obligatory case management and house calls as an alternative measure. This makes it unnecessary to introduce new legislation.

Citywide programme regulation
Besides neighbourhood and subject group regulation, Antwerp has a number of citywide programmes, responsible leaders in the city. The programmes in question are the following (City Safety Plan 2004: 29-32): camera surveillance at hotspots, administrative municipal sanctions to reduce nuisance (societal problems, antisocial behaviour), the 'Vzw OK' quality mark (for meeting places for immigrants causing nuisance), social and alternative work in neighbourhood management, neighbourhood mediation by older juveniles, subsidies for immigrant social and cultural work and de-concentrated drug therapy.

Administrative municipal sanctions
The new nuisance law states that municipal authorities are authorised to prosecute perpetrators of infringements directly in certain situations. This constitutes a major development, which runs contrary to the separation of powers. In practice, after one year – a codex has been introduced – and having issued thousands of tickets, the Safety Project Office has no arrears. Similarly, measures that previously came under the scope of the Mayor's responsibilities, e.g. shutting down cafes, also fall under this header. Part of the tickets was transferred from the police (primarily for nuisance) to the Project Unit rather than to the Public Prosecution Service.

3 – Differences and similarities
Both in Rotterdam and in Antwerp, many different parties are involved in the process of increasing safety. Both cities demonstrate a great deal of administrative, political and societal activity. The range of different instruments and measures deployed by the two cities show many similarities, but also differences. Other parallels can also be identified.

3.1 – National and local
A consideration of the backgrounds of the local public safety policies in the two countries reveals that the first national integrated safety plans in the Netherlands date back to 1993. They were followed by a programme that focused more on implementing measures. Regulation underwent a shift from being primarily facilitating to being primarily obligatory; from only providing resources to also laying down requirements. In large municipalities, however, local public safety policies had emerged previously, necessitated by a certain urgency, since the pressure on the local administrations had increased. In 1993, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht petitioned the national government with a request to introduce a national initiative to tackle safety problems. Those four municipalities were then asked to present proposals. National initiatives are based on those proposals. The national government followed current projects that were already in place in large municipalities. In a later phase, regulation became stricter, and national policy plans were created.

An important impulse in recent years is the second Balkenende government's Safety Programme, which identifies municipal authorities as regulators. The Dutch Ministry of

the Interior and Kingdom Relations will focus much more explicitly on local integrated public safety policy. The Dutch government has gradually developed a clear view on local public safety policy. Whereas the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations previously considered itself to be the policymaker, the Third Large City Policy document (*Grote Stedenbeleid III*) shows a shift to a role in which the Ministry makes clear agreements about what the municipal authorities are to deliver. However, implementation is to be effected at the lowest and most decentralised level possible. In other words, regulation is now effected remotely and based on arrangements. The Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations primarily assists municipal authorities and provides expertise and experience by way of the Core Public Safety Policy guide, the Safe Municipalities project and the Netherlands Centre for Crime Prevention and Community Safety.

A similar development can be discerned in Belgium. There, too, national initiatives are being introduced that are copies of or are based on those introduced in cities, in this case Antwerp and Mechelen. A national framework policy paper has been prepared as a new instrument, ten years later than in the Netherlands. Very recently, concrete initiatives were introduced in Belgium at federal and provincial level to encourage local public safety policy. The federal framework policy paper on Integrated Safety, from 2004, was intended as a means of presenting the priorities defined in the coalition agreement as a framework for comprehensive and integrated public safety policy. The framework policy paper forms the basis for both an overall federal public safety policy and the preparation of detailed annual operational plans. It is also intended as a means for giving shape to the federal government's responsibility for local safety (Framework Policy Paper IV 2004: 4). Local public safety policy is encouraged as the foundation for the policies of all other partners in the chain, which should correspond to the principles defined in the framework policy paper. Municipalities that fall within one police zone must coordinate their public safety policies. In addition, federal and local policy cycles are to be coordinated, as are the judicial and political policy cycles. Explicit policy priorities and permanent issues in public safety policy are terrorism, several forms of organised crime, large-scale social, economic and financial fraud (white collar crime), neighbourhood crime, traffic and nuisance. Attention is also required for crimes against persons (intra-family violence, kidnappings by parents, child abuse and sexual violence), crimes that compromise the safety of food, and racism and xenophobia (Framework Policy Paper IV 2004: 8).

