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When studying the place attachments of residents, you cannot help but reflect upon your own attachments to places. On reflection, I have realised that my research has been closely related to my own life. I joined the Amsterdam School at the start of my PhD research in May 2005, just as my son was born. As a first-time father you could say I had a lot on my mind (and my research was not always the first among them). Surprisingly, my room at the school provided a quiet place to take my mind off the worries of fatherhood at home and enabled me to focus my mind on the emotional stress of others; residents who were forced out of their homes because they were demolished or renovated.

At the same time I experienced at first hand what the effect is of having children on my attachment to the neighbourhood where I lived. Before Thomas was born, I was the typical ‘dinky’ (double income no kids), whose social life mainly took place outside the neighbourhood and my house was no more than a place to eat, sleep and lounge. The neighbourhood took on a whole new meaning after Thomas was born, both physically and socially. One of the best ways to stop him from crying was to push the buggy around in the neighbourhood; the rocking motion was the only thing that would send him off to sleep, allowing me to explore the area where I lived on foot in blissful peace. During those quiet moments I grew quite fond of all those places in ‘my’ neighbourhood. It also brought me into contact with many neighbours, whose existence I had largely ignored so far. It was quite fascinating to discover the number of parents living in the area and to discover how easily it was to bond with them by showing off my (sleeping) baby in the buggy.

What it meant to move house became a reality for me when in February 2007 I moved out of the Netherlands with my family and England became our new home. All of a sudden, I found myself in a new environment where all the familiar faces and places were gone. This time I was surrounded by dinkies, while being
confined to my new home as a house dad and PhD student. However, I became quickly attached to my new environment, thanks to England’s best park (Saltwell Park) on my doorstep. Many happy mornings were spent at the pond and play ground of this great place, meeting other parents and even fellow countrymen. This gave personal meaning to the title of a book I wrote on the meaning of social urban renewal with Kees Fortuin, “Feeding the Ducks”. I do not want to suggest that every relocated resident should be supplied with a loaf of bread and a pond full of ducks, but I think there is a lot to be said for the importance of attractive public spaces for new residents to get attached to their neighbourhood.

Three years on at the end of my research, in May 2005, my PhD project and personal life became once again intertwined. While I was finalising my thesis, I moved up the societal ladder by finding a job as Research Associate at the University of Teesside, around the corner from our house in Eaglescliffe, personally demonstrating the intertwinedness of social mobility and neighbourhood attachment. The story became full circle with the birth of my daughter: I started studying the emotional ties of others when Thomas was born and finished when Jessica arrived. By then I was settled in a new country; not only by finding a new home and job, but also by feeling emotionally connected again to the place where I live. This time, my children did not provide the biggest incentive, but in true English style, my garden. After spending many a weekends digging and weeding to transform my pebbled backyard into a proper English garden, complete with apple tree and vegetable plot, I was firmly rooted in my neighbourhood. How this relates to the residents I was studying you can read in the following chapters.

As you will read in chapter two, emotions are a thoroughly social affair, even when studied as a subject for a doctorate. I would like to mention a number of people to whom I am deeply thankful and attached.

First of all, my sincere thanks go to Jan Willem Duyvendak, who has been a mentor ever since he became my dissertation professor in 1997, when I was studying Sociology at the University of Utrecht. Later, when he became General Director of the Verwey-Jonker Instituut in Utrecht, we collaborated on many research projects, where he helped me to develop myself as a researcher and as a person. When he became professor of Sociology at the University of Amsterdam, he
didn’t think twice when I asked him to become my PhD professor. He allowed me to follow my own path, while guiding me with advice and a sharp mind for detail and overview, exposing the weaknesses in my argument and opening up new ways of thinking and directions for my research. One couldn’t wish for a better PhD professor.

I own sincere thanks to my colleagues and the management team at the Verwey-Jonker Instituut, who supported me in my quest to become a doctor and allowed me to take time out of the office to study in Amsterdam. I consider the institute as a place where I grew up as a researcher and still feel strongly attached to the place. I would especially like to thank my room mates, Kees Fortuin, Jody Mak and Ron van Wonderen, who kept me going with liquorice, herbal teas and fine conversations.

I would also like to thank Maggy and Gerry Price for sacrificing their Turkish holiday to correct my Dutch English (dunglish) and greatly improve the readability of this book. And of course, I would like to thank my parents for their continued support in and outside school: after 29 years I am finally taking my last exam.

And last, but not least, my wife Kathryn, who has been supportive of my undertaking between two labours, two countries, two house moves and two jobs. If ever a PhD was a test of endurance, ask my wife. Without your support and love I would have never been where I am now.
1. Introduction

1.1 What is the Problem?

Many cities in Western Europe are faced with persistent social problems. Popular neighbourhoods of the past, situated on the outskirts of city centres, are nowadays characterised by low-income populations, high unemployment levels, high crime rates, racial tensions and low levels of social capital among its residents. However, the problems are not only social. The housing stock in these neighbourhoods does not comply anymore with the housing demands of today’s market. The houses, mainly built before or shortly after World War II, are often too small, poorly maintained and designed for a lifestyle that has rapidly changed and diversified over the last six decades. In short, the problems housing associations face are as much spatial as social.

Housing associations and policymakers have tried to deal with these problems by focusing on the spatial redesigning of deprived neighbourhoods. They assumed that they could kill two birds with one stone: by demolishing large parts of the old housing stock and by replacing them with more up to date and diversified housing, they hoped not only to solve the problem of a mismatch on the housing market, but also to solve the persistent social problem in these neighbourhoods. The new housing should attract higher income groups to poor city areas, which should also benefit the less fortunate living there. The new arrivals should bring money to the neighbourhood to strengthen the economic base of the area, while also bringing a vital ingredient for neighbourhood life: social capital.

