

Beste gemeente Dordrecht

zienswijze ontwerpbestemmingsplan Maasterras fase 1

I write in English, my native language. I would write in Dutch but it would not be smooth reading. If you ever wish to get back to me, Dutch is fine. I use a lot of links to reference material, I can supply a PDF is so desired.

I have read about 4/5 of the documents supporting the development of the Maasterras. There has been a lot of work involved. I am impressed, at the work itself and the what needs to be done to tick boxes. There seems to be a though a few things that seem more dreams and not defined.

I have few points that could improve the plans.

Removal of the bridge

The removal of the bridge as your documents show increase traffic on the A16 by over 10%. This is already a seriously busy road, its often nose to tail. I cycled for years between Dordrecht and Rotterdam, the tailbacks to the Dordrecht Tunnel began near Ridderkerk around 1600 in the afternoon. I was happy I cycled. Your plans will make traffic extremely bad on A16. It will give Dordrecht an extremely bad image. Once in a while I cycled across the island, the traffic freed itself up on the other side of Dordrecht. I understand the morning traffic is worse coming from Brabant.

I personally would bend the bridge as tightly as a bus can turn / handle, speed limit at 30km/h and run the road above the Laan der Verenigde Naties. Use it as means to reduce wind over the redeveloped land. Other thoughts, limit bridge to registered business traffic(number plate reader) and busses. Cap in hand to Rijkswaterstaat please. Thus no need to cater for long queue traffic waiting to cross if its up. Or at least integrate the bridge into the plans, dump the traffic onto Laan der Verenigde Naties not Hugo de groot laan.

I can cite a few more problems if the bridge is removed.

- It will reduce business in Dordrecht:

- Why build your business/extend it next to an extremely busy road, the A16. Which has a worsened traffic issue. Where the source of the issue is the local council you will be working in.
- Businesses on the Kil industrial estates have come for smooth access to the Dutch highways system. Not one hampered by the local politic
- Business will probably avoid Dordrecht, not invest and this will lead to loss of jobs and income for the city.
- Every city is crying out for investment, why do this to the city? Reduce the chances of investment?
- The bridge encourages local trade between Dordrecht and Zwijndrecht. Local trade means more money locally invested. Keeping money local improves cities.
- Non motorway legal traffic uses this bridge.
- How to route traffic when the A16 is blocked, which does happen. Each time either the A16 or N3 is blocked, Dordrecht is blocked up. At least if the tunnel is blocked the route is short and over the bridge.

Tall buildings

Tall buildings, why such tall buildings? Tall buildings cost a lot to run, they take more money to maintain. They are simply put, not sustainable. In a time when energy is more important than ever picking tall is not a solution.

Example Why high is generally bad. Such building is currently concrete with rebar, the lifetime is not long. See <https://www.tno.nl/nl/duurzaam/veilige-duurzame-leefomgeving/infrastructuur/verlenging-levensduur-betonconstructies/>. The amount of CO2 produced in concrete building, is unlikely to be recaptured in 50-100 years (link above). A tree takes 60 years to start capturing meaningful amounts of CO2, 167kg CO2 per year. It keeps doing so for another 200 years. General average data.

Greenery on top of buildings/structures

All the greenery on top of buildings/structures. The Bijlage 1 Stedenbouwkundig masterplan is full of pictures of trees on structures (example: p55 landbridge) . Have you any idea how much extra building material is needed to place true greenery (small/medium trees, big bushes) on top of structures, lots. It takes a lot more money. Worse still, it is extremely environmentally unfriendly, using tons and tons of concrete and steel to hold up a tree. See note above on lifetime of said structure.

Bijlage 1 Stedenbouwkundig masterplan. See p80, all the trees on the Weeskinderendijk parkeer hub. Not realistic, and if attempted will cost a lot of money to build. An example, which I think fails is the parade up to Rotterdam central station. trees which seem non native, its a wind alley. Nice idea, but eating lunch there is no fun on a sunny day. The big carpark underneath, seems full of leaks. Probably near unrepairable, and very expensive to remove.

Please lets have greenery, much more in the city, given how much is cut down yearly. But please with common sense added. For example: it would be cheaper, to build, run and maintain teh Maasterras development if buildings where the same height as the trees. The view over it will be a sea of green. For far less money, and help the future. Stipulate Biobased bouw, and no concrete buildings.

Picture postcard train entrance.

The area under development is a gateway into Dordrecht. It is an utter shame that MaasPlaza was built blocking the view over the roof tops from the railway. Such views add mystique and mystery to a city. An ugly building does not. What appears on the other side of the railway should make the city attractive. A network of structures which block the view from the train, i do not think as wise.

An entrance to a city should be a postcard, that can be sold. It should attract visitors and leave a desire to come back.

New municipal buildings and trust.

In the documents I found little or no reference to concrete details of what is coming. A possible primary/basis school, and then in another place how much room to given over to outdoor exercise space. Uncoupled, and I think using the

minimums in Dutch norms. It would be great that Prins Bernhardschool was given more space with recreational space to expand onto. However, I doubt the will and foresight of the council.

