All work, no play?

How the city of Rotterdam can balance a liveable city with facilitating its cultural nightlife.

Name: Wouter Drost.

Student number: 416014.

Supervisor: Frans Brouwer.

Faculty: Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication.

University: Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Programme: Master Thesis Cultural Economics and Entrepreneurship.

Date: June 15, 2019.

Abstract.

Over the last years, there has been growing friction between the Rotterdam nightlife sector and the city's municipality. Complaints of miscommunication, lack of vision and lack of responsibility have been uttered by both sides. Therefore, this research asks: to what extent can the municipality of Rotterdam balance its cultural nightlife with the liveability of the city in the coming years? The study comprises examinations of existing theory on cultural nightlife, liveability, successful cultural policy measures and in-depth, semi-structured interviews with a range of different stakeholders and actors of the Rotterdam nightlife sector. The results of the interviews were categorised in the core themes relating to nightlife (facilitation). While the discussion on individual themes and concepts lead to quite universal ideas and visions, it found that the issue of a city's nightlife as a whole is complex and interwoven with almost all other facets of organising city life. Some possible focus points for nightlife policy were identified as a result of the interviews, but to truly facilitate a safe, varied and flourishing nightlife, long-term vision, intense collaboration, customization and multi-disciplinary approaches within and between the municipality and external bodies are necessary.

Keywords: cultural nightlife, cultural policy, Rotterdam, liveability, nightlife facilitation, nightlife regulation.

Acknowledgements.

I am someone who was born and has lived most of his life in the city of Rotterdam. As a result, unconditional love and appreciation for this city, its facilities and its citizens has grown over the years. Having also partaken in the city's nightlife for more than 10 years now, this love and appreciation also includes the venues, the creatives, the performers, the audiences and the people that facilitate and regulate the city's nightlife. Researching the nightlife and the city's liveability is therefore something that seemed logical to me and people who knew me. Whereas first, I was just a consumer of the nightlife (on an incidental basis also partaking in the production), I now also have in-depth knowledge on the sector's and municipal visions and experiences, thereby changing my own notions of them greatly. I understand the eagerness of creative entrepreneurs and their frustration with some regulation, but I also have gained a deep respect for the policy makers that have to work with intricate bureaucratic systems and departments while aiming to improve this city.

On a personal level, it felt strange writing this thesis in a period of so much global turmoil, often leaving me with the question: why am I doing this, as well as having to deal with uncertainty and panic in my own life and that of the people close to me at some times. Therefore, I would hereby like to thank my parents, for helping me wherever they can and always being there for me. The same goes for my friends, whose thoughts, opinions and discussions (on the subject matter of this thesis, the global and local events as well as life itself) have helped greatly over the last few months. Last, but certainly not least, I have to thanks my supervisor Frans Brouwer. Especially in the first few months of our collaboration, I was sometimes severely lacking in our communication, partly to do with some internal struggles of my own. However, despite this, he kept on supporting and encouraging me, always looking at my work with a keen eye and critical mindset. Without his work and patience, this thesis would not have been completed. I hope you enjoy reading it, enjoy it and learn about the complex concept of nightlife.

Table of Contents.

1. Introduction.

1.1. Relevance

For the last few years, Rotterdam's popularity has risen across national borders. Articles from the New York Times (Bolt, 2018), CNN (Forster, 2017) and travel mediums such as the Culture Trip (Coggins, 2017) and Lonely Planet (Koning, 2015) have praised Rotterdam, urging people to come to Rotterdam because it's "lively, contemporary and culturally rich" (Bolt, 2018), "Europe's new capital of cool" (Forster, 2017) and "renowned for its diverse nightlife" (Coggins, 2017). This praise would indicate that Rotterdam is a vibrant, exciting city where everybody can find something to fit his or her needs and wants, but looks can be deceiving.

Articles concerning the 'distance' between the municipality and its citizens ("Minder klachten", 2017), detrimental bureaucracy (Koning, 2019), gentrification issues (Veelen, 2019a, Veelen, 2019b) and overall overconfident decision making ("Gemeente Rotterdam neemt te veel risico's", 2019) are popping up. Recently, lots of complaints regarding the city's policies towards cultural nightlife have also been voiced by some media. Since 2008, the number of clubs has halved ("De discotheek & club in beeld", 2017); there is night time license mismanagement (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a); bureaucratic mistakes leading to cancelled plans (Guido van Eijck, 2019); and voices uttering the municipality is neglecting its cultural nightlife (Geluk & Lewis, 2019b). These articles thus seem to indicate there are still plenty of improvements possible for both the city as a whole and the Rotterdam nightlife.

The above voiced criticisms have multiple origins according to their writers: some mention not enough attention for individual circumstances (of both its citizens and entrepreneurs), some mention a lack of internal communication and others argue there are failings in the overall bureaucratic system of the municipality. The direct social relevance and underlying reasoning for this research are the recent setbacks with the areas of the Ferro Dome, Stadhuisplein and Schieblock. The Schieblock could rightly be called a cultural hotspot in Rotterdam. The current history of the Schieblock starts with the financial crisis in 2008, when there were a lot of vacant buildings. During this time, various (cultural) entrepreneurs rented spaces there, culminating in a wide variety of companies and spaces such as the architectural firm ZUS, pop stage Annabel, BAR, the Hiphop House, the Biergarten and several offices and studios for these companies and other artists. Over time, the conglomeration of these actors has created a 'creative incubator' for the city of Rotterdam, and the city "owes its prominent place on 'must-see' lists by, among others, the New York Times, Time Magazine and Lonely Planet, in part to the success of the Schieblock

and surroundings" (Rijnaard, 2018). However, the occupants of this area have been uncertain on the future of the area for years. Ever since 2009, an intricate and frankly confusing series of events and choices has led to a situation where the municipality owns the land and a large part of the buildings, but has lost over 50 million euros with the Schieblock (Van der Linden & Graaff, 2020), thus making it necessary for the municipality to try to make as much money as possible from the redevelopment of the area with high rise housing and offices. On the 28th of May 2020, the municipality voted to follow redevelopment plan 2a, with two large towers, offices on the side of the train tracks and a 'cultural hub' at the base of one of the two towers ("Schiekadeblok in ontwikkeling", 2019). In the recently released *Nota van Uitgangspunten* it is argued that nightlife and living do not combine well. It is because of this reason that all nighttime (after 11pm) licenses will disappear in that area. Kristiaan de Leeuw proprietor of former club BAR, current arcade hall Poing, and part of the winning bid for the Ferro Dome location has recently spoken about the current plans. It bothers him that they were immediately told there would be no options for nighttime venues. The select nightlife that would remain is allowed to open until 11pm. His complaints lie not with redeveloping the area, but with the 'black or white' mentality of the municipality. He argues that one of the reasons to turn BAR into an arcade hall, with dining possibilities and an underground room still able to host parties, was the willingness to create something more in line with the future plans of the area (De Leeuw, 2020).

Another plan for reinvigorating old buildings and neighbourhoods was the plan for starting a club, gallery and restaurant in the old buildings adjacent to the Ferro Dome (which is deemed industrial heritage). In 2017 the municipality offered entrepreneurs to hand in a tender for the renewed usage of the buildings, and the plans had to be nightlife related. De Leeuw and his Maatschappij Voor Volksgeluk (also the organisation responsible for BAR) won the contest. However the plans got cancelled eventually, leading to disputes in the media between the municipality and the entrepreneurs. The municipality argued the entrepreneurs did not honor made commitments, continually asking for postponement of payments. De Leeuw, on the other hand, complained about backroom politics by the Port of Rotterdam (the owners of the buildings) and that the municipality actively thwarted the process. He thinks that because of the housing shortage, the municipality "has to build many houses. Perhaps a club did not fit very well in the new vision. A lot has changed in recent years. I think it suited them well. Now they can decide on the building themselves again" (Berkelder, 2019).

The last example of recent friction between the sector and the municipality is the case of the Stadhuisplein. Since the mid-nineties a number of bars and clubs have been

situated there (some even much longer like Café 't Fust since 1961), cultivating their spot in the Rotterdam nightlife. However, in 2017 the municipality decided to use the buildings opposite the square for student housing. While student housing might seem to combine well with nightlife at first thought, there have been many noise complaints (Beek, 2019). The municipality issued the permit for renovating the office buildings into homes without considering noise restrictions, therefore, the renovators did not have to put in any sound isolation. After that, there have been a series of court cases, in which the judge ruled in favor of the venues, arguing the municipality should not decide to build homes 'just anywhere', that the Stadhuisplein is not a suitable environment for housing and that "the zoning plan paid too little attention to a good living environment in the center" (Beek, 2020).

The above mentioned cases seem to reinforce the notion that there is friction between the nightlife sector itself, (housing) corporations and the municipality. One voiced opinion is that the nightlife of Rotterdam is not seen as a priority by the mayor and his counsellors. However, in the policy documents relating to the nightlife of the city (which will be discussed later on), the municipality of Rotterdam expresses their desire to realize the city that is described in the above mentioned international news outlets, also in terms of its nightlife. As will be discussed at the end of chapter 2, the city's current policy documents speak of facilitating and upholding a vibrant and varied nightlife for its citizens. It seems that the willingness is there. This research therefore set out to identify what has created the current friction between the municipality on the one hand and the nightlife entrepreneurs, media and audiences of Rotterdam on the other and what can possibly be done to diminish this friction.

The above paragraphs already point to the social relevance of this research. What encapsulates this social relevance best however is the protest that was organised after the cancelation of the Ferro Dome plans. On the 20th of February 2019, a protest called *Opstaan voor de Nacht* was held to voice discontent on the current regulation and facilitation of nightlife by the municipality, getting national attention ("Rotterdammers demonstreren", 2019). An estimated 800 to 1500 people attended and a couple of thousand people voiced their support through the Facebook event that was created 4 days before the protest itself (Boer, 2019). It was a direct manifestation of the apparent friction, got the attention of the municipality as well as being one of the instigators for the formation of the N8W8, an independent advisory board, doing research and giving solicited and unsolicited advice to the nightlife sector as well as the municipality.

In terms of its scientific relevance, this research aims to add to the scientific literature in two distinct aspects. First there is a lack of scientific literature on the Rotterdam nightlife. The few examples that were found include research on urban surveillance (Van Liempt & Van Aalst, 2012), the role of bouncers (Van Liempt & Van Aalst, 2015), spatiotemporal differences in nightlife consumption (Brands, Schwanen, & van Aalst, 2014) and the festivalization of urban cultural policy in Porto and Rotterdam (Hitters, 2007). This research aims at adding to the scientific literature on Rotterdam nightlife, by combining views and experiences from different stakeholders to present a wide and in-depth look at the sector.

The second aspect of the scientific relevance of this study is the objective of presenting an extensive view of the sector as a whole, discussing almost all facets that accompany the facilitation of nightlife from a municipal perspective. During the research on the theoretical framework, it became clear that the large majority of nightlife studies often focus on one sole aspect of nightlife. Most concerned the social values participation in nightlife can have, the prevalence of drug use or the accompanying risks such as violence. Little literature actually tries to present an overlook of all the different subjects relating to nightlife. This study does, by looking at the possible values and risks of nightlife as well as the facilitation of it through municipal regulation.

1.2 Research questions.

The aim of this research is to provide readers with a theoretical framework on the values and risks of nightlife culture and to answer the following the main research question of this research:

- To what extent can the municipality of Rotterdam balance its cultural nightlife with the liveability of the city in the coming years?

Based on the research's conclusions, focus points and possible recommendations for cultural nightlife policy (for the municipality of Rotterdam) are given.

To create a complete picture and to reach the above mentioned aims, several sub-questions are also asked:

- What are the criteria to balance nightlife with the liveability of a city, specifically in Rotterdam?

- What are the social and economic values, cultural nightlife in Rotterdam can potentially bring?
- What are the risks accompanying cultural nightlife facilitation that are detrimental to Rotterdam's liveability?
- What are possible measures to prevent these risks?
- What are the policy measures the municipality of Rotterdam can take to improve the facilitation of its cultural nightlife, while minimizing its risks?

1.3 Structure of this thesis.

The second chapter of this thesis consists of the theoretical framework. This framework delves more deeply into the social and economic advantages of a city's cultural nightlife. However, there are also risks and unfavourable side-effects associated with cultural nightlife, which also are discussed. Finally, some already existing measurements to prevent or counter the aforementioned risks are looked at, as well as some current policies affecting the city's cultural nightlife. Chapter three summarizes the research methodology, explaining motivations behind the research strategy, design, sampling and data collection as well as the methods of analysis. The fourth chapter presents and expands on the results of the data collection and interviews, also discussing some overarching themes. Finally, the fifth chapter presents a summary of the results and expands on them in the form of conclusions on each of the different concepts as well as possible policy changes concerning the Rotterdam nightlife and closes with recommendations for further research.

2. Theoretical Framework.

The questions that were asked in the introduction give way to several important concepts. First, what values nightlife can provide for the city and its citizens? Secondly, we must conceptualize the risks that accompany nightlife. Thirdly, the prevention of these risks is explored and examined, along with possible measures based on existing literature. The different conceptualisations of liveability and research on the liveability of Rotterdam is also looked at, as well as the factors that contribute and are detrimental to it. Finally, some policy documents of the Rotterdam municipality concerning nightlife is summarized to outline its current view of and goals for nightlife.

These conceptualizations can help in providing the municipality of Rotterdam to improve the delicate balance the cultural nightlife finds itself in, as explained below. Rotterdam is a city of extremes. In 2014, Rotterdam was the city with the highest percentage of poverty, vandalism, violent crimes and unemployed in the Netherlands (Joosten, 2014). Thus, it is no surprise that in a research report by the municipality in 2018, they found that 66% of people not living in Rotterdam had the impression that Rotterdam is too busy, not very welcoming and suffers from criminality ("Imago-ambitie van rotterdam", 2018). The conclusion of the report was that it should invest in calm, spacious and affordable housing, improve safety, cleanliness and positive reporting of the city. Is it possible that this is where conflict with the cultural nightlife seems to come from?

As mentioned above, there are certain risks associated with nightlife culture of which several have been highlighted in the media. A study by the Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR) found that over half of the EUR students regularly takes drugs (Smaling, 2018), new housing has caused restrictive measures for the venues around Stadhuisplein (Beek, 2019), and a number of sexual assault cases has been linked to the former Club Vie (Oosterom, 2017). This indicates how the current goals of the municipality and (media portrayal of) nightlife clash at times.

The cultural nightlife in Rotterdam is a varied spectrum of types of places, genres as well as norms and values. It can range from small dark, underground clubs focussing on house and techno to large pop podiums presenting more widely accessible music; from small local pubs (the so-called 'bruine kroeg') to internationally focussed, trendy bars; and one can even argue that places like the Holland Casino and the Kunsthal are also included in the category of nightlife as they regularly hold nighttime events with entertainment. This research is focused on one specific sector of the cultural nightlife in Rotterdam, that of the nighttime music venue industry. The main conditions for these are: they are generally open until the early morning, serve liquor and offer visitors (live) music and dancing. This means

that places like Annabel, Bird, WORM and Rotown are included, while excluding places like Bar3, HipHopHuis, galleries and earlier mentioned places like casino's and museums.

While the municipality must 'keep everybody happy' and provide the possibilities and foundation for a diverse cultural nightlife, it seems the disharmony between this category and the municipality is large in the city of Rotterdam right now. This is seen in the plurality of news coverage it has received as well as the protest that was held in February last year ("Rotterdammers demonstreren", 2019). While there can be a difference between the opinions of the media and the overall perception of the citizens of Rotterdam on both the nightlife and the liveability of the city, the fact that the discussion (or attention thereof) has increased and intensified in the last years indicates it is a pressing question for the city of Rotterdam and its inhabitants.

2.1 Values of cultural nightlife.

There are several distinct but intertwined values that cultural nightlife has the assumed capacity to provide, namely economic, social and mental benefits. A city's cultural nightlife has garnered importance over the years as academic research has been done on its values.

2.1.1 Economic value of cultural nightlife.

Perhaps the most measurable value the cultural nightlife can bring a city is the economic impact it can have on an area or city. The *Guardian* estimated that the British nightlife earned over 66 billion pounds, employing almost 8% of the working population, and of "huge economic and cultural significance" (Miller, 2016). Ariel Palitz, the senior executive director of the Office of Nightlife in New York City, claims that nightlife in New York generates "$35.1bn in economic activity, and nearly $700m in local tax revenue" (Faarea, 2019). Finally, a research by the Club Commission has reported that the nightlife in Berlin has attracted over three million visitors yearly, provides over 9.000 people with a job directly, thousands more indirectly and in total, provided the city with a little less than €1.5 billion (Lee, 2019).

Similarly impressive figures can be found for the sector in the Netherlands. In 2016, it was estimated that just the Dutch dance sector employs over 13.000 people and brings in €674 million annually (Sisson, 2016). RTL estimated that the famous ADE (Amsterdam Dance Event) has boosted the local economy by €60 million in 2016 ("Dansend rijk worden", 2016). The most recent extensive report on the club scene in Rotterdam by the RRKC (Rotterdamse Raad voor Kunst en Cultuur) has estimated that in 2009 (in the midst of the financial crisis), the sector had a revenue of around €30 million (2010).

Glaeser, Kolko, and Saiz (2001) argue the welfare gain of cultural consumption amenities in cities has increased dramatically and that the future of cities depend on their capacity to become 'consumer havens' in order to remain economically strong. Because of increasing globalization, the competition between cities, both on a national and international level, has increased severely. In order to attract the higher educated working force, as well as tourists, cultural consumption amenities were (and are still to this day) increasingly used to market the city, promoting a certain kind of image to the rest of the world. Darchen concurred with this as he also argues that urban planning and policy making in respect to cultural consumption is an important "means to economic development in the context of economic globalization" (Darchen, 2013, p.191).

Besides its influence on the city's image, cultural nightlife has other economic values. While difficult to map, nightlife also has numerous economic spillover effects. Think of spending in the hospitality sector (hotel stays for artists), transport fares (both artists and audiences) but also the work photographers and graphic designers obtain from nightlife venues or the works artists produce for other, non-nightlife companies. Markusen and King call it 'artistic dividend' and argue that "the productivity of and earnings in a regional economy rise as the incidence of artists within its boundaries increases, because artists' creativity and specialized skills enhance the design, production and marketing of products and services in other sectors" (Markusen & King, 2003, p.3).

Finally, I want to touch upon the concept of 'third places'. It's a term coined by sociologist Ray Oldenburg and encompasses places that have a social setting that aren't home (first place) or work (second place) (Oldenburg & Brissett, 1982). Talk of third places mostly focuses on their social and mental values, so the concept will be examined more closely in the following paragraphs. However, arguments have been made that third places can benefit the economy by facilitating economic development of urban areas through spillover effects, as well as attracting investments, people and sometimes increasing the value of nearby properties (Cilliers, 2019 & Beck, 2009). Furthermore, Dijksterhuis claims that third places have the capacity to create jobs (Dijksterhuis, 2008) as regular human interactions and informal conversation have the capacity to give way to new ideas and innovations.

2.1.2 Social & mental values of cultural nightlife.

It is often argued nightlife is a generator of cohesion, helping individuals in their search for collective identity. Calafat et al. argued that nightlife is "an antidote against anonymity, a form of ritualisation of disorder that acts to question and also to preserve order", also noting

it was "an essential element for collective identity and health" (Calafat et al., 2003, p.45). Further on in the report, they argue that nightlife is "essential to personal health", but also beneficial for "learning communication strategies and […] acquiring social capital" (Calafat et al., 2003, p.289).