Policymakers and housing professionals believed that residents in deprived areas were not only deprived of labour market and educational opportunities, but especially lacked the right kind of social capital. Living too close to people, with the same lack of opportunities, reduced their chances for upward mobility, and kept them trapped in their deprived position. By knowing the right kind of people, residents should acquire access to much needed information and skills to move up
the societal ladder. Towards this goal large restructuring programmes are set up in the Netherlands, which aim not only at renovating the housing stock, but specifically focus on attracting higher income groups to the deprived centre areas of the big cities, in order to help poor residents bridge their social capital deficit. Enabling a social mix became a central ingredient of Dutch urban renewal policy.

Critics of these programmes have warned against the opposite effect: urban renewal programmes do more harm than good for the social bonds of people in a neighbourhood: residents are forced to move out to make room for the new bourgeoisie (gentrification), uprooting their already distressed social networks and leaving the neighbourhood more segregated due to different time-space patterns between old and new residents. The new occupants, on the other hand, are not interested in their poorer neighbours and prefer to spend their resources and time elsewhere and with more like-minded people. Research seems to confirm these claims. Blokland (2001) showed, for example, that higher income groups do not develop more civil action in neighbourhoods than lower income residents and Kleinhans, Veldboer and Duyvendak (2000) demonstrated that even under this assumption mixed neighbourhoods do not lead to more socially vital communities. ‘Meeting’ (the possibility of contact) rarely leads to ‘mating’ (engaging into meaningful contact), because residents prefer to interact with people who are more like themselves. Instead of interacting with each other, different groups are mainly living together, apart. There are some middle class exceptions to this rule, but they remain limited (Veldboer, Engbersen, Duyvendak, Uyterlinde, forthcoming). In short, the direct positive effects of mixing appear to be modest or even problematic.

Evidence on the claim that the results will be counter-effective is more inconclusive. Gentrification is visible, though, not in every city (Duyvendak, Veldboer, Baillergeau, Van der Graaf (2005). Research by Kleinhans (2005) suggests that, to some extent, networks are indeed uprooted, but to a limited and relatively harmless extent: residents that are forced to move out of their neighbourhood relocate in adjacent neighbourhoods thus in close proximity to their old neighbours leaving these networks virtually intact. Contacts that are lost are not usually mourned, because the neighbourhood is only a small node in their network that is easily replaced by contact elsewhere (through work, school, family and friends). In
sum, loss of social capital is limited both in extent and magnitude, and seems easily restored.

However, Kleinhans’ research points to a new direction, where losses are greater and potential gains are higher. He demonstrates in his dissertation (2005) that relocated residents did not mourn the loss of social capital, but the loss of attachment to the place they lived in. The emotional ties they developed over time with the place where they lived provided an emotional source of comfort and identity which is cut by moving; causing distress, feelings of displacement and not belonging. These findings suggest that in specifying the effects of social-spatial interventions more attention is needed to the social-emotional ties of residents’ place attachment. Although much research is devoted to the uprooting of and changes in the social networks of residents in urban renewal, much less is known about the changes in the social-emotional ties of people to the neighbourhood.

1.2 Out of Place?

This research will, therefore, focus on the social-emotional ties of residents and research how these ties are affected by urban renewal. How do residents feel at home in their neighbourhood and do these feelings change during urban renewal?

My motives are both conceptual and practical. I believe that social interactions and the physical settings where these interactions take place are intrinsically connected: social behaviour is influenced by the design of places and the quality of spaces is, in turn, influenced by the social behaviour that takes place in these spaces. This insight is not new. However, many attempts to use this relationship have failed in the past: all too often a renewed space is not used the way in which it was intended by the designers, illustrating that this is not a straightforward relationship that can easily be manipulated. Many post-war neighbourhoods that were designed with a specific ideology in mind, often based on the ideal of a self-supporting community, are classified today as deprived areas and targeted for urban renewal and major ‘restructuring’ programmes.

The question of how to combine social and spatial measures in urban renewal is central to the current political debate in the Netherlands and was one of
the main causes for my research. Although the social-spatial question is a political issue, I argue that in order to research this question scientifically a redefinition is required. This concerns the framing of the social dimension of urban policy not exclusively in terms of social capital or social mobility, but as well in terms of emotional ties of residents to places. I believe that emotional ties strongly influence the perception of space in the neighbourhood for the residents, and therefore how they will use (or avoid) this space. Although feelings related to a place are fluctual and even volatile, they always refer to a set geographical location, which is more fixed and resistant to change. The same place can evoke many different feelings for many different groups and individuals, accommodating for social differences, but also for social change. Social change does not necessarily have to result in a neighbourhood out of place with its new population, if the neighbourhood space allows different emotional ties to settle in and attach themselves to the environment. When the physical environment is successful in making different groups feel at home over time in the neighbourhood, this environment does not always need to change shape to accommodate social change. Therefore, spatial interventions need to take account of the emotional ties of existing and new residents, by creating both new environments and by sustaining existing ones, which allow a changing and diverse population to feel at home in their neighbourhood.

So far, attention for the emotional ties of residents in urban renewal has been almost non-existent or at the very least has not been framed as such. More implicit references are made in the hot Dutch political debate on immigration, although these references are ambiguous. Politicians state that it is important for new citizens to feel at home in their new country, while at the same time they argue that immigrants should cut all emotional ties to their country of birth. Research on the place attachment of immigrants, however, shows that objects and rituals from their home country are important mediators for feelings of attachment to their new country. A simplistic and implicit conceptualisation of place attachment is used to describe and deal with the emotional ties of immigrants. The same holds true for urban policy. In the Dutch urban policy, implicit references are made to the emotional ties of residents: urban renewal programmes should protect and re-attract the original residents, who feel alienated from their neighbourhood.
by the decline of their area and the arrival of large numbers of immigrants in their
neighbourhood. The social programme is mostly defined by the rights and
obligations for those who have to move.

Equally simplistic and implicit conceptualisations are used when discussing
the role of middle class groups in urban renewal. In order to lure these groups into
the neighbourhood, much attention and resources are devoted to improve
neighbourhood reputations and to provide deprived areas with a new unifying
identity by redesigning the neighbourhood for different life styles and branding
areas with positive new images. However, these images often prove very difficult
to implement in the design, due to their vague and unproblematic nature (negative
reputations and differences between residents are ignored) and because they are
unrelated to the daily practices of residents and professionals.