This comes down to Trust, lack of, look at the basis school Regenboog. The space the children have is tiny, same as Vest. As are all schools in the older parts of Dordrecht. I hope that the Maasterras does not repeat this. Why I have no trust in the council, How on earth did the Regenboog, school play ground get placed next to a busy road? I expect on basis that the air pollution from experts is not high. Based on 'common' standards.

Particulate matter(PM) pollution, and all pollution is a moving target. Each year we discover more horrors of pollution. The latest findings sit not in the Dutch norms and point to PM pollution being on the same level as smoking cigarettes. However, unlike cigarettes, some particulate matter pollutants are life long(see

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412020319292>).

For the regenboog, the carpark should have been at the front. The space at the rear for the children and extended into space around carpark. Yet, it didn't happen. The children will pay and eventually society via health insurance costs.

I see in the (Stedenbouwkundig masterplan, p69) a Kinderdagverblijven next to a major road. Please think!

Recreational space for all.

Then there is the point in the Maasterras docs, about basis school, and air quality. This point applies to people of all ages. Good clean air is important for everyone.

Diving in deeper, into space. p57, Binnenhoven, Spelen & bewegen, Stedenbouwkundig masterplan

Recreational space should be also for Adults too (and all animals). It should be outside the door, so that it becomes part of everyday life. Easy to build in when starting from initial planning. There are examples to find, Singapore. Each 'hof' for apartment blocks has its own work out space for all comers. This went into city planning there decades ago, its impact has helped drive an extremely

healthy population, The healthiest in a densely populated land. The extra costs for giving people exercise, recreational space is paid back in having a population that is healthier, and potentially more productive and happy. Example, the outdoor weights and exercise systems should be in the BinnenHove and, the start of a jog path, walking route, dog walk route. Not some pretty stepping stones. What the documents give is a 'wood covered path' (p88 semi-private hofjes krijgen een houten looppad). Not good enough. Not enough 'vooruit denken', not even daring.

Example of existing Dordrecht infrastructure: We get an outdoor workout park that is kilometres away from the front door, 100's of metres from any door, such as weizigtpark park. On top of which it has been badly detailed and lies in an area that floods. When it froze in January, the ground around was an ice rink. Whereas in Zwijndrecht I saw people working out in the freezing weather in HoogeDevel Park.

Trust again, the weizigtpark re-generation is not great; flooded paths, paths that damn water, flooded grass. For a country that is would leader in drainage, weizigtpark park does not show it. And there lies another item with Trust, in the gemeente. The ability to see issues, ahead of time, and deal with them.

Solutions, tall buildings, reactional space, healthy citizens

If high buildings have to come. The vision is not bold enough

I think Dordrecht(and all Randstand cities) need to look to Singapore. Very densely occupied, but at early planning the aspect of human health, space to play and relax is taken into account. No % guidelines, that could be solved by throwing everything into a neglected out of the way corner. Instead, baked into the buildings.

Here are the ideas of Singapore:

<https://www.ura.gov.sg/Corporate/Guidelines/Urban-Design>

There is page after page in the Stedenbouwkundig masterplan, over each area, 80-110. Yet, it really not enough. The design from Singapore tackles issues. It is not long document, succinct and to the point.

Some ideas: <https://www.ura.gov.sg/-/media/Corporate/Guidelines/Urban-Design/Marina-South/Marina-South-Urban-Design-Guide.pdf>

Wind

An example from the Singapore link above, Wind. (yes, I read p112, its not good enough - limited to one area, not the space above the carpark, or along Maas, and we are given only wind from zuid-west). Given climate change is making our part of the world windier all year round, I find the lack of detail terrible. There could have been a separate document/bijlage on the subject.

The details of how to handle wind and effects need to be in the early stage documents like those posted about Maasterras Stedenbouwkundig masterplan.

Guidance,

I see in the masterplan, no clear guidance, standards to use for developers, architects, engineering bureaus. By guidance I do not mean just the BBL.

Why not quote building guidance from elsewhere? I quoted Singapore as its Densely populated and has an amazing reputation, with its own guidance at city level. Europe offers outstanding guidance.

An example: <https://smart-cities-marketplace.ec.europa.eu/insights/smart-city-guidance-package>

Deeper: See

<https://www.iso.org/committee/656967/x/catalogue/p/1/u/0/w/0/d/0>. I would love to read deeper into them, but I do not have money to buy all Iso standards. A council planning a huge redevelopment should have the money!

Another useful weblink, <https://build-up.ec.europa.eu/en/home>

Strong, well backed up Guidance would improve trust. Improve outcomes. There will be failures, but less.

Copy paste, repetition

Stedenbouwkundig masterplan, the amount of copy and past in pages 80-107, the 'spelregels' of each buurt, is a shame. It could have been broken down to tables. The resulting space in the masterplan used for guidance, (see eurocities link above) about each buurt/zone, presentation, access, waterafvoer, wind, green. Rather than word checking, 'hout' this, 'hout' that. 'Hooge' value that or this.

