

Reporting and decision-making

Phase 2 - Statenkwartier District citizens' consultation on climate change – 31 May 2022

Context

The second phase of the citizens' consultations began in the Statenkwartier district on 31 May. This meeting was exclusively about knowledge and information. The participants received information from various experts about the themes that surfaced during Phase 1. The full Phase 1 report can be found on the [Statenkwartier District citizens' consultation website](#). A total of 23 participants were present on 31 May. They comprise the definitive citizens' consultation body for the Statenkwartier.

The first two citizens' consultation meetings were held on 10 and 12 May, which jointly constituted Phase 1 of the citizens' consultation. A total of 59 people took part in these. They were able to specify whether they wanted to participate in Phase 2 once Phase 1 had been completed. A maximum of 30 participants were able to participate in Phase 2. 38 people signed up for this, from whom 30 participants were selected. This was a weighted draw, based on people's gender, age and housing situation (private/social rental or owner-occupied home). 23 participants were finally able to take part from the 30 participants who entered the draw. [You can visit the website for further information about the context of the citizens' consultations.](#)

The meeting was held from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. in the Couvéehuis on Frankenslag in the Statenkwartier. The programme started with a joint dinner in smaller groups. Dinner was once again all about getting to know each other better. The three-course dinner was provided by Stichting Lichtpuntjes.

Votes on process proposals

The evening was hosted by Jonneke Stans. She welcomed everyone during the dinner, and the attendees from the organisation all introduced themselves. A number of proposals regarding the process were submitted to the consultative body at the start of the evening because it is important that the consultative body not only backs the advice given but also the actual process. These proposals were voted on. The proposals and the results of the vote can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this document. The presentation can be found [on the website for the Statenkwartier citizens' consultation participants](#).

What is the voting process?

- A process proposal was explained
- The participants would vote using a green card (proponent), a yellow card (in doubt) or a red card (opponent)
- The host would allow both the proponents and opponents to speak and attempt to process any objections into the proposal
- The participants then vote again, this time only with the green and red cards
- Proposals that receive 75% of the vote are adopted

Questions from participants regarding the process

The participants were also asked questions about the process, which were answered on the spot. You can read these questions and answers below.

Question: Do we have to take any preconditions into account?

Answer: this would increase the chance of the municipal council being able to adopt and implement any of the recommendations. You may also estimate how realistic it is, for example based on the insights of

officials such as Henry, and whether or not you are concerned by this. You may also advise the municipality to increase its existing budgets.

Follow-up question: But what about plans that are possible within the budget? I would like there to be some kind of framework, because I want to know if it is realistic.

Answer: we can bring people in to consider this if you want us to.

Question: has this been noted down so that it can be found on the website?

Answer: we will make a decision about that shortly.

Question: why do we assume a majority of 75%? Can we also use the consensus as a starting point? Are we still able to talk about this?

Answer: yes we can talk about this.

Is there any exchange of views between the citizens' consultations in the Statenkwartier and the Laakkwartier?

Answer: No, in principle these are two separate bodies. We could see if we can organise something here if participants from both consultative bodies so wish.

Will there be any feedback afterwards, when our advice has been discussed in the municipal council, and what will happen with the results?

Answer: We will see if we can arrange something if this is important to you.

Who will present it to the city council?

Answer: That will be decided by all of us.

Three experts give their views

The experts had their say after a number of proposals had been voted on and questions regarding the process had been answered.

Four themes emerged from the initial phase of the citizens' consultation:

- 1) Housing and energy
- 2) Public space and mobility
- 3) Communication and participation
- 4) Financing and regulations

The host explained that it had however been decided, based on the completed forms and requests submitted by participants, to invite experts for three of the themes. Firstly, this was because there was insufficient time for four experts in just one evening. It also came to light that questions about the 'funding' issues overlapped regularly with the theme of 'housing and energy'. It was therefore decided to add the 'funding' theme to the 'housing and energy' one and to allow additional time for that component.

We also saw that the theme of 'regulations' is being reflected in all other areas. This is why Henry Terlouw from the Municipality of The Hague was also present to answer any questions regarding regulations on the spot.

The following experts spoke:

- Expert 1: Housing, energy and costs – Margit Heine, Royal Haskoning
- Expert 2: Communication and participation – Sara Wortelboer, Climate Psychologist
- Expert 3: Public spaces and mobility – Bas Hilckmann, The Hague University of Applied Sciences

Each expert gave a brief presentation. There was then some time for participants to put some questions together for the expert. Three questions were asked by each group in front of the full meeting and were answered by the expert. Any questions that were unanswered on the evening itself will be answered in writing after the evening drew to a close.

All the questions asked during the meeting and the answers to them can be found on the website.
The presentations given by the experts can also be found on the website.