Explicit attention in urban renewal is needed for the emotional ties of
residents, not only as a separate and valuable goal in itself for urban renewal, but
also because it is linked with the two other social goals of urban renewal:
increasing social cohesion and social mobility of residents. It is important to specify
the different relationship between these three social goals in order to get a clearer
view of the effects of urban renewal programmes and design more effective ways
to attain the social goals.

1.3 Aim and Research Questions

This research deals with feelings of home in a changing environment: the feelings
of people whose neighbourhoods are being regenerated. The term ‘regenerated’
has a positive connotation, implying new opportunities for the neighbourhood.
However, regeneration is not always positively received and perceived by residents
whose neighbourhoods are being demolished. It can evoke uncertainty about the
future: where to live, who will return, what will happen to the neighbourhood in
between? Feelings of home surface and become challenged by the regeneration
process: “Will I feel at home in the new house or neighbourhood?”, “Will I still feel
at home in the same neighbourhood when all the people I know have left?”
Central to my research is the following question:

*How do urban renewal programmes affect the emotional ties of residents?*

This key question was broken down into the following sub questions:

- What types of emotional ties can residents develop to their neighbourhood?
- Do emotional ties of residents differ between resident groups, places and over time?
- (How) do urban renewal programmes aim to affect the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood?
- What (spatial and social) interventions are used in urban renewal programmes that could affect the emotional ties of residents?
- How do different urban renewal programmes change the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood?
- Does the effect of urban renewal programmes differ for resident’s groups and places?

To answer these questions, different types of data have been used, both quantitative and qualitative. Existing quantitative survey data on housing needs and neighbourhood satisfaction (WBO/ WOon) were re-analysed to explore the emotional ties of residents in deprived neighbourhoods in the Netherlands, focusing on 56 so-called priority neighbourhoods which receive additional funding from the government to implement spatial, social and economic projects for tackling poverty, deprivation and degeneration. Changes in the social emotional ties of residents in deprived areas were studied over time and compared to non-deprived areas to research the possible effect of urban renewal on the emotional bondings to the neighbourhood.

The statistical analyses, however, could not reveal what the particular effects are of different urban renewal programmes on the emotional ties of residents in deprived areas. Each city designs its own urban renewal programme and although ambitions and goals are often similar, the ways in which urban renewal programmes are implemented differ widely between cities and therefore...
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there are potentially different effects for each urban renewal programme. To study the effects of different programmes, more detailed information was required on the specific make-up and implementation of urban renewal programmes. This qualitative information was be gathered in two Dutch case studies; the first case study was conducted in the neighbourhoods of Angelslo, Bargeres and Emmerhout in Emmen, and the second case study took place in the borough of Hoogvliet in Rotterdam. The case studies were based on earlier research I was involved in as a researcher at the Verwey-Jonker Institute and were extended for the purpose of this research to explore the effects of urban renewal on the emotional ties of residents. The research in Emmen was commissioned by Emmen Revisited to evaluate the impact of their urban renewal programme after 5 years (Van der Graaf & Duyvendak, 2005). The research in Hoogvliet was conducted as part of a larger research project for the borough of Hoogvliet, in collaboration with the University of Amsterdam and the OTB research institute in Delft (Veldboer et. al., 2008).

Both case studies are part of the 56 priority neighbourhoods and have developed their own programmes to tackle deprivation. In doing so they developed projects that implicitly and explicitly try to influence the emotional ties of residents. How do they work and what can we learn from them, as much from their mistakes as their successes, for the use of emotional ties in urban renewal? The qualitative case studies will allow further elaboration on the analyzed effects from the survey data. Changes in patterns of emotional ties can be connected to the implementation of specific projects in order to establish their effectiveness.

Urban renewal and the search for combined spatial, social and economical efforts is not an exclusive Dutch affair; many West-European countries are faced with similar problems and many of them look abroad for innovative approaches. International networks are established to share experiences and extract good practices and a large body of international comparative research is carried out to establish the relative effectiveness of each country and different cities within countries across Europe. This research will contribute to this endeavour by
comparing notes with the United Kingdom\(^1\). The United Kingdom is not only my new home country, but also an interesting case study for my research. Just like the Netherlands, the United Kingdom has a large social rented housing sector, which is even bigger than the private rented housing sector. The housing markets in both countries show comparable developments in the second half of the 20th century, although behind these similarities major differences are visible between the social housing sectors in both countries. In England and the Netherlands large scale urban renewal programmes are set up to tackle deprivation and within these programmes the attention to social and emotional ties varies greatly, although in the United Kingdom there appears to be more attention to emotional ties to places in urban renewal. This is reflected in the consistent references made in policy documents and scientific articles to housing as homes: dwellings are not merely places of bricks and mortar, but are places of home to the people who live in them. Before any attention is given in British urban renewal programmes to the role of higher income groups, activities focus on changing the identity and reputation of an area. Making people proud of their home ground in order to prevent them from self-destructive behaviour is one of the elements of this community-approach. Do these differences in approaches lead to different effects of urban renewal programmes on the emotional ties of residents in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom?