Nighttime music venues are 'third places'. According to Oldenburg and Brisset, third places have two defining characteristics, one of form and one of content. The characteristic of form that third places have is that of 'pure sociability'. Sociability is found in most of the associations we have on a daily basis. However, in most of our associations in daily life we engage in 'purposive association', where our sense of individuality is always subjected to power relations, and people's value is "predicated largely upon organizational criteria" (Oldenburg & Brissett, 1982, p.271). According to Oldenburg & Brisset, with pure sociability, "the surrender of outward status is rewarded by unqualified acceptance into human fellowship", and is described as "the most purely democratic experience life can offer" (1982, p.271).

The other defining characteristic of a third place, that of content, is 'non discursive symbolism'. Discursive symbolism relates to the style and quality of conversation when individuals pursue rational ends. Non discursive symbolism on the other hand, takes place in the "free and uninhibited atmosphere of third place fellowship" (Oldenburg & Brissett, 1982, p.272). It is not focused on contractual bonds or power relations, but on the social and spiritual bond between people. This kind of conversation removes schemes and strategies of self-interest while giving people (to the extent they participate in it) a sense of unity, belonging and continuity.

Third places aid community building, democracy, civic engagement and feelings of a sense of place. Cabras and Mount (2017) argue they are unique in the fact that they can both bridge and bond social capital thus strengthening relationships between and relationships within different social groups. Third places are therefore vital in "promoting the interests of the community as a whole instead of individual group interests" (Cabras & Mount, 2017, p.72).They also aid feelings of inclusivity, belonging and group participation "without the rigidity of policy or exclusiveness of club or organization membership" (Jeffres et al., 2009, p.336). The same study found that the availability and variety of third places greatly influence an individual's perception of the quality of life. Third places are therefore deemed "a vital component of urban life" (Cilliers, 2019, p.91).

Besides the research into third places, multiple studies have found similar effects for cultural nightlife participation. Sarah Thornton argued they are subcultural capital, which is less rigid than Bourdieu's conception and does not base itself on class-bound borders

(Lobato, 2006). Nightlife offers individuals "a potential space in which identities may be formed and reformed, tried on and discarded" (Lobato, 2006, p.65). Nightlife does not just provide hedonism and escapism. It is a place where ideas, speculation and values are exchanged, encapsulating the tacit knowledge that cities build upon.

There is a plurality of other papers that claim nightlife has similar mental and social benefits. They provide "inclusive environments that value diversity, acceptance and equity" (Adorean, Ilovan, & Gligor, 2017, p.28), are efficient in "forming identities" (Bolier et al., 2011, p.1569), aid "personal development" (Bianchini, 1995, p.124), taking up "social responsibilities" (Bogt et al., 2002, p. 157), and "generate subcultural variety and intensity" (Grazian, 2009, p.909). Besides its economic impact, cultural nightlife is valuable by providing a plethora of social and mental benefits.

2.2 Risks and negative effects of cultural nightlife.

The majority of available papers and research is concerned with risks and associated negative effects that nightlife can bring. Nightlife consumption has often been associated with violence, noise, sexual assault, substance abuse, transport accidents and gentrification, as well as contributing to the upkeep of social differentiation and its accompanying issues.

2.2.1 Gentrification.

Hae (2011) points to one of the most pressing negative outflows of nightlife, gentrification. He argues that nightlife venues are often one of the foundations in redeveloping derelict neighbourhoods, as they can create an ambiance of vivacious urbanality. Especially venues that are principal in the formation of inner-city sub-cultures, such as nighttime music venues and underground clubs, give character and feeling to a neighbourhood. This then attracts new inhabitants, reinvigorating the entire neighbourhoods, thereby contributing to social displacement. However, Hae also identified another outflow of gentrification, one that is also detrimental to the nighttime venues itself. It has been observed that nightlife venues that were originally instrumental in reinvigorating the neighbourhood, are then pushed out. This process is what Hae labeled as 'gentrification with and against nightlife'. This also affects the artists themselves, as the increased property values of gentrified neighbourhoods often leads to renting and buying prices that are not affordable for artists.

Because of differences in valorisation of nightlife subcultures by municipalities, cities have seen the variation diminish, in favour of venues that will not impede the 'quality of life' of the gentrified neighbourhoods. This renewed distinction has created an environment where the unconventional, innovative and creative venues that are instrumental in the

described social advantages of nightlife, but are less lucrative, have been nudged out of these neighbourhoods. Hae mentions a case study by Talbot, which found that the "perceived distinction between orderly and disorderly venues was often layered with a venue's "commercial viability or business competence"" (Hae, 2011, p.3451). It is argued these new distinctions also have frequently been affected by demographics such as class (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002) and race (Talbot, 2006), leading to 'sub-cultural closure' as "forms of wilder, experimental and culturally diverse nightlife are increasingly purged out of gentrifying neighbourhoods and replaced by gentrified forms of nightlife" (Hae, 2011, p.3451).

2.2.2 Substance (ab)use.

A simple Google Scholar search on nightlife literature will present an extensive amount of papers focussing on substance (ab)use amongst nightlife participants. Drugs have been known to have stimulant and hallucinogenic effects and are used to enhance endurance for dancing, as well as altering or stimulating sensory perceptions (Parks & Kennedy, 2004). Research on consuming drugs has found that the most often mentioned reasons for taking them are "experimentation, to enhance social and recreational activities, and to relax" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.296). There are three categories of reasons to take drugs: "tension-reduction or coping, experiencing the drug effect, and relating to peers" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.296).

2.2.2.1 Facts & figures.

Nightlife is often portrayed as an area of urban living in which substance abuse is permeated. Research on European nightlife drug consumption by the EMCDDA (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction) in 2015 found that drug use amongst frequent nightlife participants was "between 4 and 25 times higher than in the same age group in the general population" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.5), with significant percentages of cannabis (55%), ecstasy (37%) and cocaine (22%). A study by Calafat et al. (2007) questioning 2670 European youngsters from 9 different cities found that more than half (54.6%) of participants used illegal drugs in the preceding year. In a similar research, Calafat et al. found that over 53% of nightlife participants were consumers (C) of drugs, where "almost all C drank alcohol (95%), smoked (94%) and used cannabis (93%), and a substantial percentage used ecstasy (44%), cocaine (35%), LSD (22%) or speed (21%)" (Calafat et al., 2008, p.193).

There has also been quite some research on substance usage of nightlife participants in the Netherlands over the years. A study by Van der Poel et al. (2009) researching the use of cocaine found that young, nightlife consumers had the highest prevalence rates. Young nightlife participants in The Hague had a 23% chance of having used cocaine, while visitors of Amsterdam clubs had a 39% chance, whereas the average of the entire population was just 5%. Similarly, a 2013 study by the Trimbos Institute found that amongst people of the Dutch population, 61% of people under 35 who regularly visit nightlife venues have used ecstasy at least once in the year before (Goosens et al., 2013). In a follow-up research in 2016 (Monshouwer et al., 2016), similar statistics were found with the usage of alcohol (96%), tobacco (58%), cannabis (52%) and ecstasy (46%). Notable statistics were the rise of relatively new drugs like 4-FA (25%), nitrous oxide (37%), ketamine (12%), 2C-B (10%) and GHB (8%). The research concluded that the prevalence of using drugs for people regularly visiting nightlife venues was 7 to 8 times higher compared to peers from the general population.

2.2.2.2 Health complications.

It is commonly known that (almost all) drugs have a negative impact on one's health. A study by Parks & Kennedy aimed to identify all the possible effects of taking the so-called clubs drugs. However, the research also found 16 possible negative physical, mental and lifestyle effects after consuming clubs drugs. In terms of physical effects, 50-75% of individuals reported "profuse sweating, hot and cold flashes, tingling or numbness, and blurred vision" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.300). Additionally, 20-48% of interviewees experienced "memory lapse, shortness of breath, inability to urinate, vomiting, joint stiffness, stomach pains, headaches, heart palpitations, tremors or shakes, teeth problems, weight loss, loss of energy, and muscle aches" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.300). In terms of mental consequences 72% reported consistent troubles with sleeping, while 20-46% experienced "visual and auditory hallucinations, depression, confusion, anxiety, irritability, paranoia, and loss of sex urge" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.300). The research also questioned interviewees on long term negative quality of life consequences. 40% reported to experience "trouble maintaining their usual daily activities" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.300) and 20% experienced "financial and work trouble" (Parks & Kennedy, 2004, p.300). Surprisingly, only a small group of individuals experienced problems with aggression following the use of club drugs, with 14% experiencing verbal arguments, 14% experiencing physical aggression and 2% experiencing sexual aggression.

The long term effects of most drugs is still relatively unknown, as research on them is still ongoing. However, several results point to the long term harmful effects of ketamine on liver enzymes (Reich & Silvay, 1989) and a relationship between long time ecstasy use and neurodegenerative disorders such as Alzheimer and Parkinson's (Jones, 2001). In the 1999 study by Calafat, the interviewees acknowledged that there is not a lot of knowledge on the long-term effects, which sometimes creates worries claiming "there is a very real worry (about mental health problems) in a way that there isn't a concern about mortality" (Calafat, 1999, p.61). The research also identified possible social problems such as rejection of family and friends, creating a vicious circle as "increasing social exclusion from family and friends may perpetuate their use" (Calafat, 1999, p.61).

2.2.2.3 Drug criminality.
The widespread drug use in nightlife also has judicial consequences. As mentioned before, during the week of ADE, criminals have a 5 million euro turnover in trades. In 2019, 38.000 kilos of cocaine was found in the harbor of Rotterdam ("Onderschepte hoeveelheid cocaïne", 2020), which is a staggering amount considering that it is assumed only 10-20% of all smuggled cocaine is found (Bisschop et al., 2019). In terms of production capacity, the statistics are also astounding. Over 90 drug labs were discovered in the Netherlands in 2019 ("Politie ontdekt meer drugslabs", 2020), more than the 82 in 2017. However, in 2017, the Netherlands produced over 600.000 kilos of speed and almost 1 billion ecstasy tablets with a combined value of almost 20 billion euro.

It is clear that the Netherlands is a big player on the world stage in terms of production and transportation of drugs. It is important to note that not all of the smuggled and produced drugs are intended for use in nightlife settings. Much is transported to other parts of Europe and daily consumption (on an average weekday, 4 kilos of cocaine is used in Amsterdam) (Tops & Tromp, 2019). However, all of the above paints a picture of a widespread use of drugs in nightlife settings, with all of its accompanying negative consequences. If one is to develop and regulate safe but fun nightlife settings, policy surrounding drug use, education and trade should properly be developed or improved.

2.2.3 Social issues.
While there are numerous urban and physiological problems with the nightlife effects of gentrification and drug consumption, there are also several social issues. People participating in nightlife (and under influence of drugs) can behave in ways which are very harmful to others.

Grazian argued in favor of scepticism of the value of nightlife, for there were still racial, gender and exclusivity problems with nightlife. In terms of race, he found that contrary to the rhetoric that nightlife offers spirited transcendence and non-conformity, these venues often replicate the "structures of race, ethnic and class inequality and exclusion found in the larger society" (Grazian, 2009, p.912). Similarly, the research found that nightlife venues still emphasize gender differences, while also doing little against the (sexual) intimidation and demeaning of women. Lastly, Grazian found that the often ordered segmentation of neighbourhoods still leads to nighttime venues being "homogenous or otherwise subdivided on the basis of class, neighborhoods or white ethnic enclaves" (Grazian, 2009, p.914). These findings leave the researcher sceptical on the "the insistence among sociologists and urban observers that nightlife necessarily contributes to the social capital and public life of cities" (Grazian, 2009, p.915).

It is estimated that there are over 24.000 cases of nightlife violence every year in the Netherlands with total medical costs accumulating over 31 million euros and in 52-86% of all cases, drugs and alcohol is in play. The NOS reported that the Center for Crime Prevention and Security (CCV) and the Dutch Bouncer Federation estimate the number of extremely violent incidents increased over the last couple of years (2020). There is also the issue of sexual intimidation and assault. A study by the Erasmus University Rotterdam (2018) found that 68% of interviewees had experienced sexual transgressive behaviour. While the victims of this kind of behaviour are almost always women (77%), it also noted that of all interviewees 46% of the males had experienced this kind of behaviour. During interviews, professionals in nightlife venues argued they saw sexual transgressive behaviour at least once per evening (Thursday until Sunday). Another worrying statistic is the fact that 86% of interviewees who experienced this behaviour have not reported it to authorities (both staff of venues or police and other civil servants). There were four reasons identified for this statistic: interviewees either felt that the incident was not serious enough, that it takes too much effort, that they would not have enough evidence or that they were accessory to the incident with their behaviour, giving the attacker the idea they were willing. It must be noted that a part of the interviewees said not to report the incidents because they did not remember much because of excessive alcohol or drug use (or being drugged). The perhaps most worrying conclusion of the report was that for a part of the nightlife crowd, sexual transgressive behaviour is seemingly normalized and something that 'goes with it'.

One of the other issues is traffic accidents. Nightlife regulation and facilitation is a complex issue touching on many subjects, and transportation is one of them. Over 35% of Europe's nightlife participants still use their own cars when going out and 20.8% take a

friend's car (Calafat, 1999). Although this is not a bad thing in itself, the frequent drug and alcohol use creates potentially very dangerous situations. In the Netherlands, the number of deaths in traffic related to alcohol and drugs has tripled from 2016 and the number of positive tests of drives has almost doubled ("Aantal verkeersdoden door alcohol", 2019). Amongst European nightlife participants, only 10.6% take public transport, 7.1% take taxis and 6.6% take a bike. In respect to the Netherlands, the usage of bikes is significantly higher because of "full cultural insertion of the bicycle in the daily life of the Dutch population" (Calafat, 1999, p.149). However, bicycle use does not automatically mean safe transportation. In Amsterdam, 82% of nightlife bike users have no lights, with similar statistics (78%) for student cities (Loosbroek, 2015). Research in Groningen and The Hague found that during weekend nights after one o'clock, 90% of bicycle users were under the influence of drugs or alcohol and that 70% of users had drunk too much to even participate in traffic (Broer, 2014).

2.3 Measures of cultural nightlife policy.

The prevention of gentrification, violence, substance use and other, related negative consequences of associated with nightlife requires well-thought out- and input and collaboration from all different actors such as municipalities, organisations, agencies, cultural entrepreneurs, and nightlife participants themselves. Therefore, it is important to "identify the role of each stakeholder and the way in which they can help to improve the situation, with a view to making changes in the direction of a healthier and safer nightlife scene, as far as possible without taking the fun out of it" (Calafat et al., 2010, p.39).

Bianchini notes that first and foremost "town planning and urban policies ought to be more like the culture itself of the city: more flexible, open-ended, holistic, pluralistic, innovation-oriented and, at the risk of appearing elitist, perhaps more cultured as well" (Bianchini, 1995, p.125). Calafat argues for a local working group, "to encourage joint prevention actions and assign responsibilities" and all parties directly involved to "present its particular point of view and set out problems, as well as suggesting solutions" (Calafat et al., 2010, p.41). Nightlife venue owners should also take responsibilities with a support network for staff to prevent burn-outs, minimum health standards (think of plastic glasses and bottles, hygiene standards and maximum capacity standards), keeping track and denying entrance to people previously involved in incidents and specific training for all staff by setting out their individual responsibilities and tasks as well as conflict resolution, de-escalation and first aid (including identifying specific drug overdoses) skills training. Another interesting advice is

better environment regulation such as temperature, ventilation and 'chill-out' areas. These are also notable conclusions from the Trimbos Institute report (2016) as they found that only 26% of club visitors often experienced nice temperatures and over a third found this was never the case. It also observed that 65% of interviewees thought there were no or too little venues with chillout rooms where people could cool off or relax.

While all of the above mentioned measures might seem costly, a pan-European study of measures against nightlife related problems also mentions all of these solutions. The study also argued that multi component programmes are much more effective than single interventions, mentioning the STAD (Stockholm Prevents Alcohol and Drug Problems) project in Sweden.

The STAD project in Sweden was a "ten-year multicomponent intervention initiated in 1996 to reduce alcohol-related violence and injuries in Stockholm" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.15) and has been expanded to over 200 of the 290 municipalities in Sweden (Möhle, Nijkamp, De Greeff, & Mulder, 2019). It consisted of representatives from the police, national health board, licensing board, city council, organisation of hospitality entrepreneurs, trade union for staff and owners of licensed venues. The programmes consisted of three crucial initiatives: a multi-agency partnership between government and the industry, two-day training for bar staff and management and improved cooperative enforcement. The most prominent findings were a 29% decrease of violent incidents in the nightlife areas, increased compliance of the legal age limit for serving alcohol from 55% (1996) to 68% (2001), increased compliance of denying intoxicated patrons from 5% (1996) to 48% (1999) and 70% in (2001), and a cost-saving ratio of 1:39 euro.

STAD has already had several pilots in other European areas with the STAD in Europe programme (SiE), which aimed to tackle binge drinking in four settings: nightlife, events, public areas and at home. The seven pilot areas were situated in Germany, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the UK, the Czech Republic and the Netherlands. The pilot in the Netherlands was aimed at event drinking settings and focused on festivals, thereby limiting the use of the results for the Rotterdam nightlife. However, the overall SiE programme did find there were two intermediate variables influencing binge drinking in nightlife settings: "'Level of over serving bar staff at Licensed Premises (LP)' and 'Level of community awareness of HED [Heavy Episodic Drinking]'" (Möhle, Nijkamp, De Greeff, & Mulder, 2019, p.15/16).

An effective strategy for reducing the variable of over serving bar staff was founded on three aspects: the training of staff at licensed premises, improved cooperative

enforcement of existing laws, and community mobilisation of important stakeholders. According to the results, the second variable of community awareness should be "based on public information efforts like media strategies and local campaigns" (Möhle, Nijkamp, De Greeff, & Mulder, 2019, p.16). The SiE programme has also made sure that the components of these models were made measurable for the municipalities.

In another document, common myths of the STAD programme were rebutted (Bellis, De Greeff, & Mulder, 2019). Arguments like the unwillingness of commercial parties to participate, different cultural notions on drinking and drugs, effectiveness of training, and issues with conflicting interests are countered and it is ensured that the 7 steps of implementation are applicable in all areas, as the results of the SiE programme showed. These 7 steps are: the identification of the implementation area; setting and target group; the assigning of a coordinator; the performing of a needs assessment; the formation of partnership(s); the mobilisation of the community; the implementation of training and enforcement strategies; and finally the monitoring and evaluating of the programme (Möhle, Nijkamp, De Greeff, & Mulder, 2019). Overall the STAD programme seems a general but effective method of identifying, solving and monitoring problems that can arise when facilitating nightlife in an area.

2.3.1 Entertainment zones

An interesting idea is that of so-called *entertainment zones*. This basically entails that cities could reserve certain spots in the city for nightlife that goes on throughout the night, concentrating these venues of the city on a number of spaces. These zones could be taken into account with urban development planning, such as a reluctance to build housing in the adjacent vicinity as this will often lead to noise complaints. Campo & Ryan note that most nightlife venues originate in parts of the city where there are either few residents or in neighborhoods that have a relative lack of desirability, thus providing "ideal conditions for nightlife operators and their patrons" (2008, p.309). This results in what the researchers deem one of the most important characteristics of the entertainment zone a "relaxation of the rules, regulations and social conventions" (Campo & Ryan, 2008, p.309), while this might sound as the reason why there are so many associated problems with nightlife, it is also why nightlife can deliver positive consequences in terms of social and mental development. These zones also give the opportunity for what the writers deem 'collective joy', the excitement of a group purposefully together to have fun, and deemed "a vital part of human existence" (Campo & Ryan, 2008, p.309).