Decisions regarding follow-up action

The host presented a final process proposal to the participants regarding the follow-up to the citizens' consultation after the presentations had been given by the experts. The participants were asked with how many themes they wanted to pursue from the citizens' consultations. It was mutually decided to delve further into two themes by means of a vote (see the results of the vote in Appendix 1):

- 1) Housing and energy
- 2) Public space and mobility

The two other themes (1 - communication and participation and 2 - financing and regulation) form part of both themes and are each given an important role within the two subjects chosen.

The host then asked the participants whether they knew enough to be able to continue. Some of the participants said they did not. They are able to specify by e-mail what knowledge they still require whilst taking the amount of time into consideration. One participant indicated that tonight's information cannot be regarded as 'knowledge' because it is often subjective.

It has been agreed to take a decision jointly at the next meeting about the question of what percentage is needed for taking a decision. Is the 75% is based on attendees, votes cast, or on a fixed number determined at the start of the meeting? Or is it a completely different percentage?

Appendix 1. Votes on the citizens' consultation process

Internal reporting

Vote 1: We will continue internal reporting in the same manner: 100% green

Option from a participant: we will appoint a representative for each division who will check whether the report has been approved within their own group.

Vote 2: We will appoint a group representative who will both read out and approve the report: 14 green, 8 yellow.

- *Reservation: it is too cumbersome*

New vote on Proposal 2: 14 red, 7 yellow, 1 green

Verdict: The report has been compiled by the organisation. Everyone will get the report. If you have any comments or concerns, you can bring these along and a decision will be made at the next meeting.

External reporting

Vote 1: We will publish an interim report for interested parties who are not participating in this deliberation: 19 green, 3 yellow.

- *Reservation 1:* Photos: it must not come across too clumsily as cosy little district halls.
- *Reservation 2:* What is the point? Are we providing any content? How do we determine a good balance between meaningful reporting and not revealing too much detail that has yet to be decided?
- *Argument in favour:* transparency, and this must not come as a surprise to the rest of the district.
- *Argument in favour:* the participant is confident that the organisation can find the right balance between form and content.
- *Question:* what will happen to the video recorded at the previous meeting?
Answer: If we vote now for external reporting, we will go public.

Vote 2: 18 green, 3 yellow.

Verdict: The reporting will be external. The organisation will pay attention to a balance between form and content, and will provide attractive photos.

Involving BES/Statenwarmte/Aardgasblij

Vote 1: we will ask the residents of these initiatives to come and speak at the deliberation.

- *Question:* Who exactly are these people?
- *Answer:* there are three initiatives. BES tries to help people make their homes more sustainable. Statenwarmte is a separate group. They have had a report drawn up, together with the municipality, to see whether Statenkwartier can become free of natural gas. Aardgasblij is a counter-reaction to this. BES remains neutral in the discussions between Statenwarmte and Aardgasblij.

Outcome of vote 1: 8 yellow, 1 red, 14 green.

- *Reservation:* there is only really one theme. Do we have to give them that much scope? That will also depend on what we decide regarding the subjects of our advice.
- *Option:* The report from Statenwarmte can be downloaded. It is easy to read. What if we circulate this and then vote again?

- *Reservation*: Statenwarmte has requested advice from one source. That is insufficient. The consequences of this report are large and extensive. We cannot therefore be overly reliant on this report.
- *Argument in favour*: It is important that there is coordination and communication in line with what is already happening.
- *Reservation*: this will take too long. It will give rise to too many opinions. We will have all of these conversations again. It is a waste of our time.
- *Option*: Make sure that the people involved in these initiatives are specifically kept informed. Perhaps more so than the average resident.

Vote 2: green/yellow/red votes were more or less equal.

Verdict: we did not invite them.

Schedule for today

Vote 1: Do you agree with today's schedule? 22 green, 1 yellow

- *Reservation*: we need to choose one theme that we can explore in more detail.
- *Solution*: we will decide whether or not we want to drop any themes at the end of this meeting.

Verdict: Time to make a start

How many themes will we continue with?

There are two options:

1. Energy & housing (E&H) and public space & mobility (PS&M) as the two main themes, with participation & communication and financing & regulation as a part of these substantive themes;
2. We continue with all four themes.

Vote 1: no 75% majority for any of the options

- *Reservations from proponents of Option 1*: We need to focus. Participation & communication and regulation & financing always revolve around these subjects. We will probably have to split up as a group with four subjects, but it will no longer be representative if not everyone is able to talk about everything.
- *Reservations from proponents of Option 2*: We should already be limiting ourselves. Financing and regulation are now highly significant. There is something to say for this. Not everyone will be equally as interested in all of the themes.

New proposal: We are not expected to come up with the technical solution for the Statenkwartier. We will therefore adopt the two substantive themes (E&H and PS&M) as the main topics. We will focus on financing and regulations, and communication and participation within this scope, rather than focusing on technical preconditions. We will not split up as a group.

Vote 2: 18 green, 3 red.

Verdict: We will start with a programme proposal based on this decision at the next meeting and will see whether everyone can accept it.