To research this effect of urban renewal in the United Kingdom comparable quantitative and qualitative analyses will be performed. For the quantitative analyses, data will be used from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), collected by the University of Essex. BHPS started in 1991 and follows a representative sample of households, yearly interviewing face-to-face every adult member, making it one of the longest running panel surveys in the world. Similar to the Dutch data, changes in the emotional ties of residents in deprived areas will be

\(^1\) The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, commonly known as the United Kingdom, the UK, or Britain, consist of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales - the four constituent countries. Great Britain means the countries of England, Wales and Scotland considered as a unit. The term Great Britain is often used (incorrectly) as synonymous with the UK. However, the UK and Great Britain are not equivalent since the UK is a state formed from the union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (www.wikipedia.org). My research focuses on one of the four countries of the United Kingdom, England, although I will use the terms English, British and the UK interchangeably, referring to the country of England, unless otherwise stated.
studied, over time and compared to non-deprived areas, in order to research the possible effect of urban renewal on ties. The added bonus of this data is that the panel design allows for stronger assumptions about causality. The effects of different urban renewal programmes will be studied in two English case studies: one in the neighbourhood of Sale in Manchester and one in the area of Newcastle and Gateshead. In both Manchester and Newcastle-Gateshead the emphasis in the regeneration programme is on changing area reputation and behaviour of residents. In the former the regeneration partners opt for an individual approach while in the latter a collective approach is preferred based on a large scale public art-programme. The case study of Manchester is also based on earlier research I conducted at the Verwey-Jonker Institute, while the data for the case study on Newcastle-Gateshead is newly collected for this research and chosen for its focus on a culture-led generation as a means to influence the emotional ties of residents through urban renewal. More details on the research data can be found in chapter three.

1.4 Overview of the Research

In chapter two, the concept of ‘feeling at home’ and attachment to the neighbourhood is explored. What does it mean when people say they are “at home”? And how can we measure something as intangible as feelings about a place? The sociological literature on emotions and place is explored to find clues for the study of this concept, resulting in the adaptation of the social-psychological concept of ‘Place Attachment’ as a theoretical framework for the research. Based on this concept, different dimensions of feeling at home are distinguished in order to explore patterns of emotional ties to the neighbourhood in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

In chapter three the different dimensions of feeling at home are operationalised by discussing both quantitative and qualitative data sources. For each data source a research strategy is described: variables are selected from the Dutch and English survey data on each dimension of place attachment and the four
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case studies, two in each country, are introduced, including the research methods that will be used in each case.

In chapters four and five the results are discussed of the secondary analyses on the Dutch and English Survey data respectively: the Housing Needs Survey (WBO) by the Dutch Ministry of Spatial Planning, Housing, and the Environment (2002-2006) and the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) by the University of Essex (1998-2003).

Before discussing the case studies an overview will be given in chapter six of the housing sector and urban renewal policy in each country. The case studies will be discussed individually in chapters Seven to Ten.

The urban renewal programme of Emmen Revisited is discussed in Chapter seven. The development of Emmen Revisited demonstrates an ongoing search for combining physical urban renewal with economical and social interventions. This search has widened the social scope considerably from purely resident participation to include social cohesion among residents, and even initiatives that recognise the importance of neighbourhood attachment.

Chapter eight investigates the urban renewal programme in Hoogvliet. In the regeneration of Hoogvliet, the partners developed a two bill strategy for increasing neighbourhood affection: directly by designing a new neighbourhood identity for its residents and indirectly by increasing the social mobility of individual residents. Improved job and educational qualifications of residents should benefit the neighbourhood at large by improving the reputation of and attachment to the area.

Chapter nine looks at a tenant reward scheme developed by a local housing association in Sale, Manchester to increase the involvement and independency of residents (mostly on welfare benefits) and in doing so, their attachment to the housing association and the neighbourhood.

Chapter ten discusses culture-led regeneration in Newcastle-Gateshead. Central to this programme was the development of eye-catching culture venues, combined with a large scale public art programme aimed at a radical improvement of the area reputation through the strengthening of local identity.

Finally, in chapter eleven, lessons will be drawn from the results of the case studies and the survey analyses. Are the reported changes in line with the goals set
by policy makers and city planners at the start of their urban renewal programmes? And what does this mean for future policy and urban renewal practices? Do they need revising, or are new tools and practices required to achieve these goals?
2. People and Places: A Theoretical Exploration

“Where is the character at home? ... The character is at home when he is at ease in the rhetoric of the people with whom he shares life”. (Auge, 1995: 108)

“Home is the familiar place from which one speaks to one’s neighbours about what they share in common because they occupy common places”. (Boswell, 1997)

2.1 Introduction

Where is home, and what is home exactly? What is home usually goes without saying: we go home after a day’s work, return home from a trip or stay at home when we are sick. However, home can be many different things to many different people: the house we live or lived in, the neighbourhood where we relax, the city we work in, the country we originate from, or everyplace where we put our hat, as Marvin Gaye sang. All these different feelings of home have one thing in common: they are all connected to a certain place, a house, a neighbourhood, a city, a country, even something as small as a bench in a public park. Much less is known why we feel at home in a certain place. Whether we feel at home appears to be an uncertain outcome of many unconscious decisions. Usually, we only become aware of these unconscious feelings when we leave the place they are connected to, or when this place itself is changing.

My research deals with feelings of home in a changing environment: people whose neighbourhoods are being regenerated. This subject is hardly researched in urban renewal. Although much research is devoted to the uprooting of and changes to the social networks of residents in urban renewal, much less is known about the changes in the social-emotional ties of people to the neighbourhood. My research will, therefore, focus on these ties and research how these ties are affected by different urban renewal programmes in the Netherlands. To study the emotional ties of residents, I have first consulted the literature on social cohesion and social
capital as starting point for my search for new research tools on the connection between people and places. The concept of social capital has been central to the debate on the social dimension of urban renewal. Can it be equally useful for studying emotional ties in urban renewal? As I will demonstrate in the next paragraph, the concept of social capital neglects the influence of places, and therefore my search continued by reviewing the role of places in Sociology. I will argue that there is a lack of attention to the study of places in Sociology and therefore I will turn in this chapter to another body of literature in Sociology devoted to the study of emotions, in the hope to find a concept which is more sensitive to places. This will result in the discussion of a particular social-psychological concept, place attachment. This concept provides a bridge between both dimensions by focusing on the relationship between people and places, and therefore the connection between spatial and social structures. However, I will start with a discussion of the concepts of social capital and social cohesion, which are often used by scientists and urban regenerators to link people and places in urban renewal programmes. How useful are these concepts for research on urban renewal and what can they tell us about the emotional ties of residents?