So in order to both preserve these spaces and minimize the negative consequences of nightlife venues, Campo and Ryan argue cities should implement measures to facilitate these entertainment zones. These zones must be facilitated and preserved through distinct regulations. The first point is to preserve older districts. Well organised and successful nightlife can improve the overall appreciation of older buildings, examples of this renewed positivity are the Amsterdam clubs Trouw (closed already but located in the old building of the eponymous newspaper) and Tolhuistuin (situated in the old canteen of the old Shell factory and lauded for "persisting amid the gentrification" (Coldwell, 2017). Examples of possible entertainment zones in the city of Rotterdam are the aforementioned Ferro Dome area, the Stadhuisplein and the Schieblock. According to Campo & Ryan (2008), and shown by places like the Schieblock, entertainment zones can improve a city's image, while concentrating the nightlife and its possible negative externalities in several locations, thereby making these externalities perhaps easier to manage for police and other regulatory institutions.

2.3.2 Substance use.

Much research has been done on the prevention and regulation of substance abuse. It seems that drug use is anchored in the nightlife in the Netherlands and Rotterdam, as shown earlier in this chapter. However, besides its risks and 'pleasurable effects', several researches have also pointed to positive effect of its uses. Hitzler (2002) and Moore & Miles (2004) have argued that drug use in electronic music scenes has positive stabilizing social effects, while Anderson & Kavanaugh (2007) and Ter Bogt et al. (2005) have argued that drugs can play a part in personal and social identity formation. It seems that overarching visions and programmes, focussed on instilling knowledge on and providing possibilities for 'safe' and responsible drug consumption are the most effective ways to counter its negative effects, as is discussed below.

The pan-European study at risk prevention in nightlife settings argues that to reduce substance abuse and its related health and social problems, municipalities need to find a balanced strategy. The most effective way to minimize these problems is "prevention at the user level, training of staff, environmental strategies, cooperation with relevant stakeholders, policing and law enforcement measures" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.8). A study whereby information on drugs was distributed and discussed by peers seemed to help in both the retaining and recollecting of knowledge as well as instilling a decrease in drug use.

In terms of alcohol, it was found that both web-based or face-to-face interventions seemed to "influence knowledge, attitudes, norms and intentions to drink among student

drinkers" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.9). While the actual one-on-one interventions delivered more effective results, the online interventions were also valuable because of their "cost-effectiveness, larger reach and low threshold to engage in the intervention" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.9). It also found that breath testing, in combination with a widespread media advocacy programme on its results and effects of drunk driving, was an effective and important strategy for reduction, but that "a combination of enforcement-related strategies was associated with a greater decrease in alcohol impaired driving than any individual enforcement related activity" (Sannen et al., 2016, p. 11).

Another interesting aspect is licensing policies. It was found that restricting "promoting alcohol, offering happy hours and 'drinking all night for one flat rate'" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.13) reduced alcohol abuse. Similarly, some countries have regulations for minimum drink prices, in Germany, there is the 'Apple Juice Law' which "in the on-premise trade, at least one alcohol-free beverage must be cheaper than the cheapest alcoholic beverage available" (Sannen et al., 2016, p.13). These alcohol pricing regulations are also a tactic that Calafat et al. noted, arguing that "research shows how higher alcohol prices have a preventive effect" (2010, p.43) and "prices for non-alcoholic beverages should be much lower than those for alcoholic drinks" (2010, p.43), to psychologically 'nudge' people to drink less alcohol.

2.3.3 Violence measures.

Seeing as how most of the perpetrators of nightlife violence were also under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, reducing their abuse will also significantly lower violent incidents. However, there is still one notable remark surrounding the concept and our understanding of nightlife violence. A research, by Hughes et al., actually found that the total amount of alcohol drunk was not associated with fighting. In fact, they found that pre-nightlife drinking at home is probably a bigger factor, thus arguing that the "the way in which people drink is important in predicting violence" (2008, p.63). The authors also note several issues with solely focusing on nightlife venues to discourage drinking. For example, "discouraging cheap alcohol sales in bars while permitting such sales in off-licensed premises may simply encourage more home drinking pre-nightlife" (2008, p.63). Nudging people to increase the amount of alcohol they consume before going out might lead to several other issues. It reduces the amount of liquor people can consume in the venues themselves, thereby lowering the sales of these venues while still being responsible for the intoxicated patrons. Furthermore, it can lead to more entry refusals, which could mean more angry and drunk individuals with anti-social behaviour on the streets. The authors therefore argue that more

attention must be given to other alcohol retailers than nightlife venues to reduce nightlife violence.

2.3.4 Sexual transgressive behaviour prevention.

In the research on sexual transgressive behaviour by the EUR in 2018, several notable observations in terms of prevention are mentioned. During interviews with owners of clubs, they note that they increasingly feel the responsibility for what happens in the vicinity of the venue, instructing their security to keep an eye on the streets around the venue, calling a taxi for intoxicated women on their own and making sure the audience leaves in a calm manner. They also mention it is mandatory to file a report written up by the security to assess how the evening went down and what incidents there were. However, it is also claimed that many venues do not actually enforce their security to do that. Furthermore, in interviews with security guards, they mention that there is no specific training for identifying, handling or preventing acts of sexual transgressive behaviour, only that "it is mentioned in the book" (Seidler et al., 2018, p.62). It is possible for security to follow additional courses or training independently or through the company, however, these must be paid for by the individuals themselves. The study therefore concludes that it is "financially unattractive for many companies and independent security guards to follow courses or training courses" (Seidler et al., 2018, p.62) and that "there are no established policies for sexually transgressive behavior for security guards and security companies" (Seidler et al., 2018, p.62).

Another notable issue is the training of bar staff. It is noted that they have an important task in de-escalating situations by taking timely action after identifying 'troublemakers'. Another actor in the prevention of this behaviour are the 'handhavers van Stadsbeheer', these are a group of ten people who anonymously supervise the nightlife venues and audiences and, have the capacity to give out tickets, ask for identification and carry handcuffs and transceivers. In the chapter on the results, these different roles and their facilitation will also be discussed.

2.3.5 Opening hours.

There have also been researches and pilots concerning the opening hours of nightlife venues . Currently, there are 4 classifications for cultural/hospitality institutions in terms of opening hours in Rotterdam. These are morning; daytime; evening; and nighttime. Morning institutions can be open from 04:00 to 23:00; daytime is free to be open from 07:00 to 23:00; evening institutions from 07:00 to 01:00 on Sundays-Thursdays and until 02:00 on Fridays

and Saturdays; and finally nighttime has the option to stay open whenever they please ("Horecanota Rotterdam 2017-2021", 2017).

A research by OPEN Rotterdam and Vers Beton has identified possible room for improvement though. The boundary between evening and nighttime establishments, forcing them to either close at 01:00/02:00 or apply for a nighttime license, has created a copious amount (155 in total) of locations that have obtained a nighttime license but do not feel the need to use it continuously. Examples of these kinds of establishments are restaurants; shawarma places; rental locations; and hotels. Others, such as sex clubs and student associations have a very private and exclusionary nature. There are even 10 locations with a nighttime license that are closed either temporary or indefinitely (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a). The research concluded that throughout the city, only 28% of the locations that hold a nighttime license, offer people a drink and dance (or visit to a shisha lounge) (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a).

The original black and white implementation for evening and nighttime establishments was originally enforced because of 'administrative burden reduction' in 2012 (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a), but is heavily criticized by current councillors. D66-councillor Elene Walgenbach has deemed the current situation 'very undesirable' and mentions that over the last few years, multiple motions to stimulate the nightlife have been accepted by the council, but denied by the mayor (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a). However, the mayor and Casimir Blokland (the district chief of the Rotterdam police unit) refuse to nudge in this discussion, even if they would have the capacity to enlist more police officers. Blokland is quoted saying "we like it the way it is now, we don't want to clean up the mess each night" (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a).

An interesting research on opening hours was the *More Hours in the Day* initiative in Manchester. It experimented with extended opening hours for pubs and clubs in the city centre and found there was an 43% decrease in arrests and a 14% decrease of alcohol related incidents. Furthermore, taxi firms reported there was significantly less aggression and an increase in fares. The police also noted they were "pleasantly surprised by the effects of the initiative on public order" (Bianchini, 1995, p.124).

In Amsterdam, the system is more stratified. Establishments can apply for a weekend closing time of 03:00; 04:00; 05:00; or 06:00 and most of their 24-hour licences are reserved purely for clubs. This is thanks to two pilots with extended opening hours. The first was a pilot where ten 24-hour permits were given to innovative nightlife concepts for a period of five years. The municipality of Amsterdam aimed to "grant flexibility to entrepreneurs in opening and closing times, but also to contribute to the spread of audiences (24-hour licences were only permitted outside the city centre), to stimulate a varied, innovative and multidisciplinary range of catering establishments, and to contribute to the 24-hour dynamics

in the city" ("Evaluatie 24-uurshoreca", 2017, p.4). In the evaluation, interviews were held with six civil servants, four licensed entrepreneurs, two entrepreneurs who did not qualify for the license, a representative of the hospitality association, two members of the creative team and the nighttime mayor of Amsterdam. Two of the objectives were spreading the nightlife audiences and giving the sector as a whole a boost. Both of them were achieved according to the interviewees. It was also stressed there were no to little negative effects in terms of incidents or extra police deployment, and that the pilot (even though the emphasis was on dance) should be deemed a success also seen in the positive reviews in both national and international media.

The only unfortunate finding was the fact that non-dance venues almost never made use of the extended opening hours, thus not necessarily stimulating the 24-hour dynamic of the city. However, 24-hour dynamics and requests for extended opening hours were present at the location of the dance venues and surrounding businesses, indicating that a willingness for a 24-hour dynamic was present and could be facilitated. Several entrepreneurs who did not qualify for the pilot argued that this success can be the base for more flexibility, also for non-dance venues and in other parts of the city, which led to another pilot titled *a hospitable and safe Rembrandt- and Thorbeckeplein* (Flight, Broer, & Van der West, 2018).

The Rembrandt- and Thorbeckeplein pilot was a more extensive pilot to improve the areas, not solely based on extended opening hours. All of the businesses around the squares would share the costs of financing with the municipality, which entailed around €120.000 for each square in total (Bijl & Straathof, 2015). It consisted of 4 specific initiatives (Flight, Broer, & Van der West, 2018). The first was an increase in the amount and visibility of hosts, who act as approachable and hospitable point of contacts, and were instrumental in significantly decreasing the amount of aggression and increasing the amount of social involvement. The second initiative was increased and improved staff training as there was no oversight in the training of the staff of the venues, while there was consensus (except for a few entrepreneurs) that training is influential in the minimizing of risks. The third initiative was mirroring the festival model. By improving and creating clean, bicycle free public spaces in and around the venues, the area was transformed in a more peaceful and self-regulating space, with increased feelings of positivity instilled in its visitors. Finally, there was also a bonus/malus initiative which allowed for the venues to (mostly) decide their own opening times, an important stimulant for the venues to cooperate. It found that the arrival and departing the different sub-genres of nightlife audiences were spread more evenly over the night, which led to more calmness in the square. While there are still some necessary improvements such as annoyances with taxis, public urination and binge drinking, the

evaluation report concludes the statistics support the experiences of those involved (Flight, Broer, & Van der West, 2018). Surveys showed that visitors, entrepreneurs and residents have more pleasant experiences, with less annoyances and incidents (also supported by police statistics) (Flight, Broer, & Van der West, 2018)

2.4 Conceptualization of liveability.

The second concept to operationalize is liveability. While it is a subjective term as it is understood differently per individual, liveability might be best translated into the slightly more concrete term quality of life. Much has been written on measuring quality of life in urban environments, and although quality of life is partly also influenced by geography and culture, studies from around the world on the concept can be valuable.

One of these is a research by Türksever & Atalik on the possibilities and limitations of measuring quality of life (2001). They argue that quality of life is always formed by two factors: psychological experience of an area and environmental reality of an area. The researchers argue quality of life studies have value because of their all-inclusive nature as it looks at location specific amenities and feelings, thereby crucial in municipal public policy. Furthermore, the authors argue that even though "there remains a disagreement about the measurement, it is worth to consider both objective and perceptual aspects" (Türksever & Atalik, 2001, p.165). In their own research, the researchers found there were several universal variables that were important for quality of life, but also that there were those whose determination of the quality of life hinged on specific and different variables such as shopping and leisure amenities.

Haslauer et al. presented an intriguing study on the duality of subjective and objective readings of quality of life in urban environments (2015). Throughout the city of Vienna, they measured satisfaction on the amount of green space and on public transport amenities and contrasted that to objective data on these. While mostly corresponding, there were also some 'spatial mis-matches'. In the northern, greener part of the city, there were below average satisfaction ratings, while in the less greener city centre, there were extremely positive perceptions. This is attributed to self-selection realities, as "those wishing to reside in a more urban setting may be quite satisfied with less green space as urban amenities are more important to these residents, whereas those residing on the outskirts of the city may have higher expectations for green space" (Haslauer et al., 2015, p.926). Another reason for the discrepancies were the demographics of the interviewees. It found that the 26-40 year olds inhabited the areas where the interviewees felt high satisfaction but had little amenities, while 41-55 years old characterized the areas with relatively high

amounts of amenities but low satisfaction. According to the researchers, this "seems to imply a higher cognitive flexibility of younger residents whereas older city residents exhibit a more critical tendency" (Haslauer et al., 2015, p.926).

Another interesting piece of literature on this subject is a study by Okulicz-Kozaryn (2013) who investigated whether there was similarity between survey data and the findings of the Mercer city ranking (one of the world's leading organizations for liveability research, used by media such as the Economist and Forbes) of European cities. Just like Türksever & Atalik, he found that there were several universal variables that indicate satisfaction: safety, trust in fellow citizens and green spaces. However, it also showed that there is only a weak relationship between the subjective survey data and the Mercer index and that there were only a few variables that correlate in both the survey and the Mercer ranking. The author therefore argues more attention should be given to the subjective indicators of quality of life as "what matters is what we perceive, not what is out there" (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2013, p.443).

Finally, there is a study by Kaal (2011) on Dutch political conceptions of liveability. It shows that the concept of liveability has changed drastically over the last 50 years and which role it had in urban governance. In the 50's the term first arose as a concept used to describe the rights of rural citizens who felt left behind compared to the cities. Liveability here meant the right to cultural consumption and leisure, as these amenities had been disappearing thanks to population decline. Rural geographers however, approached it like a set of rights such as clean water, proper housing, education and job opportunities. In the 1960's, after the rise of the welfare state, these rights were taken care of by the state. So post materialist liveability rights developed that they "were at the core of the counterculture protest movements and other urban social movements that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s" (Kaal, 2011, p.544). These included the right to environmental and noise protection. However, during this time, a new political mindset also arose, the notion that liveability could only work if citizens themselves had influence on decision making, a more direct form of democracy was propagated, which also led to the rise of the local liveability political parties in cities such as Utrecht and Rotterdam. In the 70's and 80's the Amsterdam conceptualisation, "with a focus on environmental protection, 'romanticist' urban redevelopment and citizen participation in policy making" (Kaal, 2011, p.544) was implemented nationwide. At the same time, a new form of active citizenship was also promoted though, arguing that liveability was not just a right, but also a duty. Citizens had an active responsibility in improving the liveability of the neighbourhood.

In the 90's housing corporations and municipalities "started to define liveability in terms of a neighborhood with sufficient amenities and a balanced composition of the

population" (Kaal, 2011, p.545), creating situations where the unemployed and certain ethnic minorities were identified with a decrease in liveability, causing social exclusion and displacement. In light of these times, we should be wary for an overt use of the concept of liveability in urban regulation. Finally, Kaal argues that in the last 50 years, we have transformed from "a class based style of politics to an issue-based, individualistic and consumption-oriented mode of citizenship". There are a few takeaways from this historization of the concept liveability. It is incredibly contextual and is not solely used for we describing the physical circumstances of the city or the how citizens perceive it. We need to constantly ask when, why, by whom and for whom the concept is (and must be) used. However, studying the concept in modern times can help us obtain "new modes of citizenship and governance and to uncover how citizens, politicians and policy makers have understood local democracy: how they perceived each other's involvement and responsibilities in urban society" (Kaal, 2011, p.545).

It seems that while there is a general consensus on what the concept of liveability (and subsequently quality of life) entail, but that there is no universal way of measuring or ascribing importance to it. In order to still get a reading on the liveability situation in Rotterdam, all interviewees in the empirical research have been asked for their quality of life experience, what factors they deem important and how their quality of life is affected (either positive or negative) by nightlife and its risks.

There are also several already existing researches and databases on the liveability of European and Dutch cities, also incorporating Rotterdam, some of which will be discussed below. Many different sets of data are available, mainly because there are also many different interpretations and conceptualizations. Overall however, it seems that Rotterdam scores quite well on several different lists. A survey held amongst 40.000 people by the European Commission ranked Rotterdam as #12 in the list of 79 European cities in 2015. The report noted that Rotterdam had the largest increase in satisfaction percentages of living in the city amongst the interviewees as it increased with 10% to 93% from 2012 to 2015. There was also a 93% satisfaction rating with the availability of public spaces, a 92% satisfaction rating with the availability of retail shops and 52% rated the integration of foreigners positively. Another notable finding was the "high levels of satisfaction alongside relatively low levels of public transport use" (Quality of European life, 2016) as 87% rated the Rotterdam public transport positively. The three aspects of life in Rotterdam that were deemed most important were safety (44%), health services (44%) and education (44%).

A report by ECA International focussed on the best places for Europeans to live ranked Rotterdam as #12 in the list of 490 in both 2019 and 2020. It tested 490 locations

worldwide on liveability factors such as housing, leisure facilities, personal safety, air pollution, climate and infrastructure. While not specifically explaining the position of Rotterdam, it notes that North-European cities consistently rank high, partly because of their high-quality (transportation) infrastructure, excellent healthcare and long-term political stability.

Another source is the research by the municipality itself in 2018 to map the status of the city ("Staat van de Stad 2018, 2018). It found that the city is growing in the number of inhabitants and the level of their education, people's average age is going up, there are less people suffering from chronic illness, and the unemployment rate has dropped significantly. However, it also noted that there are still large numbers of people living in poverty and debt, that the price of housing is rising and that the number of people suffering from illness and loneliness is highly comparable to other cities. In terms of the quality of life, it noted that people had a high percentage of satisfaction with over 80% arguing they were satisfied to very satisfied, an increase of 10% since the research conducted in 2014. Another notable finding was the fact that for the first time, the most pressing issue identified by the interviewees was not crime and drug issues (39%), but traffic issues (40%). At the third place stands pollution and destruction of public spaces (34%), a significant decrease was found for youth problems (from 25% to 9%) and an increase was the issues with housing (from 8% to 15%).

The final database on liveability is the Leefbaarometer, a tool created by software developer ATLAS and research agency RIGO on order of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (Leidelmeijer, Middeldorp, & Marlet, 2019). It measures the liveability of municipalities, neighbourhoods and streets across the Netherlands through 100 different indicators. These 100 indicators are divided into 5 categories with distinct importance: housing (18%), citizens (15%), facilities (24%), safety (25%) and physical environment (18%). There are 9 different classifications (of which 5 are positive, 3 are negative and one more neutrally inclined, although it is called 'weak') for an area ranging from very unsatisfactory to excellent. The average classification for the Netherlands is right on the border between more than satisfactory and good. However, the so-called 'stadsregio Rotterdam' has a weak score. The accompanying rapport noted that the 5 municipalities with the lowest scores were Rotterdam, Schiedam, Vlaardingen, Tiel and Maassluis (Leidelmeijer, Middeldorp, & Marlet, 2019). While the area scores excellent in terms of facilities, it has quite low scores on safety and citizens. However it must be noted that there seem to be some negative outliers severely affecting the municipal average. Neighbourhoods like Oud-Mathenesse, Tarwewijk and Carnisse score more than inadequate on all categories except for facilities. Furthermore,

the report does note that there are positive developments throughout the municipality. Additionally, whereas in 1998 Rotterdam was the city where the largest part of the population had issues with feelings of unsafety, in 2018 it had the lowest scores of unsafe feelings amongst its population of the so-called G4 (Amsterdam, The Hague, Utrecht and Rotterdam). All of these datasets and researches paint a picture that there are definitely some major problems which Rotterdam needs to solve which give it its relatively low liveability score based on statistics. However, it seems that the subjective experiences of its population are significantly more positive on most (if not all) factors that determine liveability.