Examples: No cross refence, to greenery, or where the water afvoer can go. Where I would have hoped modern climate change handling ideas would appear, such as, use of landscape artifacts to slow down, gather, retain water. Such as playgrounds. Look at the drawings that exist now, very high buildings surrounding an event plain. No comment on how to manage wind scoop, or along the Oude maas path, where the wind will come off the open water with more strength. The proposed tower there will need better wind modelling than you have allowed us to see. An example of where to pick up more information <https://www.iso.org/committee/656967/x/catalogue/p/1/u/0/w/0/d/0> ISO guides.

If you have read so far, thank you.

Explore State of the art.

My key take away here for Dordrecht is the Warmtenet. Its planned for Maasterras. Yet the Warmtenet as expanded in Dordrecht is not best practice. It should be Heat and Cooling, it should not be One place generating heat but any place in the city that generates heat or cool. A district heating system(een Warmtenet) is a great big heat pump from place to place from hot to colder. Where 'Cool' is part of the equation. Pumping cool and heat around. I would use Maasterras to kick this best practice off. How much heat does Boon foods give off to cool foods? Or AH in maasplaza.

It is at this scale the city can push planning through. Why do I think this, the Danes, the Swedes, the world leaders in District heating have made their mistakes and learnt. Dordrecht is, I guess, 20 -30 years behind the lessons.

Entry point, to ask for more details:

<https://ens.dk/en/our-responsibilities/global-cooperation/experiences-district-heating>

I have listened to one of their representatives a few times, its amazing and eye opening. Dordrecht should try and follow. Please read the white paper in the link above, its all about Cooling and heating! With cooling, you can bring that into the Binnenstad to cool all the shops!

Please understand, I am here wishing to push the gemeente towards best practice, based on what I see from other cities in Europe. I visited various places over the years. Another example: housing mix. Given the city owns a lot of the land, please look to the Viennese housing model. Social housing for all wage groups.

Short points and lack of checking in the documents

- I enjoyed the Handboek Nibo! More examples were needed. Dordthuis, is not finished and public information is hard to find.
- the future new Weeskinderendijk carpark. Its too small. The existing Weeskinderendijk carpark is now often nearly full.
- transit in city, transportation across city. Too much spoke and hub, all via railway station.
- I have read a lot about how to improve cities. The documents I have read about maasterras seem rooted into city design from many years ago. I again appeal to you read : <https://smart-cities-marketplace.ec.europa.eu/insights/smart-city-guidance-package>

or <https://eurocities.eu/latest/does-the-eu-care-about-sustainable-buildings/>

For what it is worth, the documents as whole could really good do with someone reading them.

For example: from Bijlage Maatschappelijke voorzieningen Maasterras fase 2 01.pdf

Huisarts

Dordrecht telt op dit moment 55 huisartsen (ZorgkaartNederland, 2023). De huidige patientennorm volgens de LVH is 2095 patienten per huisarts. Dit betekent dat er op dit moment voor 115.225 inwoners een huisarts beschikbaar is. Op 31 januari 2023 telde Dordrecht 121.563 inwoners. Hierom is het wenselijk dat er op het Maasterras 1 of 2 huisartsplaatsen extra komen naast de huisartsen die nodig zijn om de inwoners van de wijk te onderhouden. Ook hier is de situering in de wijk belangrijk. Een huisarts moet namelijk wel bereikbaar zijn voor de auto, omdat sommige patienten daar afhankelijk van zijn. Ook is het wenselijk om een huisarts in een gezondheidscentrum te plaatsen, waar ook andere zorgverleners een plek kunnen krijgen.

Apotheek

Voor het aantal inwoners wat beoogd is op het Maasterras is een apotheek niet noodzakelijk. Ook op stadsniveau is er nog geen apotheek noodzakelijk. Dordrecht telt in totaal 16 apotheken. Dit houdt in dat er voor 133.600 inwoners een apotheek beschikbaar is. In een straal van 1 kilometer rond het Maasterras zijn er 2 apotheken: BENU apotheek Burgemeester de Raadsingel en apotheek De Vijzel op de Krispijnseweg.

=> do you read the difference in inwoners. Lack of fact checking or poor use of data(guessing the higher figure is predicted/toekomstig population). In two paragraphs next to one another.

Fwiw, I can add real life experience to the point made. I use one of those apotheken. 20 minute Queues, and very busy, too often. I also, therefore believe it is bad research too. Does that apply to the whole planning doc?

Lastly

I think the effort put in to the planning is fantastic. The Maasterras master plan, should have been a guide of how to get this right. It is not a guidance. Unless it is a basis for one on one chats with project developers about what they want and get away with. I look to Stadswerven and Wilgenwende, both places where as many people have pushed into small spaces with out good transport links(no buses), Wilgenwende is an over flowing parking lot, if you pass through it. No real recreational space on the door step.

From the perspective of an interested citizen, it is really hard to find clear information. The council CMS:

- should have a landing page with dedicated news about the project.
- dedicated feedback channel.
- A place with all details gathered and ordered.

These do not exist. If they do, not easy to find. I have spent too much time looking. The search engine I find poor. Another link to help improve, to give ideas <https://eurocities.eu/goals/citizen-engagement/>

Yours Sincerly

Alex Carrell

Email: llerrac@protonmail.com

Augustijnenkamp 48, 3311XC