Since the 1990s, Belgium has been developing a national safety plan for the police force. This means that policies are clearly being developed at the national level in Belgium, and attempts are being made to regulate matters nationally and provide assistance to municipal authorities. Belgian municipalities receive funding to focus on specific national priorities, while at the same time they are given sufficient opportunity to tackle their own local problems and follow local priorities. Under the Federal Large City Policy, funding is used to focus on other priorities, such as the Neighbourhood's Turn campaigns. Regulation is effected through funding, and subsequently policy frameworks and priorities. The country is rapidly drawing level. On paper, police priorities and integrated public safety policies are coordinated at the federal level (Marks & Van Sluis 2006).

3.2 – Local political and administrative control and regulation

Despite the differences in names and sizes, the municipal administrations of the two cities have virtually identical responsibilities and powers. The balance of political power has shifted in both cities: in Rotterdam, Leefbaar Rotterdam joined the Municipal Executive, whereas the Cordon Sanitaire kept Vlaams Belang out of Antwerp's Municipal Executive.

The concept of decentralisation is evident in both cities, because the municipal districts in both Rotterdam and Antwerp have their own administrations, since this makes it easier to respond to local needs and requirements. Despite the fact that the Municipal Administration is made up of multiple individuals, and both cities had alderman for Safety, the Mayors of both cities are responsible for public order and safety as set out in the respective municipal bylaws. Municipal regulation of public safety policy in Rotterdam is the responsibility of the Steering Committee Safety, which coordinates public safety policy on behalf of the Municipal Executive and is responsible for supra-district problems. Antwerp has a similar structure, although there the responsibility lied with the alderman for Integrated Safety, in close consultation with the Mayor. In both cities, the responsible parties are assisted by a civil service organisation around which the public safety policy revolves; in Rotterdam that is the Safety Directorate, and in Antwerp it is the Integrated Safety Project Unit. In Rotterdam, regulation at the decentralised level is the responsibility of the municipal districts, since those bodies are closest to the people, while city marines regulate matters in specific problem neighbourhoods.

Reinforcement of the municipal regulation
Rotterdam is a leading example of the administrative organisation for safety-related matters. This is mirrored by the developments in Belgium. Antwerp is aiming toward a greater degree of regulation and a more explicit regulatory role for the municipal administration, i.e. the concept of a strong government. The philosophy of Rotterdam's former Safety Programme Department has served as a source of inspiration for the design of Antwerp's Integrated Safety Project Unit. Inspiration was also found in the United Kingdom, with community policing on the one hand and the subject group policy on the other. Antwerp already had an established tradition of prevention, of which the primary examples are social work projects in the private sphere, with volunteers. However, the city could not regulate these, and also lacked an enforcer. Antwerp has now opted for strict municipal regulation by the Integrated Safety Business Unit, which was set up for the purpose of breaking through the system of administrative islands and providing strong administrative support for the implementation of the public safety policy.

New Public Management
The parallel with the Dutch regulatory model with a stronger administration fails in terms of becoming businesslike. Rotterdam's approach is characterised by strict municipal regulation, using 'standard formats', by concrete and quantifiable targets and by accountability for results (Netherlands Court of Audit 2005). The motto in Rotterdam is 'more implementation and less policy'. The municipal districts also regulate their partners based on the predefined performance agreements, with the assistance of the Safety Programme Department. Antwerp lacks the focus on businesslike management

and the reliance on New Public Management[4]. There is resistance against the concept of performance orientation. Partly for that reason, Antwerp finds it difficult to identify with Rotterdam's approach, out of fear for perverted effects that will impair the envisioned effect and results of performance orientation (cf. Van Sluis & Van Thiel 2003: 23). However, Antwerp's public safety policy is demonstrating a greater focus on policy results. In the Netherlands, performance orientation is impending for local safety: the example of performance orientation in the police forces will be carried over to local public safety policies. This development has not – or not yet – occurred in Belgium.

3.3 – Comparison between policy dynamics
Both cities have experienced turning points in their local public safety policies. In Rotterdam, the change was characterised by a shift in the 1990s from projects to a systematic approach and from anti-vandalism to a broader orientation. Policy then shifted from a broad, systematic approach to a result-oriented approach aimed at various specific issues and from issues of crime to issues of quality of living (cf. Van de Bunt 2006). Rotterdam broke with existing trends in various respects. Informal cooperation, often a characteristic of local public safety policy, was replaced by obligations. Horizontal regulatory facilities were supplemented with vertical facilities. The purpose of the change in policy was to reinforce the regulatory role and power of the local administration and to increase the cohesion between various separate projects. Especially in neighbourhood safety campaigns the various related measures are intended to improve safety, quality of living and social cohesion. The scope of these measures is not limited to reducing crime, nuisance and perceived lack of safety. The Rotterdam Audit Department has announced that the past ten years have been characterised by a general continuity in terms of the substance of neighbourhood safety policies. The changes in policy essentially concern the increased emphasis on policy implementation, which is visible in the system developed and strictly applied for the neighbourhood safety programmes and the identification of targets and definition of choices (Rotterdam Audit Department 2005: 12).