2.5 The current Rotterdam municipality and relevant policy documents.

This section will briefly shed some light on the current policies and regulations of the municipality of Rotterdam concerning its bars, cafés and other nightlife venues. Some remarks on the current state of the municipality must also be made. In the report by the municipality on the state of the city ("Staat van de Stad", 2018) it is noted that the number of employees of the municipality is decreasing for several years now. Since 2005, the number of full-time employees has decreased by almost 6000. A consequence of this is the rising cost of labour for the municipality. In 2015 and 2016, these were around 800 million euros, however, it increased to 850 million in 2017. While there are no predicted figures mentioned for when these FTE's would have stayed on, the document itself attributes these rising costs to hiring more external agencies, individuals and services, which are more expensive than internal labour costs. This means that the task of maintaining, regulating and facilitating all the facets of life in Rotterdam is increasingly the responsibility of a decreasing number of people, something which might also explain the criticisms mentioned in the introduction of this research.

In 2019, the municipality released their *Beleidsvisie Pop 2019-2030* document in which the current state and goals of the Rotterdam musical performing sector is set forth (2019). The document identifies four focus areas in terms of facilitating artistically high-quality offerings for the diverse audiences in Rotterdam: providing programmers with enough and suitable locations and resources for production, a plurality of genres is taken into account, possibilities to programme throughout the entire city and making sure these programmes are visible enough. To realise this, the municipality wants to provide stability by letting programming parties steadily build on their success and investigate possibilities for facilitating responsible growth. Another focus point is strengthening the infrastructure of the sector, although it is argued this is mostly the responsibility of the sector itself and the municipality can only provide cooperation through departments such as Rotterdam Festivals

and Rotterdam Partners. Finally, the document does acknowledge that some venues are located in places that are assigned for (re)development, which could lead to friction and put these venues under pressure. However, the municipality argues they will look at the cultural functions in these areas and how the correct balance between liveliness and liveability can be found.

Another policy document is the *Uitgangspunten Horecanota 2017 – 2021* (2017), which sets out the municipal vision for the hospitality sector. It entails several principles, these being that the neighbourhood is the starting point in determining the possibilities and impossibilities, a shared responsibility between the residents and the entrepreneurs, facilitation of spaces for innovation and experimentation to promote entrepreneurship and liveliness, simplified licensing systems with fewer restrictions, and an overall high trust-high penalty system of regulation, which will be elaborated on below. According to the municipality, putting these principles into practice involves a neighborhood oriented approach. No area is the same, so customized regulation and policies should be developed. Key factors in this are: frequent consultation between the entrepreneurs and residents with outspoken trust in fulfilling agreements, increased responsibility for entrepreneurs to regulate the environment around the venue, and also includes responsible alcohol management, staff training and communication with safety regulators such as the police department.

The document acknowledges that enthusiastic entrepreneurs are often experimenting and learning from mistakes and that the municipality encourages this experimentation. This is facilitated through possibilities to temporarily deviate from some existing regulations and requirements with the so-called high trust - high penalty system. Here, entrepreneurs get 'limited freedom' and trust of the municipality to regulate their surroundings themselves. Examples of this are the category 0 licences (limited bureaucratic obligations in exchange for light forms of hospitality exploitation); the 'cool-down' period, where establishments serving alcohol have the freedom to let their guests finish their drinks; and the incidental exemptions of closing times (15) and noise regulations (10) called 'verlaatjes' & 'geluidjes'. With this trust also comes a high level of responsibility and (if not complying or failing) high levels of punishment. If a venue fails the instilled trust of the municipality, it can lose these exemptions as well as having to cease its activities immediately.

There is also the *Wijkagenda 2019-2022* (2019), a document describing the tasks and objectives for the city centre. In the next 4 years, 18.000 new houses and apartments will be built in the city-centre and at least 180.000 m2 of vacant offices will be transformed into housing. Some passages also concern the nightlife/hospitality sector (in the city centre).

The largest advice was the drafting of an unambiguous vision of the city centre, its different neighborhoods and streets with a better balance between the various functions (such as retail, nightlife, hospitality and living), something which will be discussed below with the *Omgevingsvisie*. It also argued for better enforcement and control of the issued permits and licensing, more research on easy and relatively inexpensive sound-absorption possibilities, while also pleading for investigating the amount of maximum possible venues for each neighbourhood.

Finally, the recently formulated *Verkenning Omgevingsvisie* (2018) must be discussed. The municipality recognised that all the different policy documents and goals as well as the often (relatively) short-term assessment were sometimes conflicting and not optimal. Additionally, on January 1st 2021, the new *Omgevingswet* goes into effect, which severely alters the system of spatial planning. It combines 26 separate currently existing laws into 1, will be a mandatory instrument for municipalities to envision the future and aims to "create more transparency, more integrality, more administrative consideration possibilities and faster and better decision making" ("Omgevingsvisie", 2019, p.29). The *Omgevingsvisie* is described as a "strategic instrument to provide insight and direction to the coherence between all aspects that influence the physical living environment" ("Omgevingsvisie", 2019, p.6). It argues there is a need for continuity (in some aspects, it looks decades into the future), recognizable identities and (r)evaluation of historic narratives and places. It is made up of 5 different 'glasses' with which to look at the spatial planning for the future: the compact city, the healthy city, the inclusive city, the circular city and the productive city.

Similar to the *Wijkagenda*, one of the major talking points is the housing shortage, as it notes that for until 2040, at least 50.000 new homes must be built as the city is expected to grow from 624.000 inhabitants in 2015, to 700.000 in 2037. What is interesting is the fact that the cultural, hospitality and nightlife sector is barely mentioned. The preservation of cultural monuments is addressed a few times, as well as aims to make culture and entertainment accessible for every citizen. However, it is also mentioned that noise is a major issue for the current liveability of the city, thereby indicating the issues with facilitating nightlife in a densely populated city like Rotterdam. It is argued that one of the next steps for the *Verkenning Omgevingsvisie* is the identification and elaboration of themes not (or insufficiently) discussed, thereby specifically mentioning the cultural and hospitality sectors, and that one of the major goals for this document was the starting of conversations with other non-municipal parties.

Throughout its policy documents, the municipality aims to facilitate a varied and lively cultural nightlife, although some statements of different policy documents seem to clash

sometimes (think of the aspiration for more flexible, high responsibility - high trust system for licencing, but also arguing for more control and rigorous enforcement). However, many of the formulated goals would indeed facilitate a successful nightlife and ideas such as the high trust - high penalty system and all-encompassing policy documents such as the *Verkenning Omgevingsvisie*.

   The different sections of chapter 2 describe nightlife as a complex subject, intersecting with many different aspects of city life. However, it is possible to identify several core themes and concepts. The values and accompanying risks of nightlife have been studied and set out in much detail. In terms of its values, it offers a wide range of benefits ranging from individual personal development, social cohesion, city marketing and economic (spillover) effects. Yet there are also several associated risks, some of these being substance abuse, violence and clashing with city planning. Similarly, on the concept of nightlife policy measures, a few interesting or effective solutions or problematic issues have been discussed, the three major ones being the planning of entertainment zones, establishing a multi-disciplinary health and safety body, and nighttime licensing. Finally, this chapter set out the different policy documents of the Rotterdam municipality in order to identify its vision (or possible lack thereof) on the facilitation of nightlife. Seeing as how chapter 2 seems to be a reasonably complete but heavily condensed account of the concepts relating to nightlife, all of the above mentioned conceptualizations have been used in the formation of the interview guide as well as the identification of possible themes when analysing the interview transcripts.

3. Research Strategy, Design and Methods.

3.1 Research Strategy.

As mentioned in the introduction, this research aims to answer the question how the city of Rotterdam can balance a liveable city while facilitating its cultural nightlife. To answer this question, a qualitative research strategy is adopted. There is some quantitative data on the Rotterdam nightlife and liveability available, but important is to know how people feel, what they experience. As the aim is to look for practical policy advice on improving the balance between nightlife and the liveability of the city, this research has a descriptive and exploratory nature. It is descriptive in the sense that quite some literature on the cultural nightlife policies already exists, but exploratory in the sense that it will be connected to the specific cultural nightlife and values of Rotterdam and its different actors, with practical possible policy measures as outcome.

3.1.1 Aspects of qualitative research.

Bryman determined the main preoccupations of qualitative researchers, thereby identifying 5 areas of emphasis: "seeing through the eyes of research participants; description and context; process; flexibility and lack of structure; and concepts and theory as outcomes of the research process" (Bryman, 2016, p.380). Before diving into these the distinction between definitive and sensitizing concepts should be mentioned. According to Blumer, social research should stay away from using definitive concepts. He argued that definitive concepts are fixed once developed (Blumer, 1954). According to Bryman, Blumer found this "approach entailed the application of a straitjacket on the social world, because the concept in question comes to be seen exclusively in terms of the indicators that have been developed for it" (Bryman, 2016, p.388). Therefore, social researchers should concern themselves with sensitizing concepts that provide 'a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances' (Bryman, 2016, p.388). This distinction connects with this research very well, as the two main concepts are hard to objectively express; they are more based on the subjective feelings that the citizens of Rotterdam experience. The theory and data discussed in the theoretical framework is definitely helpful to formulate this 'general sense of reference' but it will still differ per person.

As mentioned above, there are five preoccupations that entail qualitative research. The first is 'seeing through the eyes of people being studied'. To understand the world of the Rotterdam nightlife, one must have an idea of the experiences of all the different parties that constitute it. There can be so much data available, but real-world experiences are still required, or as Bryman argues: "The social world must be interpreted from the perspective of

the people being studied, rather than as through those subjects were incapable of their own reflections on the social world" (Bryman, 2016, p.399).

The second aspect is an emphasis on context. Besides the opinions and thoughts of people affiliated with the nightlife, another crucial aspect of understanding is "the contextual understanding of social behaviour" (Bryman, 2016, p.401). This helps making sense of behaviour that for others would seem odd, irrational or careless. An example relevant for this research could be the difference in bureaucratic capabilities, understanding and context between municipalities and cultural organisations, as the latter ones often have a more loose and fluid organisation, which could be detrimental for their bureaucratic capabilities compared to city councils. While there is no consensus on what went wrong exactly, the conflict between the municipality and the proposed plans for the Ferro Dome project seems subject to a difference in contextual understanding of bureaucracy.

The third aspect is the emphasis on identifying and explaining processes. Nightlife and liveability are two social processes and sectors, the latter even continually changing as the demographics of a city change constantly. Therefore, it is instrumental in research on these two topics to look at the processes of how they come about. According to Bryman, this knowledge can be obtained through qualitative semi-structured and unstructured interviewing "by asking participants to reflect on the processes leading up to or following on from an event" (Bryman, 2016, p.402). Which leads to the final aspect, flexibility.

Flexibility and limited structure are also key in qualitative research as it is helpful to enhance the opportunity of genuinely revealing the perspectives of the people you are studying" (Bryman, 2016, p.403). Most of the interviewees will be people who on average have a lot more interactions with the processes, regulation and experiences of nightlife in Rotterdam than the interviewer, it is therefore beneficial to the research to limit the structure of the interviews, in order to gain insight and knowledge on topics and processes that the researcher did not think about. As this research concerns the experiences of citizens of Rotterdam with creating, regulation and experiencing nightlife, as well as their experienced quality of life, it is their opinions and thoughts that are valuable, not necessarily the questions of the researcher.

3.1.2 Pitfalls of qualitative research.

There are of course also some pitfalls when carrying out qualitative research, for one, there is the risk of subjectivity. The data collected through the interviews will always have to be interpreted by the researcher, who runs the risk of relying "too much on the researcher's often unsystematic views about what is significant and important, and also upon the close

personal relationships that the researcher frequently strikes up with the people studied" (Bryman, 2016, p.405). This subjectivity is often also influenced by the characteristics of the researcher. For the study, the researcher is a 27 year old male, who has his own experiences with nightlife and liveability in Rotterdam. Therefore, he will interpret the interviewees' answers and experiences differently than a middle-aged female researcher from Bergen op Zoom, for example. However, as the subject of social research is humans, inherently interpreting and sense-making beings, social scientists must recognise that they are also an active interpreter and that this will always be the case; there is no turning off one's own inherent interpretation of the world through your senses. The consequence of this is that the researcher must acknowledge his/her work as interpretative and that as (s)he tries to make sense of the sense-making of the interviewees, another layer of interpretation is imposed. In practice, the only objectivity that the social researcher can strive for is not a capacity to interpret actors without internal norms and values, but an impartiality in relation to the interests and allegiance of the actors. In this specific study, this will entail keeping an open mind to the different interests of the interviewees and reflecting on their possible motivations for saying something.

The difficulty of interpretation is also influenced by another pitfall, that of fairness and partiality. The researcher himself is almost a lifelong citizen of Rotterdam, who has participated in the nightlife himself, and has become acquainted with some of the actors in the nightlife of the city. Is the researcher capable of maintaining objectivity, and fairly representing different viewpoints? These personal relations and judgements must be shoved aside by the researcher, who needs to adopt a neutral viewpoint. Furthermore, the researcher must make sure his sample is relatively varied in order to hear a plurality of experiences and opinions of the sector. This means talking to entrepreneurs, but also policy makers, audience members and citizens who experience problems thanks to nightlife.

Another problem is the difficulty to replicate the study or results. Finally, there is the problem of generalization. How can just a few interviews with citizens of the city represent the feelings of the city on the subjects of nightlife and liveability as a whole? They cannot. Therefore as Bryman argues, "the findings of qualitative research are to generalize to theory rather than to populations" (Bryman, 2016, p.406). It is not the case that if interviewee A argues that policy B should be changed, it should be changed. If interviewee A has issues with policy B, we can contrast that with existing theory on that kind of policy and then see whether it would be beneficial to make some changes.

The above paragraphs can be identified as descriptions of possible issues with qualitative research. However, the two crucial factors of validity and reliability are less

applicable to qualitative research by nature. It is used to understand the subjective meanings and opinions held by different actors, subjective realities. It is characterized by pragmatism and interpretivism, the knowledge can be imperfect but valuable. More important criteria are the extensive grasp on the wider context of the issue, the diversity of perspectives that are explicated and whether understanding of the subject has been extended. Therefore, in order to get a varied and widespread impression of both the status of the nightlife as well as possible improvements on the policies and workings of the sector, qualitative research is a viable strategy.

3.2 Research Design.

This research aims to combine theoretical data and notions on nightlife with the subjective experiences of citizens in Rotterdam on these two concepts. The primary data will be collected from a range of people who are in some way or another (organisational, regulatory, advisory or simply experientially) involved in the nightlife of Rotterdam. Therefore, it is difficult to categorise the design of the research. Bryman defines a cross-sectional research design as "the collection of data on more than one case (usually quite a lot more than one) and at a single point in time in order to collect a body of quantitative or quantifiable data in connection with two or more variables (usually many more than two), which are then examined to detect patterns of association" (Bryman, 2016, p.58). However, as the main data collection of this research consists of semi-structured interviews, and will thus mainly generate qualitative data, we define it as a case study on the status of nightlife in Rotterdam. Bryman associates case studies with a location, an organization or a community, with an emphasis "upon an intensive examination of the setting" (Bryman, 2016, p.69).

3.3 Methods.

This research consisted of two ways of gathering data: conducting in-depth qualitative interviews and using secondary data. Besides the theoretical framework, the data on the current status of both the Rotterdam cultural nightlife and the experienced liveability of the city were also taken into account when creating the interview guide and analyzing the interviews. However, as discussed in the theoretical framework, these kinds of datasets and researches are often based on objective data and do not accurately represent subjective feelings and experiences of citizens. Therefore, the experiences of the interviewees were leading in answering the research questions and the formation of the conclusions. The data on the cultural nightlife, such as the number of clubs and cultural participation is less concentrated and not up-to-date as there are regular shifts in the nightlife in Rotterdam, but

paints a picture of a rapidly changing and fluid sector, thereby indicating the fragility but also the ambition of the sector and its entrepreneurs. While the interviews were leading in the results, the secondary data has provided objective context on both concepts and their relationship.

Another reason for the focus on in-depth interviews is the fact that the research uses relatively much grey literature, which has two distinct pitfalls. Firstly, grey literature can have issues with its reliability, biases, inaccuracies and a lack of peer-reviews. The second reason is longevity as these (digital) grey sources can be changed or deleted. However, there are also several good reasons why this research incorporates grey literature. A lot of the research and secondary data of this research consists of documents published by governments, transnational organisations and research institutions.

While grey literature is indeed associated with problems with reliability and biases, it lacks the profit-seeking of commercial publishers, thus also removing a possible reason for biases. Furthermore, most of the grey literature used is, while not published by professional publishers, obtained from renowned institutions and organisations. A research by the Trimbos Institute definitely has authority and validity when it comes to the subject of drug use in the Netherlands. Similarly, one may expect that a pan-European research on the liveability in European cities executed by the European Union qualifies as reliable data, at least not less reliable than a research held by a commercial party that may have underlying motives, as one may assume that the goal of the European Union is to accurately chart liveability in European cities. Finally, as this research is heavily related to regulation and municipal policy, it is unavoidable that grey literature (which governmental documents often are) is used.

Qualitative, in-depth and semi-structured interviews with the actors that play a role in the sector have the capacity to shed light on the workings of the nightlife sector, policy makers and the requirements for a liveable city. Also, as the research must give a fair and nuanced image of the experiences of nightlife and liveability in the city of Rotterdam, the sample of interviewees has included people that are affected or affecting the nightlife in all facets. There has been an extensive interview with a cultural policy advisor of the municipality for example, as well as an interview with Thijs Boer, the founder of N8W8, an advisory body on nightlife issues. A citizen living adjacent nighttime venues has also been interviewed on subjects including those such as noise complaints. Nighttime venue owners have also been asked to explain their visions and experiences, and a member of the Panel Deurbeleid and ex-chairman of the security guard association was also included in the list of

interviewees. Several other interviews have been held and while limited in size, this group represents a wide spectrum of interaction with the Rotterdam nightlife.

Qualitative, in-depth interviews have two main advantages. First and foremost, based on the theoretical framework, they will be the core information on which the resulting answer to the research question will be based. Qualitative, in-depth interviews give the interviewer a detailed and deep understanding of the topics discussed through the interviewees, thereby providing the research with reliable and comparable data. In this specific research, the interviewees can provide detailed experiences with and opinions on the production, regulation and bureaucracy when it comes to cultural nightlife, as these experiences are far greater than that of the researcher and thus their voices have authority when it comes to the matter of how to balance liveability with cultural nightlife. Secondly, because of the fact that the interviews are still semi-structured, the interviewer has the possibility to create an interview guide. Providing the interviewer with the option of preparing questions, necessary talking points and somewhat shape the course of the interview while still leaving room for deviation.