2.2 Social Capital and Social Cohesion in Urban Renewal: Remedy or Symptom?

Urban renewal in the Netherlands is concerned with the social bonds of people. Living in a poor, deteriorated, crime-ridden neighbourhood does not only diminish the labour market and educational opportunities for residents, but is also perceived to reduce their social capital, which is deemed crucial to improve their living conditions. According to policy makers, living too close to people with the same lack of opportunities, reduces their chances for upward mobility and keeps them trapped in their own prison. Alternatively, by knowing the right kind of people, residents should acquire access to much needed information and skills to move up the societal ladder. Therefore, large restructuring programmes are set up in the Netherlands, which aim explicitly at attracting higher income groups to the deprived inner areas of the big cities in order to help poor residents bridge their social capital deficit. Critics of these programmes have warned against the
opposite effect: urban renewal programmes do more harm than good for the social bonds of people in a neighbourhood; residents are forced to move out to make room for the new bourgeoisie (gentrification), uprooting their already distressed social networks and leaving the neighbourhood more segregated due to different time-space patterns between old and new residents. The new occupants are not interested in their poorer neighbours and prefer to spend their resources and time elsewhere and with more likeminded resourceful people. Who is right in this debate? To answer this question, first of all a clearer understanding of the concept of social capital is necessary to assess the potential of social bonds between neighbours for urban renewal programmes. Therefore, in the next paragraph the history and different uses of the concept of social capital will be briefly explored.

2.2.1 What is Social Capital?
Social capital has a longstanding tradition in the social sciences and refers, in addition to human and economical capital, to the value of social relations. Social capital is the product of individuals who are embedded in a network of social ties, which they can use to mobilize aid and support. Portes (1998) provides a useful definition:

*Social capital refers to the capacity of individuals to command scarce resources by virtue of their membership in networks or broader social structures (...) social capital does not inhere in the individual, as the possession of money (material capital) or education (human capital) does, but is instead a property of the individual’s set of relationships with others. Social capital is a product of embeddedness (Portes, 1998).*

This definition distinguishes between three different aspects of social capital, which are often confused in scientific literature; the structure, the content and the effects of social capital. Social relations and networks are the bearers of social capital; individuals do no possess social capital. The content of social capital is established by the norms of trust and reciprocity that are valid within the network and that motivate the individuals within the network to supply other members with aid and supports. The effects of social capital are the material and immaterial
benefits (and disadvantages) for the individuals in the network or the society at large that arise out of the interplay of the structure and content of social capital.

The concept is first mentioned in the 1961 classic of Jane Jacobs: The Death and Life of Great American Cities. She used it to describe how communities use networks of ties to channel diversity and contribute to the life of cities. Sociologists such as Pierre Bourdieu (1979) and James Coleman (1988) further developed the concept in their research. Bourdieu used the term social capital to explain the advantages and opportunities that accrue to people through their membership in groups, while Coleman used it to refer to the advantages which social ties afford individuals. More recently, the phrase is made popular by the work of Robert Putnam who uses it to explain why in some Italian regions democratic institutions are flourishing, while in other regions totalitarian regimes remain. In his explanation he echoes the heritage of De Tocqueville: regions with a strong civil society, and accordingly dense networks of social ties, are more effective in nurturing democratic institutions. Putnam puts a high interest on civil society as the manufacturers of social capital, the latter which he vaguely defines as ‘a commitment to co-operation, the presence of trust in fellow citizens, the usage of norms of reciprocity and the existence of social networks in a society’. For Putnam, social capital essentially means reciprocity. Reciprocity among citizens is, according to Putnam, essential for a strong civil society and hence a strong democratic government.

His research resulted in an extensive scientific and political debate on the definition of social capital and whether this capital is declining in modern society. Putnam is sure of the latter: in his book ‘Bowling Alone’ he paints a dramatic picture of American society in decline, characterized by ongoing individualization, because people spent too much time in front of their televisions instead of developing social ties and accumulating social capital. However, not all scientists share his pessimistic view. Different authors point to new forms of social capital, which are created outside the traditional institutions (church, family, bowling clubs) of civil society.

A less heard critique on Putnam research deals with the supposed equality of citizens and their social capital. Critics, like Talja Blokland, argue that social capital creates inequality, because citizens do not possess equal amounts of social
capital. Especially the ones that need it most; people at the bottom of society possess the least, while the ones with the best connections are already advanced on the societal ladder. This refers to the dark side of capital, a concept coined by Richard Florida (and discussed earlier in the work of Pierre Bourdieu) stressing the excluding power of social capital.

Another issue of debate is the question “which form of social capital is declining in modern society?” Are people in general interacting less with others and do they prefer to stay among like-minded individuals or does individualization merely mean weaker ties between many more individuals? Central to this debate are the concepts of bonding and bridging, referring respectively to social capital that unites people who already know each other and social capital that connects strangers. Duyvendak and Hurenkamp (2005) argue for instance, that ‘communities light’, with only weak ties among its members, are the preferred mode of organization in modern society, due the diverse and multilevel networks that people maintain. Others, like Talja Blokland, argue that social capital is not needed at all in the neighbourhood. According to Blokland all that is needed for neighbours to get along is ‘public familiarity’. She uses the concept of public familiarity to emphasise the need for knowledge about neighbours, instead of knowledge acquired in personal contact with neighbourhoods, to develop social trust in neighbourhoods. According to Blokland the neighbourhood is not a basis for shared identification, but merely a framework that can be used for identification. Repeated observations of people in the public space of the neighbourhood are sufficient to anticipate whether we can trust a neighbour or not. This knowledge does not need to be acquired in close personal contacts with neighbours. Her concept is consistent with the warnings of some scholars (Anderiessen & Reijndorp, 1989; Wellman, 1996; Friedrichs, 1997) against putting too much emphasis and fate on the neighbourhood as a basis for identification and integration. They distance themselves from policy makers and landscape architects who paint a romantic picture of the harmonious community of the past, where life was well-organized and everybody knew and helped each other. They dismiss this line of thinking not only as a relic from the past but also as a ‘mythical netherworld’ that never existed.
When someone tells you he or she used to have many contacts in the neighbourhood and now only a few, then this mainly tells us something about the amount of familiarity people used to have: ‘everybody knows everyone’, but ‘knowing’ meant more often ‘knowledge about others, ‘being familiar with another’, not being part of personal networks of sustainable relationships between people who like each other (2005: 30).