In Antwerp a change is visible too. Previously, the policy was put forward as a comprehensive plan. The intention was to tackle every facet together, with a large number of ambitions, in which everything and everyone had to work together. The Municipal Safety Plan is an administrative annex to the Zonal Safety Plan, and sets out its own administrative view of safety that revolves around the priorities of the partners in the Zonal Safety Council, formalising the city's involvement with those priorities. A change has been realised in this approach to policy. The new policy is more realistic, less pretentious, more concrete and more specific. For example, everyone has to work on their own core responsibilities, and not continually discuss matters. A change has occurred in intentions and regulatory philosophy; the policies are more specific than they were previously, with better targets, and are aimed more at implementation than on policy, and have shifted from comprehensive and pretentious to concrete.

3.4 – Instruments and measures
Monitoring

---

[4] However, the police are aware that in an integrated approach to safety, a greater degree of cooperation with public-private organisations will result in savings in terms of costs and capacity, allowing local police forces to focus more on their 'core business' (De Kimpe 2007).

A difference can be seen in the ways in which the two municipalities deal with monitoring safety and the quality of living, and the related policies. Whereas Rotterdam retains control of the monitoring, with the Safety Index that it publishes every year, Antwerp handles matters on a smaller scale. As in Rotterdam, Antwerp generates data for each neighbourhood, primarily concerning objective crime and nuisance figures. But unlike in Rotterdam, where over thirteen thousand people are asked about their perceptions of safety, only a small number of key respondents are asked about their subjective nuisance data. But then again, Antwerp participates in the biannual federal safety monitor.

Area-oriented approach
In imitation of both the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, Antwerp has adopted a neighbourhood-oriented approach. Nevertheless, the regulation of the decentralised approach and the enforcement authority are much more limited than in Rotterdam, for example. In Rotterdam, the municipal districts regulate matters based on a mandate, and Rotterdam's city marines serve as coordinators with an enforcing authority to tackle and resolve urgent neighbourhood problems. If agreements are unlikely to be fulfilled, for example as a result of stagnating cooperation, the city marine has the power to enforce cooperation from the partners (Marks *et al.* 2006; Nandoe 2006). The Antwerp neighbourhood coordinators are not city marines as in Rotterdam, but rather community workers who have to make do with their ability to convince people. The neighbourhood coordinators have few powers and little authority to enforce matters, and as such are more similar in function to Amsterdam's neighbourhood coordinators than Rotterdam's city marines. In Antwerp, cooperation within the neighbourhoods is much more voluntary, with the neighbourhood coordinator greasing the axles of the cooperation.

Rotterdam uses the experiences gained in previous years with both intervention teams and with the Municipal Personal Records Database and cooperation and exchanges of information between municipal services. Those instruments, combined with a street surveillance model, are intended to improve the degree of cooperation between the various actors and so result in a more effective approach to surveillance and enforcement on the streets. Some of these characteristics are also discernable in Antwerp's SafetyMix, which serves as a coordination instrument for systematically identifying suggestions for improvement in the area of reducing nuisance and improving the quality of living in the neighbourhood.

Antwerp's system of house calls (X-stra!) was copied from Rotterdam. Whereas Rotterdam's intervention teams relatively soon were regarded as an effective and meaningful instrument, Antwerp continues to experience a great deal of controversy about those teams, in terms of privacy. One policy desired by Antwerp is to invest even more heavily in enforcement, in line with the Dutch policy. Considering the commotion caused by the City Safety Plan and the debates about loss of privacy and the ignoring of rules of law, the hard, repressive discourse that is currently on the rise in the Netherlands is still encountering heavy resistance in Belgium. The institutional context, which is in some ways different from that in the Netherlands, is one factor. Visiting people in their homes is seen as an important instrument. The problem, however, is that Belgian policy on reducing social fraud has not been decentralised sufficiently. For example, social

safety fraud inspections are organised at the federal level. Moreover, the visits are under scrutiny from the Privacy Commission and the media.

Antwerp has only a small amount of social housing, and as a result fewer regulatory instruments than Rotterdam. Moreover, in Belgian municipalities, welfare benefits can only be paid own through the public centre for social welfare OCMW. In other words, the local authorities do not pay unemployment benefits and consequently are unwilling and unable to bring any influence to bear through that path, since they have no interest in doing so.