Bryman (2016) argues there are certain basic elements to keep in mind while preparing the interview guide, some of the most important ones being to "create a certain amount of order on the topic areas, so that your questions about them flow reasonably well", "formulate interview questions that will help answer your research questions" and "do not ask leading questions" (p.473). With this in mind, a schematic was made (which can be found in the interview guide appendix itself) where the overarching concepts that were discussed in chapter 2 were placed on the left, the research questions that were mentioned in section 1.2 were then attributed to these concepts after which these questions were split up into less complex questions. The answers to these questions could, when put together, possibly answer the research questions and thus were the questions the interview guides consisted of. However, as mentioned, the interview was semi-structured, often, this meant not every question was asked to each interviewee, and depending on the role the interviewee plays in the nightlife sector, some subjects were discussed more intensively than others.

Because of different requested levels of anonymity, the interviewees have been numbered and will be mentioned in the results chapter as: 'interviewee 1', 'interviewee 2', etc. However, because the role the interviewees occupy in the Rotterdam nightlife differs (and matters) greatly, these will often also be mentioned when relevant in order to clarify or strengthen their opinions. In the interview guide, one can also find a list with all interviewees, their names (or initials) and roles in the city's nightlife. All interviews have been recorded and written transcriptions are available on request if desired.

After the interviews, the data was analyzed. Bryman (2016) argues that "Coding is the starting point for most forms of qualitative data analysis" and the main questions the researcher should keep in mind is "Of what topic is this item of data an instance?" and "What sort of answer to a question about a topic does this item of data imply?" (p.575). However, later on in the book, Bryman argues that thematic analysis is "one of the most common approaches to qualitative data analysis" (p.578). There is considerable overlap between the two though, as he also notes that "for some writers, a theme is more or less the same as a code, whereas for others it transcends any one code and is built up out of groups of codes" (p.578). The four main criteria identified for working with themes are: it is a category identified by the researcher through his data, relating to his research focus (and the research questions), it builds on codes identified in transcripts and it provides the researcher with a basis for theoretical understanding of his data and can contribute to the literature relating to the research focus.

In this research, the analysis began by carefully reading all the transcripts, after which the researcher already identified several themes discussed in all of the interviews. While the interviews often had a loose structure and additional topics were sometimes discussed, all of the relevant expressions could be categorised into the themes and concepts that were discussed in chapter 2, although the theme of collaboration & bureaucracy featured relatively little in that chapter. The coding has been done in a manual and open fashion. Relevant sentences were copied from the transcripts and categorised under the corresponding name of the interviewee and in one (or multiple) of the themes identified, thereby providing an extensive description of the (experienced) liveability of Rotterdam, the values of its nightlife, the risks accompanying it, the current nightlife policy, the friction between the sector and municipality and possible future improvements. In the interview guide in the Appendix, one can see how the questions of the interview guide were categorised into themes, and the (examples of) codes relevant for that theme. In the next chapter, the results of this process will be discussed on the basis of the themes that were used in the theoretical framework, added with the results on discussions on the current status of the Rotterdam nightlife, as well as discussions on collaboration and difficulties of city planning/bureaucracy.

4. Results.

This chapter will discuss the results of the interviews. After reading the transcripts of the interview carefully and multiple times, a number of themes could be identified. Most of these themes corresponded with the concepts that were discussed in Chapter 2. The themes through which the results will be discussed are liveability, the status of the Rotterdam nightlife, the values of (the Rotterdam) nightlife, (minimizing) the risks of (Rotterdam) nightlife, the Rotterdam municipal policies concerning nightlife and collaboration & bureaucracy. In chapter 5, these results will be condensed in order to answer the research questions, as well as presenting some possible changes for future nightlife policy and facilitation.

4.1 Liveability.

All of the interviewees live in or adjacent to Rotterdam and experience life in the city on a daily basis. Similarly with the other researches focussing on the experienced liveability of Rotterdam, the overall results of the interviews were solely positive. Similarly with the surveys mentioned in the section on liveability in chapter 2, the most important aspects that determine quality of life were safety, amenities and facilities. People unanimously judged the current quality of life in the city as good, such as interviewee 1, a cultural policy advisor, who notes: "I like the quality of life and liveability in the city. I would judge it as more than sufficient, somewhere around an 8". Interviewee 8, who was actually asked to participate because of the fact she lived adjacent to several nightlife venues even argued: "the kind of life I've led in recent years, yeah, I just think it's perfect".

5 of the 8 interviewees also specifically addressed the positive change the city has gone through over the years according to them. Interviewee 7, a police officer, claimed: "you notice the quality of life is increasing drastically compared to the past. You can see very clearly that the city is investing in the liveability by building new housing, but also facilitating students to come to the city". Similarly, interviewee 2 noticed that:

> "Personally, I feel the city is developing very positively. When looking at the increase of tourism, the development of the quality of life in the different neighborhoods, the redevelopment of housing and things like that, it has to be said that in recent years, the city has made a big progress from a raw, unpolished city where it was all a bit old and creaky, to a well-polished city with good amenities" (interview 2).

Interviewee 4 also praises the work of municipal departments responsible for city marketing such as Rotterdam Partners. When asked about the bad image the city had a few years ago, he notes:

> "I think that in the past ten years, city marketing has done miracles for the image of the city. Because that was indeed the image of the city everyone outside of Rotterdam had, and it was also true for the most part. Look how that turned around in the past 10 years. And how many people come to live here now because the image has improved enormously" (interview 4).

This is not to say there are no downsides or worries amongst the interviewees. Interviewee 5 fears the increased popularity will lead to gentrification, noting he has a "constant fear that Rotterdam will become a city where you will only find coffee bars that close at six, wine bars that close at 11 and beer boutiques where you can buy the most fancy beers for 8 euros per glass". While all interviewees did feel safe in the city (even during nighttime), which corresponds with the results of the surveys discussed in chapter 2; interviewee 2, who has decades of experience in the security sector, argues that "the only problem is the fact that crime has become more extreme". This was also noted in the theoretical framework, it is not the case that the crime rate is going up, but when violence takes place, there is more usage of weapons and severe violent behaviour.

4.2 Status of Rotterdam nightlife.

All of the interviewees were also asked to their opinions on the current status of the Rotterdam nightlife (before the outbreak of the corona pandemic), both in the quality as in the variation of the current nightlife. The expressed opinions varied greatly. 4 of the interviewees expressed dissatisfaction and concern about the current nightlife, 3 argued the nightlife was good and identified a positive trend and one did not necessarily give a value judgement. Interviewee 5, the founder of N8W8, judged it with a 6,5 with "lots of room for growth and lots of potential". He argued there is strong programming, but much to do in terms of professionalization and dialogue with other stakeholders. Interviewee 6, the co-owner and artistic director of MONO argued the (experienced) lack of unambiguous vision of the municipality in relation to nightlife has been detrimental for the sector, as

according to her, they sometimes judge it as cultural institutions and sometimes as commercial hospitality venues. Interviewee 2 was also critical, arguing that

> "it used to be better. I have a feeling that the atmosphere in the nightlife was better. I think the clubs were more fun. If you look at the nightlife venues, how many of them currently have their own concepts? Most of these locations are now, simply put, shed that are rented out". Another reason, he argues, is the festivalization, "the nightlife crowd has a fantastic curriculum of festivals they can choose from here and you can only spend your money once".

However, there were also interviewees who felt that the nightlife in Rotterdam was doing well. Interviewee 7 argued "I think the current nightlife in Rotterdam is on its way up. Previously the focus was on the Stadhuisplein and the clubs that in the vicinity, you now see more and more places where nightlife grows". In terms of the number of venues and variety he argues "the number, it is growing and that is positive because when the supply grows you see that the variation also increases". Similarly, interviewee 8 notes that "it's getting more and more varied. It is getting more fun too. More entrepreneurs came in, with new restaurants and with new entertainment venues. Entrepreneurs who, for example, already had a club or a bar, added extra things to make it even more varied".

4.3 Values of nightlife.

When asked to identify and describe the possible values of nightlife, a number of recurring benefits were mentioned such as social cohesion, developing identity, economic benefits, artistic development and city marketing. Almost all of these also correspond to the benefits that were described in chapter 2. Interviewee 5, a former Cultural Entrepreneurship and Economics student, wrote his master thesis on the social and cultural values of nightlife for large Dutch cities. He found that nightlife can have

> "the same effect as museums, exhibition spaces and other cultural places. If they are well spread out across the city and are accessible to a wide audience that they actually contribute to four things, namely the social cohesion in the city, the attractiveness of the city, talent development in the city and employment in the city. So [for the city] there are three benefits focused inwards and one of them outwards" (interview 5).

Interviewee 2, with decades of experience as a bouncer noted that the nightlife can be beneficial for cultural integration of Rotterdam's many ethnicities and cultures, for he experienced it as "a catalyst to create that melting pot. Why not stimulate that in the hope that one gets both entertainment and grows together instead of getting separated?". Interviewee 6, the co-owner and artistic director of MONO also thinks that nightlife is beneficial to social cohesion as different social, cultural and economic classes come together. She also argued nightlife is a very direct form of interaction between art and the public, describing the unique duality of the experience: "I love that you have an individual experience, so you can feel something about the music yourself, but you also share it in a collective form". Interestingly, she also mentioned nightlife "has been a kind of counterculture and expression of youth culture and for me, that is very valuable". This resonates with one of the expressed ideas of interviewee 1, who argued that the nightlife facilitates meetings, experimentation and innovation   poetically noted "At night, things may arise that cannot tolerate daylight. That sounds like something very negative if it is illegal, but it is not about illegality. You have plants that flourish in daylight but you also have seeds that germinate in the dark".

All interviewees did mention the possible economic benefits it can have for the city, the municipal cultural policy advisor noted both direct and indirect profits:

> "Employment is created, euros are spent in your city and it's what people earn
> their living with. It is also favorable for the business climate. And because of
> that attractive climate you also have a kind of spillover, a ring around it [the
> city] of suppliers for nightlife or companies that settle here because of a good
> nightlife" (interview 1).

However, when talking about the values, focus mostly lied on the social and cultural benefits, or as interviewee 2 puts it when asked about expressing the value of nightlife in financial figures "I think it can be beneficial, but it cannot be just about the money. Because let's face it, nightlife is a matter of feelings".

4.4 Risks accompanying nightlife.

As discussed in chapter 2 nightlife is also often associated with a number of accompanying risks. The participants of the interviews were asked to provide their vision on these risks and how to prevent them. It provided a wide variety of answers. Although none of the interviewees identified an (experienced) increase in negative incidents, 2 of the 3

interviewees that have professional experience with escalation during nightlife (the bouncer, the police officer and the founder of the organisation of nightlife stewards) pointed out they felt that, when incidents did happen, it was often more extreme as also noted in the section on liveability. Interviewee 5, the bouncer, argued

> "part of the nightlife audiences are not inhibited anymore when it comes to violence. The fact that Feis [a Rotterdam rap artist] was shot on the Binnenweg on New Year's Eve for something as insignificant as a spilled beer ... But you can't eradicate it, all you can do is organize yourself in such a way to identify as many risks as possible".

Interviewee 3, the founder of Meion, also noticed this trend "the incidents that do occur sometimes become more extreme. You see that the combination of drugs that are used and the amount of drugs that are consumed play a part, but mostly that weapons are increasingly found [amongst nightlife audiences]". Interviewee 7, the police officer, did not have a lot of experiences with more extreme incidents in the city's nightlife. The incidents he came across were mostly small altercations of between people who had too much to drink. When it comes to the substance (ab)use, interviewee 3 argued that "a very good development is the responsible alcohol service policy based on STAD that is currently implemented in Rotterdam. However, with the combination of alcohol and drugs, I think it's more effective to provide more and better education and information".

The police officer argued that when it comes to drugs and alcohol, one of the most important aspects is the role and training of nightlife venue personnel, that it might also be prudent to focus more on de-escalation with the staff and security of venues. Persons "who can also enter into a conversation in terms of intelligence and judgement and convey to people what the situation is and how to act" (interview 7). He also signals that the Rotterdam police force is drastically ageing, with around 17.000 people leaving the 60.000 people police force in the coming years. Because of this, the issue of their capacity is a recurring issue in the Rotterdam nightlife discussions, which raises the question on how to keep a sense of security and safety throughout the nightlife in the city.

One often voiced argument is the increase in the number of BOA's (community service officers) and nightlife stewards of Meion. All of the interviewees responded optimistically to this idea. When asked about Meion, the police officer noted:

"they often communicate a bit more. In some cases, we need to be more professional in our communication to people. They are more accessible and we see there are situations where our requirement was assumed, but that the stewards act in a de-escalating manner, after which our presence is no longer necessary! Especially since, with the uniform we are wearing, we sometimes function as a red rag on a bull" (interview 7).

This perspective is shared by interviewee 5: "I don't think you need police to make a place safer. Maybe you could focus much more on the Meion stewards you have here in Rotterdam who do a very good job" and interviewee 8: "the moment you have more stewards present, it makes sense that [feelings of] safety go up. So why not? It also benefits employment".

In terms of risk prevention, some quite interesting remarks were made by interviewee 6, as she noticed that one possible reason for the absence of incidents at MONO could be the conditions of the venue:

"I think people feel it in the interaction among themselves and with the venue. Is the staff accessible and willing to engage in conversations? The music, is it loud or negative or is there a positive vibe? The light in the venue, we have pink light, we have white walls and floors, big windows and it has something transparent, it's open. I think it all comes together".

This is combined with instilling the visitors with a self-regulatory mindset:

"We strongly believe in the individuality of everybody, but in the end it is all about the collective. We don't have a stage for the DJ, besides the fact that it would not fit. But the DJ is part of the audience. What we find very important about the space in MONO is the sense of appropriation, in a very literal way. You can take a chair and put it somewhere else and nobody would hold you accountable for it, because you should understand that chair should not be taken home or put outside. But you are free to make it your at home here. A bit of improvised chaos, controlled freedom" (interview 6).

However, she is quick to stress it might work because of the specific audience that MONO attracts. This notion is shared by the founder of Meion "of course you can stimulate the senses with light and sound and smells and thus influence a mood. But that does not work

equally well for all target groups" (interview 3) and the doorman. He argues these kinds of practices might work at places like MONO but probably not at Stadhuisplein. This is not to say the subject should be neglected as he emphasizes "It's not just the doorman at the door who sets the policy. I am completely convinced that the entire club can shape door policy, only, there are aspects that make it easier at certain locations compared to others" (interview 2). Besides the possible limited effectiveness, interviewee 8 also argues these kinds of guidelines could "take away the identity and creativity of an entrepreneur" and "If you remove the darkness in certain venues, its audience might no longer feel comfortable as it's not their thing".

As discussed in chapter 2, one of the most effective methods of risk prevention in nightlife settings seems to be the aforementioned STAD programme so during the interviews, it was discussed whether it would be valuable to perhaps mirror or at least incorporate parts of the STAD programme here in Rotterdam. This can be an entirely new body, or the Panel Deurbeleid (which is currently mainly occupied with identifying and countering discriminatory door policies) could be given extended capacity (both in members and in authority). However, all interviewees immediately expressed doubts and possible pitfalls, as it can irritate and hinder the work of the current authoritative bodies such as the Rotterdam police force.

Interviewee 5 claims: "You already see a lot of committees and such, so maybe they'll think: f*ck, do have to do this as well! They [the municipality] won't have to run it, but they must be involved. While they already have capacity issues". However, he is positive about the idea, as he notes "there is actually one meeting place for all these stakeholders in the safety discussion and that is the Panel Deurbeleid. I think we have all the knowledge and experience to be able to do something with it". He also claimed they sometimes lack concrete points of action according to interviewee 5: "with executive power you might be able to get it done. But I think that is difficult to achieve". The other two members of the Panel Deurbeleid shared similar concerns, they were (relatively) open to the idea, but foresaw difficulties in implementing it. However, whereas interview 2 claimed he was very supportive of such an integrated approach, interviewee 3 was more reluctant:

> "I would be careful creating a security body for nightlife, it means you will enter
> the sphere of the police department. Of course you can give advice, as an
> addition to the Panel Deurbeleid. But I would not make it an authoritative
> organization, because you will clash with the current authorities".

4.5 Nightlife policy.

While some of the questions asked concerned the nightlife policies of the municipality in general, the desk research identified two aspects that seem to cause the most friction: the licensing system of nighttime opening hours and the recent setbacks with a number of (possible) entertainment zones like the Schieblock, the Stadhuisplein and the Ferro Dome. Therefore most of this section will discuss these two issues, especially because most of the other voiced opinions on the cultural policy can also be discussed in section 4.6.

The interviewees have provided a wide range of endorsements and objections to the idea of entertainment zones or long-term commitments. One of the major and often mentioned beneficial consequences is providing owners of the venues the security and promise of a long-term commitment if wanted, thereby incentivising them to invest in expensive but long-term solutions to minimize risks. Something acknowledged by the founder of the N8W8 when asked about entertainment zones: "It fits perfectly in the facilitation of the night to not give creative entrepreneurs a temporary place, but providing them long-term visions, so that they can recoup their investments" (interview 5). He also mentions the example of the complaints made by residents of Het Witte Dorp, a neighbourhood in Rotterdam-West. The possibilities for a sound-absorbing wall were explored, but the estimated price was over 40.000 euros, something they would not earn back thanks to the 2-year contract they had, after which it was uncertain if they could stay. Interviewee 5 also notes that, in cities like London and Manchester, there is the so-called 'agents-of-change' principle. It entails that when you come to an area, you may not disturb the venues/residents already there. This policy is shared by multiple interviewees, especially when contrasted to the recent Stadhuisplein incident. For as interviewee 2 argues:

> "To put it bluntly: first come, first serve. Those venues have been there forever. As long as I know it, they have been there and now, due to a mistake made at the town hall because a signature was wrongfully placed under a permit, suddenly the interest of those students is preferred over the interest of those entrepreneurs. While they have been there for years and have made significant investments".

But in terms of facilitating entertainment zones, he is adamant; it's dependent on:

"the existing infrastructure, the people who live and work there. Can they enjoy it with the current amenities and housing? In other words, is the insulation good? Are there sufficient parking amenities? Are there enough public toilets to prevent public urinating? Is there capable supervision? How and if you organize these entertainment depends entirely on what the already existing structures and amenities are" (interview 2).

When asked about her experiences of living adjacent to the nightlife in the Oude Haven, interviewee 8 notes: "Yes, there are some things. But you have to accept that. Every Thursday there are some drunk students yelling", also nuancing "Those venues have been there for so long and the residents have been there for so long as well. It's just a little bit intertwined, you can't change that anymore. But to actually develop housing at that place [Stadhuisplein] ... yeah, that's ridiculous". When asked about long-term commitments and the recent incidents of the Stadhuisplein, similar statements were made by interviewees 4: "I think it's ludicrous, venues that have been there for over 30 years have a problem because of mistakes made by the municipality" & 5: "I think that the responsibility should also lie with the developer. Especially if there's a venue that has been there for so long and follows the regulations that exist, the noise limitations and such. If homes are then developed, it is up to the developer to ensure that there is sufficient insulation".

Another often mentioned benefit of entertainment zones is that it offers the authoritative bodies such as the police force a place where they can concentrate their limited capacity. As the police officer, who acknowledged "if you are really going to concentrate a substantial part of the nightlife in certain places, it would be easier with regard to our efforts, as most of our focus would then simply be on a few locations, instead of having to be everywhere in the city at the same time" (interview 7), it must be noted that he was not in favour of focussing all nightlife in a few places, just venues such as clubs and large, loud live music venues, not the 'regular' bars and cafés.