According to Talja Blokland, it is not so much a decline of social capital - caused by people not bowling together anymore or spending too much time in front of the television - that makes neighbours mistrust each other but the lack of opportunities to observe each other’s behaviour in the neighbourhood.

The mentioned large societal changes [migration, increased social and geographical mobility, technological changes and the depillarisation] have each reduced and differentiated the practical usage of the neighbourhood, meaning the amount of activities in daily life that take place within the neighbourhood (2005:30).

Therefore she argues for more public meeting places in the neighbourhood, where people don’t have to interact but can acquire public familiarity with another.

2.2.2 Social Cohesion

The shift from small homogenous communities of strong ties to larger more heterogeneous communities of weak ties in modern society was identified more than a century ago by the founding fathers of social sciences, Max Weber, George Simmel and Emile Durkheim, who witnessed a transition from a rural based society to an industrialized society. Ever since their grounding work the weakening of social ties and the growing of larger and more heterogeneous networks of people are a recurring theme in sociological research and on the policy agenda. Nowadays, after a transition to a post-modern society, this theme is linked to large societal trends; globalization, privatization, reforming of the welfare state, and the rise of information technology. To describe these transitions to a (post-) modern society, social scientists have used the concept of social cohesion, referring to the
connectedness of people within a social or political system. The concept has been used in many different ways, focusing on the participation of people in public institutions, describing the social contacts people maintain with each other, or referring to people’s orientation to collective norms and values. The connections between people have been studied at many different levels, ranging from micro (individuals) to meso (neighbourhoods, cities and regions) and macro level (nations and global networks). This makes social cohesion a multilayered and multidimensional concept, which is difficult to capture in a single definition. However, all applications of the concept refer in some way to the consistency of a social or political system and the connections and solidarity of people within these systems. Paul Schnabel tries to capture this commonality and range of use in his definition of social cohesion as:

*The extent toward which people express in their behaviour and experience their involvement with societal groups in their personal life, as citizen in society and as a member of society* (Schnabel 2000: 22).

Comparing both concepts, social capital and social cohesion share many similarities; both deal with the networks and social ties of people, describing their structure and function in different times and places. However, social capital seems primarily concerned with networks between and within communities and focuses on the individuals in these networks. Social cohesion is more concerned with the institutional context in which the social networks are embedded. The concept emphasizes (more than social capital) the role of institutions and focuses on the social system made up by the networks of people. The political sciences are the exception to the rule where special attention is paid to the role of institutions, in particular, to the relationship between citizens and state. The research of Putnam is a good example.

Each concept has been claimed and developed by different theoretical paradigms, which compete with each other for the attention of social scientists. The first one is rational choice theory, with utilitarian motives at its core: people engage in and maintain social ties because it allows individuals to satisfy their personal needs at a minimum cost. This view is opposed by communitarism, which
takes norms, values and emotions as the basis for community building. Communitarianism stresses the moral dimension of human behaviour: people need to feel part of a community, with which they can share common values and which can help them to build a (collective) identity. Both paradigms stress different sides of a coin, but in their work both paradigms strongly oppose each other. Rational choice theory stresses the voluntary nature of contact: people choose to engage in relationships because it allows them to maximize their goals with a minimum of effort. Communitarianism argues that people inherently are social beings who are driven by feelings of belonging and solidarity; they stress that people simply cannot live without meaningful contacts.

These different dimensions of contact are often placed in sequential order; contacts based on strong feelings of solidarity represented the rural society and have been replaced in modern time by voluntary types of contact. However, the above-mentioned classical sociologists have used dimension of contact to explain why societies were not falling apart: both individuals maximizing their opportunities and groups looking for solidarity are present and necessary in past and modern society. Likewise, in urban renewal both approaches are visible. In the Netherlands, urban research acquired more recently a strong focus on the social mobility of individual residents, analyzing the opportunities created and used by residents to improve their careers, either on the housing, labour or educational market. Contacts with families, friends, colleagues and neighbours are beneficial to a resident in acquiring access to valuable information and resources for finding a job or a new house, or starting an education.

Another popular line of research approaches the neighbourhood as a mix of different (ethnic) groups who need to learn to coexist by sharing a minimal standard of norms and values. In this view neighbourhood problems are caused by a lack of co-operation. Therefore contacts between different groups need to be stimulated to allow the exchange of values and norms and to help correct stereotypical images of each other. Researchers focusing on social mobility find the concept of social capital particularly useful, while the concept of social cohesion is more appealing for researchers on mixed neighbourhoods/ social mixing, although combinations exist in urban renewal research as well. Research on role modelling takes social capital theory as a starting point, but analyses the use of social capital
by other residents, particular the exchange of values. Less fortunate residents can advance in society by copying the behaviour and using the valuable resources of more able neighbours who act as role models for them.

Therefore, the question is not which concept is better, but which concept is the most appropriate for the research at hand? Depending on the form of contact one likes to study, one chooses social capital over social cohesion and vice versa. Given the focus of social cohesion on collective norms and values and hence shared grounds for identification, social cohesion appears to be a more appropriate concept for this study. However, what is missing in the concept is a reference to the spatial context of the social relations under scrutiny. Research on place attachment and place identity (Altman & Low, 1993) shows that social interactions, which are necessary for social cohesion to develop, are related to the places where these interactions take place. Therefore, any concept of social cohesion used in urban renewal research needs to take the relationship between people and places into account. In urban renewal these dynamics are especially pressing: social networks are uprooted and places in the neighbourhood become more contested as new groups enter and claim their territory while the remaining residents try to maintain their sense of community and home within their neighbourhood.