Individual-oriented approach

The individual-oriented approaches adopted by the two cities are characterised by extensive background descriptions of the persons involved, which are used to define individual processes in which measures and actions are laid down. Although there are differences in the types of subject groups, there are similarities such as juveniles and repeat offenders, but there are also evident differences (owing to the cities' demographics) such as between the PGA Antilleans in Rotterdam and the Balkan children in Antwerp. In both cities, the individual-oriented approaches are characterised by not only focusing on the repressive side, but also creating future prospects. The system of city marines is an instrument that is used for both the area-oriented approach and the individual-oriented approach. City marines are suited to Rotterdam's typical way of handling safety. This system does not have any equivalent in Antwerp.

Sanctioning

Antwerp's Integrated Safety Project Unit has taken over a large number of the police's unprocessed fines and succeeded in collecting them. After one year, the Project Unit has issued a large number of tickets, without creating any arrears. Rotterdam would like to see the new legislative proposal for 'Administrative Fines' passed, which would allow the municipal authorities to take immediate measures; in other words, the municipal authorities would like to hire more people for City Surveillance, whose primary concern would then be matters such as dog dirt, litter and suchlike. In this case, Antwerp is ahead of Rotterdam.

4 – Conclusions

In both Rotterdam and Antwerp, increased political involvement served as an important trigger for the development of local public safety policies. The increased level of intensity in the efforts put forward to create an integrated approach stems in part from the desire to take the wind out of the sails of Vlaams Belang. This appears to have been partially successful. These policy dynamics are similar to those in Rotterdam, during the rise of Pim Fortuyn and Leefbaar Rotterdam, albeit that the contrasts in Antwerp are much greater. One of the reasons why Leefbaar Rotterdam could seize power was because it had made safety the leading issue in its election programme. The balance of political power has shifted in both cities: in Rotterdam, Leefbaar Rotterdam joined the Municipal Executive, whereas the Cordon Sanitaire kept Vlaams Belang out of Antwerp's Municipal Executive.

This analysis shows that Antwerp was indisputably inspired by Dutch examples, although not just from Rotterdam. In many ways, Antwerp's public safety policy mirrors

that or Amsterdam rather than that of Rotterdam. Antwerp's Mayor, Patrick Janssens, subscribes to the concept of 'keeping things together', a quote by Mayor Cohen of Amsterdam. That is more important than the hard, number-focused performance that is so typical of Rotterdam's approach, the Mayor announced in *de Volkskrant* (Dirks 2006). The repressive and zero-tolerance discourse that is typical of Rotterdam encounters resistance in Antwerp.

However, the range of different instruments and resources deployed in Antwerp is in many ways similar to the mix of instruments that are characteristic of Rotterdam's approach to safety: a combination of area-oriented and individual-oriented approaches, of centralised and decentralised projects and of prevention combined with a repressive approach and a desire for cohesion.

Both cities have undergone changes in their ways of dealing with lack of safety: from high-flying ambitions about integral methods on paper and a 'range of separate projects' in practice to less comprehensive, but more realistic policies with concrete targets combined with stricter municipal regulation. Cooperation with the police forces has also been reorganised.

In both countries, regulation from above has been reinforced. In this respect, Belgium is drawing level, in a way similar to the Netherlands only years later. Any arrears in Belgium in terms of developing local public safety policies are now being made good, if Antwerp can be taken as an indicative example. Differences exist in terms of dynamics, time, conception and developments.

5 – Literatuur

Bunt, H. van de (2006) Het Rotterdamse veiligheidsbeleid onder de loep, *Panopticon* 2, 58-67

City Safety Plan (2004) *Stadsplan Veilig*. Projecteenheid Veilig

De Tijd (2005a) 103 illegalen betrapt bij huis-aan-huiscontroles: elf personen gepatrieerd door xstra!'', in: *De Tijd* 23 december 2005.

De Tijd (2005b) Antwerps stadsbestuur start huis-aan-huiscontroles: actiegroep Basta! Protesteert'', in: *De Tijd* 4 november 2005.

Dirks, B. (2006) Stamhoofd van Antwerpen, in: *de Volkskrant* (17 juni 2006)

Framework Policy Paper IV (2004) *Kadernota Integrale Veiligheid*, De Algemene Directie voor Veiligheids- en Preventiebeleid: Antwerpen

Goede, X. de, K. Shoekhlal en C. Nortan (2005) *Het Hot Spot-beleid: in het kader van stedelijke ontwikkelingen en stedelijk beleid*, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam: Rotterdam

Haan, W. J. M. de (1997) *Evaluatie integraal veiligheidsbeleid: een verkennende studie in Amsterdam en Rotterdam*, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau: Rijswijk