However, plenty of objections and issues with entertainment zones were also raised. 4 interviewees brought up the difficulty of combining long-term entertainment zones with the zoning plans. The founder of Meion argued:

"Zoning plans are continually changing and where nightlife might be set up now, in five or 10 years' time that area must possibly be used for developing housing because of the shortage. So situations change and then you have a location with nightlife while a lot of housing is needed. Then you get the

age-old discussion of what came first, and who has more rights. In my view, first come, first serve is not always right, because the fact that you were there earlier does not mean that you have more rights or provide more needs. That really depends on the situation, because you will have to build houses somewhere when there is a shortage" (interview 3).

According to him, the only way entertainment zones would work is to start one from scratch. As that would leave total freedom on deciding how much housing will be in the surrounding area, and the people who will come to live there will know in advance they'll be living in an entertainment zone.

The cultural policy advisor also mentioned she's sceptical about entertainment zones and long-term commitments stating: "I should check that [long-term commitments] with my colleagues from Urban Development and Real Estate, but it will intervene in the city zoning plans" (interview 1). Also, apparently there are some jurisdictional issues to implement the agents-of-change principle in the Netherlands. As she mentions: "I have raised the issue once with colleagues and then I got some ifs and buts in return and that it has to do with national legislation" (interview 1). However, she acknowledges the issues with investments and short-term stays. According to her, this is something the municipality could offer possible solutions for:

"Are there things you can do as a municipality to make investments in sound insulation more attractive or feasible? Are there interesting innovations conceivable? Are there any conceivable mobile box-in-box constructions that you can move around the city? Are there subsidies or loans with very low interest rates? So that an investment in sound insulation becomes feasible for an entrepreneur?" (interview 1).

With respect to the licensing of opening hours, there were a number of different points of view. The producers and creatives want to have more choices when it comes to closing times and not have to pick between closing 02:00 at the latest or fulfil the requirements of a 24-hour license (as those are the hardest to obtain). The proprietor of Poing (former BAR) argues "the current licensing system is weird, there is nothing in between. And it's only like this, because they [the municipality] say it is" (interview 4). The co-owner of MONO claims she does not necessarily want a 24-hour license, but wants to have the option to close a little bit later than 02:00:

"What if you fall in between? We really just want to be open an hour longer, that's it. There is a double standard I think, or a lack of vision. Because when you talk about the neoliberal system, it is always about supply and demand and market forces. Well, the market wants us to be open longer, that is clear, we have to send a lot of people away most times. But then all of a sudden it's: no we have to regulate everything and there are laws that apply. I find it a bit frustrating at times" (interview 6).

Further on she argues:

"If you are talking about 2020, this is the time in which flexibility and fluidity are great recognizable features. But still we insist on the rigid system of either two or eight o'clock in the morning, why not three or four? I understand that it is important there is legislation. But in our case, we have a good relationship with the neighborhood, we can discuss our options and wishes together. Talk and think with each other and trust the capabilities of your entrepreneurs" (interview 6).

Interviewee 8 also argues licensing should be more case-specific, arguing that Plan C, a well-isolated venue, should be allowed to be open until 4/5, while also giving the example of a specific venue in the Oude Haven.

"You will not experience any noise disturbance from one of the cafes because of the type of café it is. It's focussed on people wanting a nightcap. When everything is closed, you go there. They are geared to that. They can deal with that. When you get there and they see you're too intoxicated, they don't serve you. If you limit them to closing at two, you just take the identity of the cafe away from them" (interview 8).

There are pros and cons for either side of the debate. 3 interviewees argued that flexible closing times could put extra strain on the bureaucratic system of licenses, although interviewee 4 disagrees, as he mentions the advantage of digitization. "They can perfectly put things in a system, then you can even create a file per venue and then you see: this target group, it closes this late, etc.". However, another often voiced concern is the limited

police capacity, which might become an issue with flexible opening hours. The police officer (interview 7) noted they often have to monitor certain places (such as those at the Stadhuisplein) when they close, for possible incidents with the intoxicated audiences. The advantage being that currently, all of these venues close around the same time. With flexible closing times, the police won't have that luxury, meaning they will continually have to drive through the city visiting these places one by one, even if they have the capacity.

However, others argued having flexible closing times could actually disseminate the stream of visitors of night time venues going home, creating less opportunity of interaction, friction and consequently, disturbances such as violence. The founder of Meion noted: "a very big advantage of the layered structure when it comes to closing times is the lack of a massive groups of leaving audiences, which is more manageable. I don't think it would negatively affect the tranquillity of the city centre. especially if you have enough BOA's and stewards" (interview 3). The argument of increased BOA's and hosts seems sensible and is also expressed by others such as interviewee 4: "the argument that there is too little police capacity is nonsense, because there are plenty of BOA's that can deal with a lot of work", and interviewee 5 said: "the condition for the pilot [of the Rembrandtplein in Amsterdam] was also that there should be extra BOA's". However, interviewee 2 articulates one of the major possible issue with this idea. If venues have the possibility to do more business, more safety services will be required (be they police, BOA's or hosts) and "you have to be careful, because you have to deal with legislations". If action has to be taken on the public roads, you have to be sure they have the right to act.

> "The police, of course, have the means of violence at their disposal, the BOA's have limitations and the guys from Meion don't have that right. So it has a great legal aspect in regard to how it should be organized. If something goes terribly wrong, the mayor is ultimately responsible. So I can understand his cautiousness. Only he can be restrained and rigid or he can be restrained and constructive" (interview 2).

There were also some other arguments mentioned against changing the current policy. the policy advisor argued that, because of the limited amount of possible interested visitors, if she would issue "ten 24-hour permits in the city and 10 additional clubs open up tomorrow. I would end up with fewer clubs than I started with" (interview 1). Furthermore, she argues flexible 24-hour licensing "would solve a problem if you assume a lot of night catering permits would now be rejected because the maximum has been reached. And that is not the

signal that I receive from my colleagues from the Department of Safety" (interview 1). However, this is not in line with the statements made by the mayor and police chief in this discussion at the end of last year (Geluk & Lewis, 2019a). It is true, however, that in February, for the first time in a long time (even before the release of the Vers Beton research), a 24-hour license was issued to club RTM ("Gemeente deelt voor het eerst weer 24-uursvergunning uit", 2020).

She also draws a different conclusion from research by Vers Beton: "the lack of 24-hour venues in Rotterdam is because of the conscious choice to close, as it would not be economically viable for them, also noting there has been a pilot with venues on the Nieuwe Binnenweg, but that this flexibility was only used barely" (interview 1). Finally, she does mention the municipality is planning on evaluating current hospitality policies, including the licensing and that "the mayor has also promised an investigation into the need and actual use of the permits" (interview 1).

Interviewee 8 also argues licensing should be more case-specific, arguing that Plan C, a well-isolated venue, should be allowed to be open until 4/5, while also giving the example of a specific venue in the Oude Haven.

"You will not experience any noise disturbance from one of the cafes because of the type of café it is. It's focussed on people wanting a nightcap. When everything is closed, you go there. They are geared to that. They can deal with that. When you get there and they see you're too intoxicated, they don't serve you. If you limit them to closing at two, you just take the identity of the cafe away from them" (interview 8).

4.6 Cooperation & bureaucracy.
The final recurring theme throughout the interviews was the (distinct, but simultaneously intertwined) issues of cooperation and bureaucracy. It boiled down to three concepts that should be interwoven: increased flexibility and responsibility, increased cooperation and more streamlined bureaucracy.

One of the promising policies the municipality is already implementing in some cases is the high trust - high responsibility system. The founder of the N8W8 acknowledges this system can help venues that offer not solely entertainment, but actual cultural programming, as these venues often have issues with financing, as well as limited personnel, making it hard for them to put a lot of time and attention into a sufficient and complete subsidy application. However, he also argues that first and foremost, entrepreneurs should already

have an intrinsic responsibility to "talk to the neighborhood, but also to the municipality about how they can improve their product, their service, their place. Not only in terms of noise disturbances, but also in terms of safety and also in terms of attractiveness and accessibility. That's entrepreneurship!" (interview 5).

The proprietor of Poing (formerly BAR), also argues for more customization and flexibility, as he thinks each venue should be judged and treated on its own merit and history: "you cannot see it [the nightlife sector] as one equal whole. Of course there are parallels between what we do and Club Vie, but there is also a lot of difference. Our place has quite a good reputation with the police because we have few incidents and attract a different audience than other venues" (interview 4). One of the examples he mentions is flexibility with the location of venues. He mentions underground dance club RTM and his own venue Poing as examples, as these are venues that are (partially) located in underground basements, of which he notes:

> "the disadvantage for such a basement spaces is that they are of less attractive spaces for which you must ask less rent, unless you realize nightlife there and Poing is a very interesting example in this. We don't need windows for that, the same goes for the party area here. Those places can be underground everywhere and you only add value to your square meters. All you have to take into account is the visitors when they come out of the venue" (interview 4).

In the case of the Schieblock, he argues there were "all kinds of entrepreneurs, who played an integral role in the development of the city and in the perception of outsiders ... you simply push those people aside and throw all the work they've done in the trash. I think it signals a lack of knowledge and appreciation for them" (interview 4). Furthermore, the municipality immediately told him there would be no nighttime licences (after 23:00), which he argues is a bit short sighted, "we have already adapted the entire concept to the redevelopment. We want think along with the municipality and the developer. Instead of just a club, we're about arcade games now, a place where families come, young and old. Companies come here, the Department of Safety had their Christmas drink here actually. This place that fits perfectly with the new development to me. But apparently, no one on the other side thinks the same" (interviewee 4).

The policy advisor stresses that the issue of flexibility is complicated. For example she "can imagine removing the financial risk for experimental or more innovative

programming might help". However, she also notes there are already multiple different cultural subsidies that are available. With these "the rules say nothing about the time your event has to take place or anything. And yes, you will be tested on a number of criteria, because it's taxpayer money. We must be sensible to who we give that money. But if you want to set up a program with young, creative, talented DJs, but cannot manage it financially, you can hand in a good subsidy application for it" (interview 1). She thinks the municipality also has an image problem, "if entrepreneurs like Shirin and Kris say: they just see us as commercial venues. Why? That's an assumption on their side". Finally, she argues that the risk-averse culture we live in complicates things, "if something goes wrong, we are very much looking for who is responsible. The mayor is responsible for enforcement and security, so he must uphold it. It makes it complicated, but also safer at the same time. You know that individual was responsible and you can act on it, but it does not speed up flexibility" (interview 1).

With the requested flexibility also comes great responsibility. So on the other hand, the venues would be compelled to implement some risk minimizing initiatives such as extensive camera policies and improved training for security guards. The ex-chairman of the security guard association, when talking about the possibilities to provide extra courses for security guards argued:

> "The municipality has 1 power and that is the issue of a permit! So in that aspect, the municipality can implement any requirement they want to see in the nightlife to their liking. If the municipality has a vision of nightlife in which they make it very clear: we want our nightlife to have those and those aspects, they can include that in the licensing system".

Interviewee 8 also argued this flexibility should come with more responsibility and also entail strict and extensive door policies: "In my experience, they hardly check for weapons and drugs. I just see too few metal detectors or that they are not used when they are there at all. And fine them when not complying. A fine hits hard. I know, because I used to work at a cafe. Things like that, strict but fair".

Another result from the interviews is requested interaction between the municipal body and the actors and producers of nightlife. 4 interviewees spoke out on the perceived divide between the municipal bodies on the one hand, and the managers, police officers, security guards and bar staff on the other. Interviewee 2 claims he misses knowledge on the workings of the night with the municipality:

"Because they are in an ivory tower. They don't know what's happening on the street at all. When was the last time we saw someone responsible for approving licenses from the municipality in the nightlife of Rotterdam to experience what happens? I honestly can't remember. Let alone that it's a structural thing, like once a month. Then he creates a feeling for what he is doing as well as seeing the consequences of his actions".

The proprietor of Poing gives a striking example of the misunderstanding that seems to occur: "I spoke to policymakers a number of times and they said: 'but this is what you like right? Moving around, earning little money, putting this spot on the map and then moving on.' No, that is not what I pursue. My ambition is to become part of the development of an area" (interview 4). The policy advisor also acknowledges improvements can be made in this respect: "Thijs [the founder of N8W8] won't say that he doesn't trust me, but he does have his own subjective image about the municipality. And vice versa, this will also apply to us as a municipality towards the entrepreneurs" (interview 1).

But the, perhaps, most difficult issue surrounding nightlife identified in the interviews is that of bureaucracy. All 3 interviewees on the production side of the nightlife and 2 others argued they could not identify an unambiguous vision of nightlife with the municipality. Interviewee 8 thinks current policies and methods "leave something to be desired on both sides. But I know a lot of entrepreneurs here who feel they are flogging a dead horse". The proprietor of Poin, who won the contest for the development of the Ferro buildings says he

"experienced the lack of unambiguousness of the municipality myself with the Ferro Dome. There were just a lot of different things going on there, the interests of the Port of Rotterdam company, the interests of Urban Development, the interests of the Alderman with the Building, Living and Energy Transition portfolio, the interests of the Alderman responsible for Culture. It was such an absurd situation. I heard from someone from D66, that there once was a conversation between councillors, where one said: you must take care of this, it's your responsibility, while pointing a finger and vice versa. To come back to your question of how I see it city-wide ..... there is no unambiguous vision" (interview 4).

However, in the earlier discussed policy documents such as the *Horecanota* and the *Popvisie*, as well as during the interview with the policy advisor, an unambiguous and admirable vision for the Rotterdam nightlife was propagated. During the same interview, it was argued that there is not a lack of vision for the nightlife of Rotterdam, but that the fractal structure of the municipal departments relating to nightlife (such as safety, licensing, subsidies, etc.), all with their own focus and workings is sometimes slowing and inhibiting the process of policy making for the nightlife. The policy advisor stresses the complex system of government of a large city:

> "Nightlife itself, if you try to put that into policy terms, what is it? You can look at the night with many different perspectives. You can look at it from a purely economic perspective: What kind of people are the nightlife entrepreneurs and what product do they offer, what are the rules on people who work night shifts and do they need public transport? Then you have the infrastructure, the services that you and I use during the day, should these perhaps also be available to people who are economically active at night? You can look at it from safety. What happens at night? How do we keep it safe? What requirements do you place on licensing and how do you enforce them on licenses? You also have the tourism perspective and the cultural perspective. It is everywhere and therefore it is nowhere, because if something belongs to everyone, no one is responsible for it" (interview 1).

Further on, she asks: "So general interest can be divided into very specific interests; who makes the assessment when two interests meet? Who wins? That is what happens when a city develops and grow. The vertical layout of municipal departments was always very logical, very adequate. But the outside world is not so neat, so well-organized. So how do you match those two? This is where we stand right now with nightlife as a municipality and is also why we developed the environmental vision" (interview 1). According to her, these issues are the biggest challenges for the city, also noting "we have to ensure that all those interests are united in project teams or something like that, in order to get the interests together, but also to make a good decisions. We have to present city-wide vision this year". On the subject of N8W8, she says she spoke with Thijs to ask whether it would not be better to have an internal N8W8 with representatives from all divisions, although she also mentions "I think it is very good that there is now an external body and that it can provide solicited and unsolicited advice and is independent".

It must actually be noted that all interviewees responded positively to the ambitions and efforts of the N8W8, the independent advisory foundation founded by one of the interviewees and which will also be shortly discussed in the recommendations. But some remarks were made considering its effectiveness. Interviewee 6 argues that "the night watch is a good initiative, but in the end it must be embedded in actual policy. If it doesn't, it's almost an excuse for the city to say: 'but we have something, the N8W8!'. I think you should have a certain kind of power and control, within the municipality". Interviewee 4 also doubts the N8W8's effectiveness, although he is also positive, "I think the N8W8 definitely is a good initiative as it gives the sector a more unified voice".

Finally, one of the questions that arose during one of the first interviews must also be discussed, what was the possible reasoning behind the current policy? It must be noted that the interviews did not provide a clear and demonstrable answer, although 4 interviewees mentioned it could be the mayor, also criticizing the amount of control the mayor holds in regard to nightlife regulation. Interviewee 4 argues that in bureaucratic terms "It always starts top down, with Aboutaleb [the mayor]". He also argues "the only thing he listens to is the voice of the people, and that's where the N8W8 is important". Interviewee 6 also questions the mayors' authoritative power in the nightlife discussion, claiming he has too much decision power. Interviewee 2 shares this scepticism of the current mayor as follows: "I recently spoke to a friend who is an entrepreneur with close relations to the mayor, and he said to me the mayor told him: 'If it were up to me, everything would close in the city center at 11 pm at the latest' ". However, he does actually think that the position of the mayor is key in reinvigorating the nightlife, according to him, the quickest solution is to have:

"A mayor who is open to an advisory board made up of various specialists, who present him in a broad way what would be good for the city and in particular the nightlife. If the mayor would have confidence in the quality of the advice, he'll take the recommendations to heart and then try to work them out in practical policies with his officials and aldermen. You just have to have a mayor who is open to such advices though! That way you can easily create change, without making all kinds of adjustments to the political system. And if later, it turns out there is indeed a need for an alderman or council with the task of handling nightlife, new councillors will be appointed and the different portfolios divided" (interviewee 2).

Yet interviewee 3 says he can "understand such a comment from the mayor. He's about safety, that's his portfolio. From his role as head of safety in the city, I understand. In his role as a mayor this is somewhat more difficult".

5. Conclusion, Recommendations and Further Research.

5.1 Conclusion.

This study's research question asked: to what extent can the municipality of Rotterdam balance its cultural nightlife with the liveability of the city in the coming years, thereby posing sub questions concerning the criteria to balance these concepts, the values and risks that accompany nightlife and what policy measures could be implemented to improve this balance; whereby the last of these questions will be discussed in the following section of recommendations. Some of the sub questions can be answered resolutely. Nightlife has the capacity to increase social cohesion, talent development, numerous (direct and indirect) economic benefits and improve a city's image as a whole. Similarly, while there are numerous risks associated with nightlife (and it will continue to be susceptible to them), multi-disciplinary approaches with cooperation from all stakeholders seems effective and realisable as well as the fact that the sector seems willing to adopt such an approach.

However, in terms of the main research question, it has become clear that (facilitating) nightlife is an incredibly complex and intricate subject. With the facilitation, production and regulation of nightlife in a city, many different subjects and elements of citylife are touched upon. It is influenced by safety measures, licensing, trends, substance (ab)use, art, population density, tourism, infrastructure and more. The concepts that were discussed in chapter 2 all contribute significantly to the nightlife itself as well as the liveability of the city, and these concepts themselves are complex and encompass many different dimensions. To therefore balance the nightlife while maintaining the liveability of a city (even though the nightlife influences that same liveability) requires massive effort and attention from all stakeholders.

This is not to say that it is not possible though, as for a definitive answer to the main research question, the answer is clear. The municipality's vision and decisions have a great effect on the city's nightlife and its effects on the liveability of the city. Through laws, regulations, subsidies and cooperation (with the sector itself as well as other cities and their successful measures), a municipality has quite some power and influence on how the sector operates and presents itself to the world. Through expanding knowledge and experience within the municipality on the day-to-day (or night-to-night) workings of the sector, fitting and effective policies can be made (or improved). However, the municipal body has been shrinking over the last years, providing an increased pressure on a decreasing number of

people to facilitate nightlife and maintain the liveability of the city. Another factor is the multidisciplinary aspects nightlife encapsulates and touches upon as explained above, as this entails that many different municipal departments have a say in the municipal vision and decisions regarding nightlife.

That is why there are several important aspect to facilitating a vibrant, safe and educated nightlife. With unambiguous and long-term vision, as well as intense cooperation between the sector and the municipality, it should be possible to balance the concepts of nightlife and liveability; and facilitate and maintain the vibrant, lively and liveable city both the citizens of Rotterdam and the (inter)national news media claim it is.