2.3 Social versus Emotional Ties

Another reason to given more attention to relationship between social bonds and places is the growing evidence of the limited benefits of social capital for urban renewal programmes. Remember the debate earlier in the previous paragraphs about whether social bonds, particularly with higher income groups, would increase the social mobility of the lower income residents or whether they would do more harm than good by forcing out the original residents (gentrification) and uprooting

---

2 A new concept seems appropriate for the study of social relations in urban environments. So far the debate in urban renewal has either focused on the social mobility of individuals (with the use of social capital) or on increasing the social cohesion between different groups in a neighbourhood. ‘Place capital’ (the symbolic value of places) can be used as an additional concept for the studying of social relations in urban renewal. By studying the emotional ties of people to places, the spatial context of social bonds can be better understood.
their already distressed social networks, leaving the neighbourhood more segregated due to different time-space patterns between old and new residents. Although research confirmed that the mixing goals of urban renewal were problematic (Blokland, 2001; Kleinhans et.al., 2000), evidence on the claim that the results would be counter effective remained inconclusive (Duyvendak, et.al., 2005; Kleinhans, 2005).

However, this research points to a new direction, where losses are greater and potential gains are higher. Kleinhans (2005) demonstrates in his dissertation that moving residents not so much mourn the loss of social capital, but the loss of attachment to the place they lived in. The movers do not miss the people, but the places that are left behind as an important frame of reference. The emotional ties they developed over time with the places where they lived provided an emotional source of comfort and identity which is cut by moving, causing distress, feelings of displacement and not belonging.

Other evidence for the importance of emotional ties to residents is presented by Henk Flap en Beate Völker (2004) in their research on neighbourhood ties and sense of community. Their statistical analyses demonstrate that there is a positive relationship between the social networks and the sense of community (emotional attachment) in a neighbourhood on one side, and the willingness of residents to look out for each other (i.e. exercise social control) on the other side. Moreover, while social ties are important for making people feel at home in their neighbourhood, sense of community is more important for the amount of social control residents are able to exercise in an area. This means that it is not so much the social networks that influence the behaviour of residents, making them feel safe to address teenagers that make too much noise or to prevent cars from getting burgled, but that their sense of community enables them to be in control of their neighbourhood. Social ties influence the behaviour of residents only indirectly by increasing the sense of community of residents allowing them to act together.

Both research findings suggest that in specifying the effects of urban renewal programmes more attention is needed for the connection between people and places. To understand the effects of different social-physical interventions, not so much the changes in social bonds need to be studied, but the changes in emotional ties of residents in urban renewal areas. This raises a whole new set of
questions. How can residents’ emotional ties to their neighbourhood be defined and studied? How do emotional ties of residents develop and are there different forms of emotional ties possible for different groups of residents? How are different emotional ties affected by urban renewal programmes: do different groups (e.g. higher and lower level income groups) respond differently? Are higher income groups less emotionally connected to their neighbourhood, explaining their lack of enthusiasm to help their less fortunate neighbours? And do lower income groups, due to their social immobility, possess more emotional capital, explaining their strong sense of loss when they are forced (even temporary) out of their neighbourhood by urban renewal programmes? If so, can urban renewal programmes ease their pain and enhance their connectedness to their new or renewed neighbourhood, as politicians in the post-Fortuin era are keen to see? Can the involvement of new (higher income) arrivals in the neighbourhood, and hence their social bonds with the original residents, be increased by changing their emotional ties to the neighbourhood? In sum, by studying the emotional ties of residents and the relationship between social bonds and emotional ties, a new perspective might be gained on the effects of urban renewal programmes. To be able to answer the above raised questions, we need to know more about the emotional ties of people to places, which will be the aim of the next paragraph. In studying the emotional ties of residents I will explore two possible routes in Sociology: the role of emotions in Sociology and the role of place in Sociology. First of all, I will look into the role of emotions in Sociology: what can Sociology teach us on the use of emotions? If feeling at home is an emotion, how can we study it sociologically?

2.4 Sociology of Emotions

The study of emotions in sociology has accelerated over the past three decades. In his review of sociological theories of human emotions, Turner and Stets (2006) conclude that five general theoretical frameworks have emerged in Sociology; dramaturgical theories, symbolic interactionist theories, interaction ritual theories, power and status theories and exchange theories. The first framework is based on
the work of Goffman (1967), according to whom the emotional world is a stage: “individuals make dramatic presentations and engage in strategic actions directed by a cultural script” (Turner and Stets, 2006: 26). Goffman is not so much concerned with what emotions are and how they come into being, but is more interested in the ways emotions are dealt with. Culture, according to Goffman, defines which emotions are to be experienced and expressed in different situations. It constrains the actions of individuals on a stage in front of an audience, while at the same time individuals actively manipulate their emotions or, more precisely, the expression of their emotions, to manipulate audiences about their sincerity and concern, or get access to valued resources and gain power over others.

This framework is extended by Arlie Hochschild (1983, 1990), who internalised the struggle of actors over the control of their emotions. While Goffman is mainly concerned about the influence of culture and social structures on the expression of emotions, Hochschild is more interested in the internal conflict that arises when people’s personal feelings are out of place with the emotions they must express to others in their audience according to the cultural script of their group or society. She uses the concepts of feeling and frame rules to explain this conflict. Feeling rules describe what an individual is supposed to feel in a particular situation. These rules are developed by an individual over time and are based on three framing mechanisms: historical (what have I done before in similar situations?), pragmatic (which repertoires of emotional responses do I have at my disposal/what do I know?), and moral (what do my norms and values tell me to do?) These three mechanisms validate the appropriate response (feeling rule) of an individual. If this selected response is at odds with what the individual feels at that moment and place, then this discrepancy generates new negative emotions, which motivate the individual to engage in emotional repair work by trying to reduce the tension and adhere to the demanded emotion in the given situation. For instance, by emitting expressive gestures that are more in line with the scripted emotion or by invoking thought and ideas associated with the demanded emotion.