Harchoui, S. (2004) *Interventieteams: Ervaring met gekleurde situaties*. Forum, Tuhuteru en partners

Het Nieuwsblad (2006) Wijkagent voor wie huisbezoek weigert; ANTWERPEN Stad koppelt repressief element aan omstreden X-stra, *Het Nieuwsblad*

Kimpe, S. de (2007) Het bedrijfsmatig denken bij de Vlaamse Politie, *Tijdschrift voor Veiligheid* 6(1), 63-77

Marks, P. en A. van Sluis (2006) Laat vertrokken en toch op tijd? Lokaal veiligheidsbeleid in Antwerpen, een voorlopige stand van zaken, *Tijdschrift voor Veiligheid* 5(4), 5-18

Marks, P., A. van Sluis en N. Baaij (2006) Afspraak is afspraak? Leren omgaan met prestatiegestuurde aanpak van veiligheid, *Bestuurskunde* 3, 91-101

Municipality of Antwerp 2003 (2003) *Stadsprogramma Leefbare Stad 2003-2007*

Municipality of Antwerp (2005) *Lokale politie Antwerpen. Zonaal veiligheidsplan 2005-2008. Kennisneming. Concretisering beleidsrichtlijn*, Stad Antwerpen

Municipality of Rotterdam (2001) *Veiligheid in Rotterdam. Bouwstenen voor een vijfjarenprogramma*; *Gemeente Rotterdam*, Programmabureau Veilig: Rotterdam

Municipality of Rotterdam (2002) *Het nieuwe elan van Rotterdam ... en zo gaan we dat doen: collegeprogramma 2002-2006*, Gemeente Rotterdam. College van Burgemeester en Wethouders: Rotterdam

Municipality of Rotterdam (2003) *Veiligheidsindex 2003, meting van de veiligheid in Rotterdam: rapportage bevolkingsenquête januari-februari 2003 en feitelijke criminaliteitsgegevens en stadsgegevens over 2002*, Programmabureau Veilig

Municipality of Rotterdam (2004) *Veiligheidsindex 2004, meting van de veiligheid in Rotterdam: rapportage bevolkingsenquête januari-februari 2004 en feitelijke criminaliteitsgegevens en stadsgegevens over 2003*, Programmabureau Veilig

Municipality of Rotterdam (2006) *Veiligheidsindex 2006, meting van de veiligheid in Rotterdam: rapportage bevolkingsenquête januari 2006 en feitelijke criminaliteitsgegevens en contextgegevens over 2005*, Programmabureau Veilig

Nandoe, M. (2006) *Daar komen de stadsmariniers*, Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam

Netherlands Court of Audit (2005) *Aanpak lokaal veiligheidsbeleid*, Algemene Rekenkamer, Sdu Uitgevers: 's-Gravenhage

Safety Programme Department (2002) *Vijfjarenactieprogramma Veiligheid Rotterdam, voorjaar 2002; Stand van zaken*. Programmabureau Veilig, Rotterdam

Safety Programme Department (2006) *Samenwerken aan veiligheid: voorkomen en handhaven'. Vijfjarenactieprogramma veilig, Rotterdam 2006-2010*. Programmabureau Veilig, Rotterdam

Council for Public Administration (2002) *Partners in veiligheid; Van verantwoordingsbocht naar lokale verantwoordelijkheid*, Raad voor het Openbaar Bestuur, Den Haag

Rotterdam Audit Department (2005) *Veilig zijn, veilig voelen: uitvoering wijkveiligheidsbeleid op koers*, Rekenkamer Rotterdam

Sluis, A. van en S. van Thiel (2003) Mogelijkheden en onmogelijkheden van prestatiesturing bij de Nederlandse politie, *Het Tijdschrift voor Veiligheid en Veiligheidszorg* 2(4), 18-31

www.antwerpen.be (2006a) *Buurtregie*, http://www.antwerpen.be/eCache/BTH/600.cmVjPTQyMjg.html, bezocht 27-07-2006

www.antwerpen.be (2006b) *Buurt aan de Beurt*, http://www.antwerpen.be/eCache/BTH/600.cmVjPTQ5MzE.html, bezocht 27-07-2006

www.rotterdam.nl (2007) *College stelt invoering nieuwe huisvestingsvergunning in vier wijken voor*,
http://www.rotterdam.nl/smartsite1144.dws?MainMenu=0&goto=2091443&channel=182&substyle={sstl}, bezocht 21-03-2007

www.stadskrant-rotterdam.nl (2004) *Interventieteams pakken problemen huis-voor-huis aan*, http://www.stadskrant-rotterdam.nl/read/nummer-2-2004/interventieteams, bezocht 21-02-2007