5.2 Recommendations.

From the results of the interviews, as well as the desk research, some quite specific and some more general (possible) recommendations can be made. There is no denying that the issue of long-term commitment to nightlife venues is difficult as the zoning plans of a city like Rotterdam are ever changing. However, it is also unfair to punish or force currently existing venues to close as a result of mismanagement of housing corporations, municipal errors, or lack of investments made by the entrepreneur while they don't know they can ever earn back their investments because of the uncertainty of their location. With the Schieblock as a perfect example, it should not be an unreasonable request to incorporate long-term facilitation of some venues in some areas of the city, as it is proven these areas can have significant positive effects on the city.

Safety and risk minimization are key factors in nightlife facilitation and regulation. While some kind incidents might never be removed and it might be worthwhile to investigate more psychological and non-authoritative regulations such as lighting, all research (both the interviews and the desk research) points to the conclusion that an overarching, multi-disciplinary and regulative council is most effective, both in costs and in results. Creating such a body might prove difficult with already existing departments in place, as well as putting more stress on the municipality as they will have to supervise this coalition. However, creating and facilitating a collaboration where these different departments are bundled, combined with other experts such as the members of the Panel Deurbeleid might not only be beneficial, but prudent and necessary as both the police force and the municipality will face reduced capacity over the coming years. Seeing as how the current members of the Panel Deurbeleid do so on a voluntary basis, experimenting with such a body seems intriguing and relatively risk-free.

Expanding the nighttime licensing is another intricate issue with seemingly both positive and negative consequences. However, people from both sides of the discussion identified the flaws and possible improvements of the current system. Seeing as how the first 24-hour license for some time has been handed out in March 2020, it looks like the discussion on licensing can be set in motion again. Having only 28% of the distributed 24-hour licenses used for nightlife purposes and 9 of them even belonging to closed venues is not an optimal usage of licences and bureaucratic capacity for the city. While it must be recognized that because of the diminishing police force, the regulation of the city centre is a precarious subject, experimentation such as that in Amsterdam with the facilitation of better amenities and increased availability of hosts and BOA's, has actually led to a decrease of police requirements. Why not try something like that in Rotterdam as well? Start with a select group of venues, those that have good track records, a good relationship with their surroundings and a willingness to make extra amenities available.

Especially in the cultural nightlife sector, giving entrepreneurs the freedom to develop their ideas can possibly create interesting and successful concepts. However, one must then also be open to accept extensive responsibilities and possible punishments. The municipality is already experimenting with several flexible initiatives such as the 'verlaatjes', 'geluidjes' and short-term licensing. It would be interesting to see what happens if more aspects of nightlife will be given such a level of flexibility. However, there are two crucial conditions for the success of a flexible approach: intense interaction and feedback. Cooperation, dialogue and unambiguous vision. Those three concepts were recurring items in literally every interview. There is no denying there's friction between producers in the sector on the one hand and the municipality on the other hand. But there is also willingness to cooperate on both sides, and with each successful cooperation, the willingness to cooperate will increase. Finally, the most important recommendation might be opting for a form of dualism when it comes to facilitating and producing nightlife. The N8W8 was deemed a very promising advisory body by all interviewees, however, some scepticism towards its effectiveness was also voiced. At the same time, one of the most pressing aspects of improvement for the municipality seems to be diminishing the detrimental bureaucracy that can arise when governing a large city. It might be prudent to look into the formation of a municipal body, with representatives of all the relevant departments that relate to the facilitation of nightlife. This body could streamline the democratic and bureaucratic process, present an unambiguous (long-term) vision of the municipality's wishes in terms of its nightlife, as well as cooperating with the N8W8 intensely. The N8W8 could then become the 'bridge' between the sector and the municipality, while also still presenting both sides with solicited and unsolicited advice.

5.3 Discussion and further research.

There are several aspects of this research that should be taken into account and give way to further research. One of the major limitations of this research is the limited sample size and configuration of interviewees. While the interviewees consisted of a wide variety of stakeholders, having only 8 interviewees for a subject as complex as the nightlife of a big city is a limitation. More stakeholders could be interviewed, giving a more detailed outlook on the subject and its challenges. Examples of these are issuers of specific nightlife permits, bar staff, first aid responders, musicians and influential persons from the nightlife of other Dutch cities. Some persons occupying these roles, such as the nighttime mayor of Amsterdam, a Rotterdam based DJ, a council member of the RRKC and a manager of a venue located at the Stadhuisplein were contacted but declined the requests; they were not available in the limited time of research or simply ignored the emails and phone calls. Furthermore, while the roles the interviewees had in the Rotterdam nightlife varied greatly, the demographic diversity was limited. Out of the 8 interviewees, only three persons were female and only one of the interviewees had a non-Western ethnic background. To truly get an extensive insight in the subjective experiences of the multiplicity of people experiencing life and nightlife in Rotterdam, a more varied sample might be required. A recommendation for further research would therefore be the expansion of accumulated visions and opinions, to truly map out the sectors' wishes, annoyances and recommendations.

Another useful direction for further research concerning the Rotterdam nightlife is a more in-depth look at the internal municipal workings. While the several available policy documents can paint a picture of the aims, goals and focus points of the sector, and the 2-hour long interview with the cultural policy advisor of the municipality was enlightening, a lot of knowledge on the (internal) workings of the municipal bureaucracy is still not known to the researcher. If further research would more accurately look at this, it could lead to more easily identify the experienced friction, problems and possible improvements.

Other necessary further research is the wide differences found throughout the city and its nightlife. One of the conclusions of this research is the intricacy and complexity of nightlife production, facilitation and regulation. With the many different facets that play a part in the experiences of citizens, entrepreneurs and municipality with the Rotterdam nightlife, customized policies and regulations seem most optimal. This would mean doing further research on the different neighbourhoods of the city and its characteristics, the types of venues and the sub-cultures of nightlife audiences. Risk minimizing policies that work for

MONO could make no to little differences for places like the Maassilo and the venues on Stadhuisplein.

Just before the interviews were held and this research was written, the N8W8 foundation had its launch party, also releasing their *Visiedocument,* which encapsulated their vision and goals for the Rotterdam nightlife. More attention could have been given to the workings and future plans of this organisation as all of the respondents expressed very positive opinions on the foundation and it could become a significant player in the discussion surrounding nightlife. The possibility for having the organisation grow (perhaps with financial and organisational help of the municipality) into thé research organisation and mouthpiece of the nightlife sector in Rotterdam should be looked at and discussed further.

Finally, this research must address the time when it was performed and written. The world is currently experiencing a global health and economic crisis because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Thanks to its high infection rates, the Dutch government made the decision to close all nightlife and hospitality venues since the 15th of March. While several hospitality venues may open from June 1st and onwards (only if following strict hygiene rules), nightlife venues such as dance clubs don't yet know when they can re-open. Besides the massive economic consequences for the sector (and the municipality as a whole), the new 1,5 meter society has already been called 'the new normal'. The pandemic and measures taken by the government will leave a significant impact on the sector, and on society as a whole. This research has looked and discussed the 'normal' state and regulations of the nightlife, before the pandemic, but it is impossible to predict if, when or how the 'old ways' will return. Perhaps the sector or we as a society will (have to) drastically change our ways and render most of this research useless, perhaps we will fall back on our old ways after the discovery and mass production of medicines and vaccines, time will tell. For now, the most important thing is the minimization of human suffering, but we should hope that we will soon have the option to enjoy and participate in the ideas of creative people that want to make life at night enjoyable throughout the city in a safe and exciting manner, as it should be.

6. References.

Aantal verkeersdoden door alcohol sterk gestegen. (2019). Retrieved from

   https://www.ad.nl/binnenland/aantal-verkeersdoden-door-alcohol-sterk-gestegen~a159

   4e12/

Adorean, E., Ilovan, O., & Gligor, V. (2017). Urban nightlife consumption in bairro alto,

   lisbon. *Territorial Identity and Development, 2*(2), 24-40.

Anderson, T. L., & Kavanaugh, P. R. (2007). A 'rave' review: Conceptual interests and

   analytical shifts in research on rave culture. *Sociology Compass, 1*(2), 499-519.

Balsas, C. J. (2004). Measuring the liveability of an urban centre: an exploratory study of key

   performance indicators. *Planning, Practice & Research*, *19*(1), 101-110.

Beck, H. 2009. Linking the quality of public spaces to quality of life. *Journal of Place*

   Management and Development, 2(3): 240−248.

Beek, M. (2019). Tijd van keihard feesten op het stadhuisplein is voorbij. Retrieved from

   https://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/tijd-van-keihard-feesten-op-het-stadhuisplein-is-voorbij~a5

   fcf2c1/

Bellis, M., De Greeff, J., & Mulder, J. (2019). Common myths regarding the STAD approach.

   ().STAD in Europe. Retrieved from

   https://www.trimbos.nl/aanbod/webwinkel/product/pm0382-common-myths-regarding-t

   he-stad-approach

Berkelder, N. (2019). Toch geen danceclub in de ferro-hallen: 'Ik ben er goed ziek van'.

   Retrieved from

   https://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/toch-geen-danceclub-in-de-ferro-hallen-ik-ben-er-goed-zie

   k-van~ab81feb7/

Bianchini, F. (1995). Night cultures, night economies. *Planning Practice & Research, 10*(2),

   121-126.

Bijl, H., & Straathof, M. (2015). Langer hijsen en minder herrie op het leidse- en

rembrandtplein, kan dat? Retrieved from https://www.parool.nl/gs-bfbdc275

Bisschop, L., Staring, R., Roks, R., Brein, E., & van de Bunt, H. (2019). *Drugscriminaliteit in de Rotterdamse haven*.

Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory?. *American sociological review*, *19*(1), 3-10.

Boer, T. (2019). What is the socio-cultural impact of underground electronic dance music scenes on the inhabitants of big Dutch cities: An insight into the multifaceted value of the night-time economy. (Unpublished master's thesis). Erasmus university Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

Bogt, T. T., Engels, R., Hibbel, B., Van Wel, F., & Verhagen, S. (2002). "Dancestasy": Dance and MDMA use in Dutch youth culture. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, *29*(1), 157-181.

Bolier, L., Voorham, L., Monshouwer, K., Hasselt, N. V., & Bellis, M. (2011). Alcohol and drug prevention in nightlife settings: a review of experimental studies. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *46*(13), 1569-1591.

Bolt, R. (2018). Why Rotterdam is better than Amsterdam (and should be your next city break). Retrieved from https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/destinations/europe/netherlands/rotterdam/articles/rotterdam-city-break-what-to-see-do/

Brands, J., Schwanen, T., & van Aalst, I. (2014). Spatiotemporal variations in nightlife consumption: A comparison of students in two Dutch cities. *Applied Geography*, 54, 96-109.

Broer, K. (2014). Bijna alle fietsers 's nachts onder invloed. Retrieved from https://www.fietsersbond.nl/nieuws/bijna-alle-fietsers-s-nachts-onder-invloed/

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cabras, I., & Mount, M. P. (2017). How third places foster and shape community cohesion, economic development and social capital: The case of pubs in rural Ireland. *Journal of*

Rural Studies, 55, 71-82.

Calafat, A. (1999). Nightlife in Europe and recreative drug use: Sonar 98 Irefrea.

Calafat, A., Fernández, C., Juan, M., Anttila, A., Arias, R., Bellis, M. A., ... & Kokkevi, A.

(2003). *Enjoying the nightlife in Europe: The role of moderation*. Valencia: Irefrea.

Calafat, A., Gómez, C. F., Juan, M., & Becoña, E. (2007). Weekend nightlife recreational

habits: Prominent intrapersonal "risk factors" for drug use? *Substance use & Misuse,*

42(9), 1443-1454.

Calafat, A., Fernandez, C., Juan, M., & Becona, E. (2008). Recreational nightlife: Risk and

protective factors for drug misuse among young Europeans in recreational

environments. Drugs: *Education, Prevention and Policy, 15*(2), 189-200.

Campo, D., & Ryan, B. D. (2008). The entertainment zone: Unplanned nightlife and the

revitalization of the American downtown. Journal of Urban Design.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13574800802319543

Cilliers, E. J. (2019). *Planning for third places through evidence-based urban development.*

Rethinking third places. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Coggins, T. (2017). 10 reasons everyone should visit Rotterdam. Retrieved from

https://theculturetrip.com/europe/the-netherlands/articles/10-reasons-everyone-should-

visit-rotterdam/

Coldwell, I. b. W. (2017, -03-22). 10 of the best clubs in Amsterdam – chosen by the experts.

The Guardian Retrieved from

https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2017/mar/22/10-best-clubs-in-amsterdam-chosen-

by-dj-experts

Dance- en clubsector Rotterdam. (2010). Rotterdam: RRKC. Retrieved from

https://www.rrkc.nl/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/Dance-en-clubsector-Rotterdam.pdf

Dansend rijk worden: Amsterdam dance event levert miljoenen op. (2016). Retrieved from

https://www.rtlnieuws.nl/algemeen/economie/artikel/365591/dansend-rijk-worden-amst

erdam-dance-event-levert-miljoenen-op

Darchen, S. (2013). The Creative City and the Redevelopment of the Toronto Entertainment

District: A BIA-Led Regeneration Process. *International Planning Studies*.

https://doi.org/10.1080/13563475.2013.774147

De discotheek & club in beeld. (2017). Leiden: Van Spronsen & Partners. Retrieved from

https://www.spronsen.com/brancheinfo/discotheek-club-beeld/

De Staat van de Stad 2018, (2018). Gemeente Rotterdam. *Feiten en cijfers over Rotterdam*.

Retrieved from https://evr010.nl/staat-stad-2018/

De Leeuw, K. (2020, May 16). Een van de redenen voor ons om van onze danceclub een

retro arcade hal met restaurant bar en uitgaansgelegenheid te maken was juist dat we

iets wilden creëren wat beter aansloot bij de toekomstige plannen voor het gebied.

[Facebook status reaction]. Retrieved from

https://www.facebook.com/krisnr10/posts/10158878364229467

Dijksterhuis, E. (2008). *Slimme steden: van Antwerpen tot Zürich.* Business Contact.

Duncan & Jones (1976). *Methodology and Guidelines for Assessing Social Impacts of*

Developments. Berkeley, CA: Duncan and Jones, Inc.

Evaluatie 24-uurshoreca. (2017). (). Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam. Retrieved from

https://amsterdam.raadsinformatie.nl/document/5938280/1/09012f978220d97d

Faarea. (2019, -11-17). The growing importance of the night-time economy. *BBC News*

Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/business-49348792

Flight, S., Broer, J., & Van der West, R. (2018). Evaluatie pilot gastvrij en veilig rembrandt-

en thorbeckeplein. (). Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam. Retrieved from

https://hetccv.nl/fileadmin/Bestanden/Onderwerpen/Uitgaansgeweld/181031_Evaluatie

_Pilot_Gastvrij_en_Veilig_Rembrandt-_en_Thorbeckeplein_-_Eindrapportage.pdf

Forster, S. (2017). Is Rotterdam Europe's new capital of cool? Retrieved from

https://www.cnn.com/travel/article/rotterdam-netherlands-europe-cool-city/index.html

Geluk, M. & Lewis, T. (2019). Aboutaleb houdt informatie achter in de raadsdiscussie over

    meer nachthoreca. Retrieved from

    https://versbeton.nl/2019/09/aboutaleb-houdt-informatie-achter-in-de-raadsdiscussie-o

    ver-meer-nachthoreca/

Geluk, M. & Lewis, T. (2019). Restrictief horecabeleid temt Rotterdamse nacht. Retrieved

    from https://versbeton.nl/2019/09/restrictief-horecabeleid-temt-rotterdamse-nacht/

'Gemeente Rotterdam neemt te veel risico's bij projecten'. (2019). Retrieved from

    https://nos.nl/artikel/2303084-gemeente-rotterdam-neemt-te-veel-risico-s-bij-projecten.

    html

'Gemeente deelt voor het eerst weer 24-uursvergunning uit'. (2020). Retrieved from

    https://www.dehavenloods.nl/nieuws/algemeen/952064/gemeente-deelt-weer-24-uursv

    ergunning-uit

Glaeser, E. L., Kolko, J., & Saiz, A. (2001). Consumer city. *Journal of Economic Geography,*

    1(1), 27-50.

Global liveability report reveals which cities offer the best quality of life for Europeans

    abroad. (2020). Retrieved from

    https://www.eca-international.com/News/February-2020/Global-liveability-report-reveal

    s-which-cities-off

Goosens, F. X., Frijns, T., Van Hasselt, N. E., & Van Laar, M. W. (2013). *Het grote*

    uitgaansonderzoek 2013: Uitgaanspatronen, middelengebruik en risicogedrag onder

    uitgaande jongeren en jongvolwassenen. Trimbos-Instituut, Utrecht.

Grazian, D. (2009). *Urban nightlife, social capital, and the public life of cities 1.* Paper

    presented at the Sociological Forum, 24(4) 908-917.

Hae, L. (2011). Dilemmas of the nightlife fix: Post-industrialisation and the gentrification of

    nightlife in New York city. *Urban Studies, 48*(16), 3449-3465.

Hadfield, P., Lister, S., & Traynor, P. (2009). 'This town's a different town today': Policing

and regulating the night-time economy. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 9*(4), 465-485. doi:10.1177/1748895809343409

Haslauer, E., Delmelle, E. C., Keul, A., Blaschke, T., & Prinz, T. (2015). Comparing subjective and objective quality of life criteria: A case study of green space and public transport in vienna, austria. *Social Indicators Research, 124*(3), 911-927.

Van Havere, T. (2007). Uitgaan en middelengebruik: Trends in Vlaanderen. *Verslaving, 3*(1), 9-16.

Heath, T. (1997). The Twenty-four Hour City concept - a review of initiatives in British cities. Journal of Urban Design. https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809708724404

Hitters, E. (2007). Porto and Rotterdam as European Capitals of Culture: Toward the festivalization of urban cultural policy. *Cultural tourism: Global and local perspectives*, 281-301.

Hitzler, R. (2002). Pill kick: The pursuit of "ecstasy" at techno-events. *Journal of Drug Issues, 32*(2), 459-466.

Hobbs, D., Hadfield, P., Lister, S., & Winlow, S. (2005). Violence and control in the night-time economy. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, 13*(1), 89-102. Retrieved from https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/eccc13&i=95

Hollands, R. G. (1995). Friday night, Saturday night: Youth cultural identification in the post industrial city. URBAN STUDIES. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013504005 T4 Young people's drinking, social practice and spatial experience in the 'liminoid' zones of English night-time cities M4 - Citavi

Horecanota rotterdam 2017-2021. (2017). Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam. Retrieved from https://www.rotterdam.nl/werken-leren/horeca/

Hughes, K., Anderson, Z., Morleo, M., & Bellis, M. A. (2008). Alcohol, nightlife and violence: The relative contributions of drinking before and during nights out to negative health

and criminal justice outcomes. *Addiction, 103*(1), 60-65.

Imago-ambitie van Rotterdam als woonstad in de maak. (2018). Retrieved from

https://rotterdampartners.nl/wonen/imago-ambitie-van-rotterdam-als-woonstad/

Jeffres, L. W., Bracken, C. C., Jian, G., & Casey, M. F. (2009). The impact of third places on

community quality of life. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 4*(4), 333.

Jones, G. (2001). Causes of Alzheimer's disease: Paracetamol (acetaminophen) today?

amphetamines tomorrow? *Medical Hypotheses, 56*(1), 121-123.

Joosten. (2014). 10 slechte lijstjes die Rotterdam nog altijd aanvoert. Retrieved from

https://versbeton.nl/2014/12/10-slechte-lijstjes-die-rotterdam-nog-altijd-aanvoert/

Kaal, H. (2011). A conceptual history of liveability: Dutch scientists, politicians, policy makers

and citizens and the quest for a livable city. *City*, *15*(5), 532-547.

Koning, A. d. (2015). Rotterdam trots op vijfde plek in 'lijst der lijsten'. Retrieved from

https://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/rotterdam-trots-op-vijfde-plek-in-lijst-der-lijsten~a5d11c6c/

Koning, A. d. (2019). Rotterdammers in problemen door slechte administratie gemeente.

Retrieved from

https://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/rotterdammers-in-problemen-door-slechte-administratie-ge

meente~a6d07263/

Lee, S. (2019). New study finds Berlin club industry worth €1.5 billion annually. Retrieved

from https://www.residentadvisor.net/news/43320

Leidelmeijer, K. Middeldorp, M. & Marlet, G. (2019). *Leefbaarheid in Nederland 2018.*

().Ministry of Internal Affairs. Retrieved from

https://leefbaarometer.nl/resources/Leefbaarheid%20in%20Nederland%202018.pdf

Lobato, R. (2006). Gentrification, cultural policy and live music in Melbourne. *Media*

International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy, 120(1), 63-75.

Loer, F. (2020). Opinie: Schrijf geschiedenis met blijvende huisvesting van de creatieve

klasse in schiekadeblok. Retrieved from

https://versbeton.nl/2020/05/schrijf-geschiedenis-met-blijvende-huisvesting-van-de-cre

atieve-klasse-in-schiekadeblok/

Markusen, A., & King, D. (2003). The artistic dividend. *The Arts Hidden Contribution to*

Economic Development. Minneapolis.

McRobbie, A. 1994. *Postmodernism and popular culture*. London: Routledge.

Meer extreem uitgaansgeweld: 'Pepperspray maakt geen indruk'. (2020). Retrieved from

https://nos.nl/l/2319034

Miller, A. (2016). If amsterdam and berlin can embrace the night life, why can't britain? | alan

D miller. *The Guardian* Retrieved from

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/may/02/amsterdam-berlin-embrace-

night-life-britain

Minder klachten over gemeente rotterdam. (2017). Retrieved from

https://www.gemeente.nu/dienstverlening/communicatie/minder-klachten-gemeente-rot

terdam/

Möhle, M., Nijkamp, L., De Greeff, J., & Mulder, J. (2019). STAD in Europe. ().Canon

Nederland N.V. Retrieved from

https://www.trimbos.nl/aanbod/webwinkel/product/af1672-stad-in-europe

Monshouwer, K., Van der Pol, P., Drost, Y. C., & Van Laar, M. W. (2016). *Het grote*

uitgaansonderzoek 2016. Trimbos-instituut Utrecht.

Moore, K., & Miles, S. (2004). Young people, dance and the sub-cultural consumption of

drugs. *Addiction Research & Theory, 12*(6), 507-523.

Mulders, A. (2019). Ja echt: Hier opent een nieuwe club voor rotterdamse nachtbrakers.

Retrieved from

https://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/ja-echt-hier-opent-een-nieuwe-club-voor-rotterdamse-nach

tbrakers~afac7c695/

Okulicz-Kozaryn, A. (2013). City life: Rankings (livability) versus perceptions (satisfaction).

Social Indicators Research, 110(2), 433-451.

Oldenburg, R., & Brissett, D. (1982). The third place. Qualitative Sociology, 5(4), 265-284.

Onderschepte hoeveelheid cocaïne in rotterdamse haven verdubbeld. (2020). Retrieved

from https://nos.nl/l/2317954

Oosterom. (2017). 'In vie wil de man jagen'. Retrieved from

https://www.ad.nl/rotterdam/in-vie-wil-de-man-jagen~acdd7704/

Parks, K. A., & Kennedy, C. L. (2004). Club drugs: Reasons for and consequences of use.

Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 36(3), 295-302.

'Politie ontdekt meer drugslabs, vooral in oost-Nederland'. (2020). Retrieved from

https://www.rtlnieuws.nl/nieuws/nederland/artikel/5036366/drugslabs-politie-afval-pillen

-oost-nederland-brabant

Quality of life in European cities 2015. (2016). (No. 10). Brussels: Publications Office of the

European Union. Retrieved from

https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/urban/survey2015_

en.pdf

Reich, D. L., & Silvay, G. (1989). Ketamine: An update on the first twenty-five years of

clinical experience. Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia,36(2), 186-197.

Rijnaard, S. (2018). Hoe ziet de Rotterdamse politiek de toekomst van het Schieblock?

Retrieved from

https://versbeton.nl/2018/03/hoe-ziet-de-rotterdamse-politiek-de-toekomst-van-het-schi

eblock/

Rotterdammers demonstreren voor meer nachtelijk uitgaansvermaak. (2019). Retrieved from

https://nos.nl/l/2272815

Rowe, D., & Bavinton, N. (2011). Tender for the night: After-dark cultural complexities in the

night-time economy. Continuum, 25(6), 811-825. doi:10.1080/10304312.2011.617875

Sannen, L. Krusche, G. Burkhart, K. Hughes, & N. van Hasselt. (2016). Responding to drug

and alcohol use and related problems in nightlife settings. Ministry of Health, Sports and Welfare, the Netherlands.

Schiekadeblok in ontwikkeling. (2019). Gemeente Rotterdam. Retrieved from https://www.rotterdam.nl/wonen-leven/schiekadeblok/

Seidler, Y., van den Heerik, A., van San, M., & de Boom, J. (2018). *Seksueel grensoverschrijdend gedrag in het rotterdamse uitgaansleven.* (). Rotterdam: Risbo. Retrieved from https://www.risbo.nl/_images/Risbo_SGG_2018.pdf

Sisson, P. (2016). How night mayors are proving the economic and cultural value of robust nightlife. Retrieved from https://www.curbed.com/2016/9/6/12814920/club-nightlife-dance-music-night-mayor-club-commission

Smaling. (2018). XTC het populairst onder EUR-studenten; meerderheid gebruikt weleens drugs. Retrieved from https://www.erasmusmagazine.nl/2018/10/22/xtc-het-populairst-onder-eur-studenten-meerderheid-gebruikt-weleens-drugs/

Talbot, D. (2006). The licensing act 2003 and the problematization of the night-time economy: Planning, licensing and subcultural closure in the UK. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 30*(1), 159-171.

Tallon, A. R., Bromley, R. D. F., Reynolds, B., & Thomas, C. J. (2006). Developing leisure and cultural attractions in the regional city centre: A policy perspective. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, 24*(3), 351-370. doi:10.1068/c0526

Tops, P., & Tromp, J. (2019). *De achterkant van Amsterdam*.

Türksever, A. N. E., & Atalik, G. (2001). Possibilities and limitations for the measurement of the quality of life in urban areas. *Social Indicators Research, 53*(2), 163-187.

Van den Ende, T. (2020). Coöperatie van architectuurhistorici en investeerders staat op voor Schiekadeblok. Retrieved from

https://versbeton.nl/2020/05/cooperatie-van-architectuurhistorici-en-investeerders-staat
-op-voor-schiekadeblok/

Van der Linden, H., & Graaff, P. (2020). Erfgoed van het schiekadeblok is meer dan de
'geveltjes'. Retrieved from
https://versbeton.nl/2020/05/erfgoed-van-het-schiekadeblok-is-meer-dan-de-geveltjes/

Van Eijck, G. (2019). Club weg, iedereen boos. Retrieved from
https://versbeton.nl/2019/02/club-weg-iedereen-boos/

Van Liempt, I. (2015). Safe nightlife collaborations: Multiple actors, conflicting interests
and different power distributions. *Urban Studies, 52*(3), 486-500.
doi:10.1177/0042098013504010

Van Hest, M., Faes, F., & Sannen, A. (2015). *Alcohol en Agressie*.

Van Liempt, I., & van Aalst, I. (2012). Urban surveillance and the struggle between safe and
exciting nightlife districts. *Surveillance & Society*, 9(3), 280-292.

Van Liempt, I., & Aalst, I. (2015). Whose responsibility? The role of bouncers in policing the
public spaces of nightlife districts. *International Journal of Urban and Regional
Research*, 39(6), 1251-1262.

Van der Poel, A., Rodenburg, G., Dijkstra, M., Stoele, M., & van de Mheen, D. (2009).
Trends, motivations and settings of recreational cocaine use by adolescents and
young adults in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 20(2), 143-151.

Veelen, A. v. (2019a). Is Rotterdam dan toch de bakermat van een nieuwe beschaving?
Retrieved from
https://decorinterviewee.nl/9402/is-rotterdam-dan-toch-de-bakermat-van-een-nieuwe-b
eschaving/1002376469622-24de140a

Veelen, A. v. (2019b). Wat een postbode ziet van de wederafbraak van Rotterdam.
Retrieved from
https://decorinterviewee.nl/10446/wat-een-postbode-ziet-van-de-wederafbraak-van-rott

erdam/1113680557506-544174bc

Verkenning Omgevingsvisie Rotterdam. (2018). (). Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam.

Retrieved from https://rotterdam.notubiz.nl/document/7429255/1/19bb438

Wish, N. B. (1986). Are we really measuring the quality of life? Well-being has subjective

dimensions, as well as objective ones. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology,*

45(1), 93-99.

Wijkagenda centrum 2019-2022. (2019). (). Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam. Retrieved

from

https://www.watdoetdegemeente.rotterdam.nl/begroting2019/wijken/wijkagenda-centru

m/Wijkagenda-Roterdam-centrum.pdf

7. Appendix I, Interview guide.

The rationale for the interview guide below can be found in section 3.3.

Sample.

Because of the current pandemic and governmental instructions, all but one interview (interview 4) were held either online through Skype (interview 2, 5, 6 and 7), Microsoft Teams (interview 1), or via the telephone (interview 3 & 8).

- 19-05-2020, interviewee 1: Kim Versluijs, cultural policy advisor of the municipality of Rotterdam.

- 08-05-2020, interviewee 2: Ton Vink, ex-chairman of the security guards association with decades of hands on experience, member of the Panel Deurbeleid and entrepreneur with businesses relating to safety, security and risk and crisis management courses.

- 19-05-2020, interviewee 3: Mohammed Mejdoubi, also member of the Panel Deurbeleid and founder of Meion, a company providing nightlife stewards trained in dealing with large groups of visitors, influences from alcohol and drugs, first aid and aggression or violence.

- 27-05-2020, interviewee 4: Kristiaan de Leeuw, owner of former club BAR and current night time arcade hall POING, one of the founders of the Maatschappij voor Volksgeluk, the organisation that won the bid for the renewed usage of the Ferro Dome.

- 05-05-2020, interviewee 5: Thijs Boer, member of the Panel Deurbeleid and founder of the N8W8, an independent advisory foundation that aims to give solicited and unsolicited advice to both the municipality and entrepreneurs when it comes to nightlife.

- 07-05-2020, interviewee 6: Shirin Mirachor, artistic director and part-owner of nightlife venue MONO.

- 11-05-2020, interviewee 7: S. T., a member of the police force of Rotterdam, with experiences of its nightlife and accompanying risks.

- 19-05-2020, interviewee 8: Yolanda Koelhof, a citizen living adjacent to the nightlife venues the Oude Haven.

Title: All work, no play? How the city of Rotterdam can balance a liveable city with facilitating its cultural nightlife.

Date: May, 2020

Place: Rotterdam

Interviewer: Wouter Drost

interviewee: ...

INTRODUCTION
- Introduction of the study.
- Introduction of interviewer.

QUESTIONS
General questions:
- Welcome for having the time for this interview on the nightlife and liveability of Rotterdam, can you tell a little bit about yourself?
- How would you judge your quality of life in Rotterdam and what factors are important for your quality of life?
- How would you judge the current state of the nightlife in Rotterdam as a whole, in terms of the quality of the different venues as well as the amount and variety of venues?
- What do you feel are the values of nightlife, if any?
- How would you describe the possible risks of nightlife?
- What are the most important aspects to keep in mind when balancing the nightlife with the quality of life in a city like Rotterdam?

In-depth questions:
Liveability.
- What are your feelings about safety in Rotterdam?
- What are your thoughts on the housing market of Rotterdam?
- What are your feelings on the level of noise, thrash and other possible nightlife excesses in Rotterdam?
- Have you experienced drug criminality in Rotterdam, how do you feel about that?

Nightlife status.

- How do you feel on the amount of nightlife venues in Rotterdam?

- How do you feel on the variety of nightlife in Rotterdam?

- What are your opinions on the overall relationship between nightlife venues and the municipality?

Nightlife values.

- What are your opinions on the values of Rotterdam's nightlife?

- Do you think nightlife participation can help one's personal development? If so, in what ways?

- In what way, if any, do you think the nightlife of Rotterdam can be beneficial for social relations?

- How valuable would you deem a city's nightlife for its overall economy?

Nightlife risks.

- What are your experiences with violence in the nightlife in Rotterdam?

- Have you or anyone you know experienced sexual assault in the nightlife, and if so, what are your feelings on how the situation is in Rotterdam?

- What are your experiences with drugs and criminality in the Rotterdam nightlife?

- How do you think these risks can effectively be tackled?

- Do you feel there is enough and effective cooperation between all nightlife actors in Rotterdam in reducing these risks?

Balancing the nightlife with liveability.

- What are your opinions on the municipality's role in the nightlife of Rotterdam?

- What are the aspects of nightlife that the municipality should focus on according to you?

- Are there any suggestions you would like to give for the municipality to change with respect to current policies?

- How do you feel on so-called entertainment zones, areas in the city specifically 'reserved' for nightlife?

- What are your thoughts on installing a specific municipal council or advisory organ aimed at improving the nightlife in Rotterdam without diminishing the quality of life?

Operationalisation

Concept	Research questions	Related questions	Thematic categories	(Examples of) Theme identifying codes
Liveability	What are the criteria to balance the cultural nightlife with the liveability of a city, specifically in Rotterdam?	How would you judge the quality of life in Rotterdam?	- Liveability	Facilities, amenities, infrastructure, public transport, job opportunities, safety, housing, quality of life, unsafe feelings, violence, exciting, nuisance, noise.
		What are the most important factors for your quality of life in Rotterdam?	- Liveability	Facilities, amenities, safety, housing, education, job opportunities, green spaces, culture, quality of life.
		What are your feelings about safety in Rotterdam?	- Liveability	Safety, unsafe feelings, violence, weapons, criminality.
		What are your thoughts on the housing market of Rotterdam?	- Liveability	Housing, gentrification, (housing) shortage,

				(housing) corporations, noise standards, pricing, city planning.
		What are your feelings on the level of noise, thrash and other possible nightlife excesses in Rotterdam?	- Liveability - Nightlife risks	Noise regulations, noise complaints, annoyances, pollution, regulation.
		Have you experienced drug criminality in Rotterdam, if yes, how do you feel about that?	- Liveability	Safety, drug trafficking, criminality weapons, drug usage, education.
		How would you judge the current nightlife in Rotterdam?	- Status of nightlife	Clubs, quality, programming, number of venues, musical variety, nightlife audiences, preferences.
		How do you feel on the amount of nightlife venues in Rotterdam?	- Status of nightlife	Clubs, quality, programming, number of venues, musical variety, nightlife

				audiences, preferences.
		How do you feel on the variety of nightlife in Rotterdam?	- Status of nightlife	Clubs, programming, number of venues, musical variety, nightlife audiences, preferences.
Nightlife	What are the social and economic values, cultural nightlife in Rotterdam can potentially bring?	What are your opinions on the possible values of Rotterdam's nightlife?	- Values of nightlife	Integration, profit, city marketing, tourism, social development, mental stimulation, relaxation, culture, art, friendship, love, relationships, jobs.
		Do you think nightlife participation can help one's personal development? If so, in what ways?	- Values of nightlife	Integration, mental stimulation, relaxation, culture, art, friendship, love, relationships.
		In what way, if any, do you think the	- Values of nightlife	Integration, friendship, love, relationships.

		nightlife of Rotterdam can be beneficial for social relations?		
		How valuable would you deem a city's nightlife for its overall economy?	- Values of nightlife	Jobs, city marketing, spillover effects, hospitality sector, profit, subsidies, tourism, attracting expats.
	What are the risks accompanying cultural nightlife facilitation that are detrimental to Rotterdam's liveability?	What are the most important risks nightlife can bring according to you?	- Risks of nightlife	Violence, criminality, overdoses, sexual transgressive behaviour, noise, pollution, door policy.
		What are your experiences with violence in the nightlife in Rotterdam?	- Risks of nightlife	violence, weapons, security, police, intoxicated, regulation, lack of inhibitions, BOA's, Meion, staff training.
		What are your experiences with drugs and	- Risks of nightlife	weapons, security, police, intoxicated,

		criminality in the Rotterdam nightlife?		regulation, lack of inhibitions, violence, dealers, staff training.
		Have you or anyone you know experienced sexual assault in the nightlife, and if so, what are your feelings on how the situation is in Rotterdam?	- Risks of nightlife	Intoxication, sexual transgressive behaviour, security, staff training, approachable female authorities, punishments, lack of proof, (lack of) inhibitions
	What are some possible measures to prevent these risks?	How do you think these risks can effectively be tackled?	- Risks of nightlife - Nightlife policy	Violence, drug use, intoxication, policy, regulation, training, education, rehabilitation, mental health programmes, environmental regulation.
		Do you feel there is enough and effective	- Risks of nightlife - Nightlife policy	Regulation, risk management, responsibility,

		cooperation between all nightlife actors in Rotterdam in reducing these risks?	- Cooperation & bureaucracy	training, collaboration, bureaucracy, cooperative body, fragmented authorities, multidisciplinary approach.
		What are your thoughts on installing a specific council or advisory organ that includes both entrepreneurs, audience members and municipality which is aimed at improving the nightlife in Rotterdam without diminishing the quality of life?	- Risks of nightlife - Nightlife policy - Cooperation & bureaucracy	Regulation, risk management, responsibility, training, collaboration, bureaucracy, cooperative body, fragmented authorities, multidisciplinary approach.
	What are the policy measures the municipality of Rotterdam can take to improve the facilitation of its	What are your opinions on the overall relationship between nightlife venues	- Cooperation & bureaucracy - Nightlife policy	Communication, flexibility, facilitation, regulation, customization, fragmented bureaucracy,

	cultural nightlife, while minimizing its risks?	and the municipality?		(lack of) vision, (un)ambiguous.
		What are your opinions on the municipality's role in the nightlife of Rotterdam?	- Cooperation & bureaucracy - Nightlife policy	Communication, flexibility, facilitation, regulation, customization, fragmented bureaucracy, (lack of) vision,
		What are the most important aspects to keep in mind when balancing the (facilitation of) nightlife with the quality of life in a city like Rotterdam?	- Liveability - Value of nightlife - Risks of nightlife - Nightlife policy	Regulation, safety, responsibility, vision, city-planning, flexibility, experimentation, education, unambiguity.
		Are there any suggestions you would like to give for the municipality to change with respect to current policies?	- Cooperation & bureaucracy - Nightlife policy	Flexibility, facilitation, regulation, unambiguity, customization, fragmented bureaucracy, vision, effectiveness, openness.

| | | How do you feel on so-called entertainment zones, areas in the city specifically 'reserved' for nightlife? | - Risks of nightlife
- Nightlife policy
- Cooperation & bureaucracy | City-planning, regulation, facilitation, long-term commitment, collaboration, investments, responsibility, flexibility, customization, concentration of risk, clustering, city-marketing. |