The tension between what we ought to feel and are actually feeling is also central to symbolic interactionalist theories. However, they describe this tension not so much as a conflict between emotions, but between identities. People’s
emotional responses are, according to these theories, not enforced by an outside cultural system of feeling and framing rules, but are the result of an internal drive to align their identities with the outside world. People constantly try to confirm their self-identities in interaction with others. “When others respond to us in a manner that is consistent with the way we see ourselves, we experience positive emotions” (Turner and Stets, 2006: 29). However, when people don’t respond to us the way we expect them to, we feel distressed and experience emotions as anxiety, anger, shame and guilt. Therefore, symbolic interactionalist theories also try to describe the ways in which we try to bridge the gap between expectations and actual experiences. According to the interactionalists, individuals will first use the exit option and leave the situation. When they cannot, they will try to change their behaviour or their self-perceptions and identities to conform to cultural expectations. In some interactionalist theories a hierarchy is emphasised: when identities are confirmed they move up in the hierarchy of an individuals’ identities, with identities higher up in the hierarchy more likely to be presented that those lower in the hierarchy.

So far, the individual takes centre stage in dealing with their emotions, while the larger sociological world only appears in reference to wider cultural rules or the emotional responses of others. In the third theoretical framework distinguished by Turner and Stets (2006) emotions are emphasised as collective achievements of a group. Interaction ritual theories start from the assumption that individuals try to maximise their emotional energy in an encounter. However, they acknowledge that the build up of emotional energy depends on specific group dynamics, which create more enduring collective emotions sustained across encounters. These collective group rituals sustain solidarity and result in the development of groups symbols which are powerful enough to reinvoke the collective emotional energy of the interaction rituals. The introduction of collective level in emotional theories brings power and status into play: according to interaction ritual theories, the capacity to increase positive emotional energy is mediated by power and prestige. Those with more power and prestige have first rights and are able to use the symbols to invoke the emotional energy associated with the symbols, while “those with less power must give deference and as a consequence experience less positive and perhaps negative energy, leading to less
commitment” (Turner and Stets, 2006: 33). This can even lead to alternative strategies revolving around minimizing the loss of emotional energy rather than maximising positive emotional energy.

This issue of power and prestige is further taken up by power and status theories, which document the effects of power and status on the arousal of emotions. In its most simplistic form the theories state that when individuals have or gain power, they experience satisfaction, confidence, and security, whereas they experience anxiety, fear and loss of confidence when they lose power. A crucial element in these theories is the introduction of expectation states: “When individuals expect to gain power, but in fact do not, they lose self-confidence and experience fear and anxiety” (Turner and Stets, 2006: 35). When the opposite happens (the gain of unexpected power), they feel more satisfied and self-confident. In other words, expectation states add more fuel to the power dynamics. This addition brings us back to the earlier dramaturgical and symbolic interactionalist theories, which stressed the damaging tension between expectations (either external or internal) and actual feelings. However, the micro level perspective has now been replaced by a more meso level perspective, stressing the importance of group dynamics in the creating and sustaining of emotions, while micro dynamics add further fuel to these group processes.

The connection with the macro level is less developed in sociological theories on emotion. Turner and Stets conclude that: “Most power and status theories are micro in their focus on the relations among power, prestige and emotions”. They discuss a noteworthy exception by Barbalet (1998) who investigated the distribution of emotions over different segments of a population, which possess varying levels of power and prestige. Barbalet argues that changes in social structures are responsible for the biggest changes in emotions by off-setting the distribution of valued resources as power, honour, and material well-being.

The effect of social structures is analysed by exchange theories. Starting from a rational choice perspective, which states that individuals are motivated to receive rewards or utilities and avoid costs and punishment, emotions come into play, according to exchange theories, when rewards and costs are assessed against normative standards of justice and fair exchange. “When payoffs exceed costs and investments while meeting standard standards of justice, individuals experience
positive emotions” (Turner and Stets, 2006: 41). More importantly, justice standards overrule the utilitarian principle in exchange theories: when profitable payoffs fall below what is considered fair or if payoffs exceed the justice standards of equity too far, the individual will feel less positive and will even experience negative emotions. What is considered fair depends on the payoffs and costs of other people, past payoffs in similar exchanges with others and the relative power of these others.

Thus, this depends essentially on a social comparison, which brings us back to the symbolic interactionalist theories, although culture is reduced to a relative profits and costs comparison. Exchange theories go on to study the nature and intensity of emotion when the conditions of exchange alter: the type of exchange, the types of structures in which exchanges of resources occur, the relative power and dependence of actors on each other for resources, the expectations for resources, the standards of justice that apply to the exchange, and the attributions that actors make for success or failure in receiving profitable payoffs (Turner and Stets, 2006: 41). However, exchange theories fail to make the link between the individual and collective level because they reduce social structures to a pay off game between individual actors whose exchanges do not rise above the meso level. Moreover, they reduce emotions to a by product of these exchanges.

In sum, emotions in Sociology appear primarily as individual responses to external norms (Dramaturgical theories) or an internal drive to confirm identities (Symbolic Interactionalists), whereas power and status decide on the scope and availability of emotional responses (Power and Status theories). Emotions are a commodity, which the powerful possess in more positive amounts, while the dominated are left frustrated with the negative emotions. Emotions become a predefined response to power and status games, the outcome of a calculated pay off in social and economical exchanges between individuals (Exchange theories) In spite of the efforts in Sociology to theorise emotions, emotions are narrowly defined and limited to the meso level.

Even the feeling and framing rules, which were introduced by the sociologist Arlie Hochschild as a clear attempt to incorporate society in the explanation of individual emotions, are in the end a micro level affair, because it is the individual who decides what the right emotion is in a given place and time, based on past
experiences and his or her emotional repertoire and the values they adhere to. Society sets the frame for these decisions and is reduced to a passive backstage for individual emotions. Hochschild does not elaborate on the interaction between individual responses and feeling and framing rules; do individual responses feed back into these rules, allowing them to change over time and place? What are the dynamics of feeling and framing rules and how do they respond to structural and cultural changes?

Not only are emotions in Sociology narrowly defined at the micro and meso level, we are also left none the wiser regarding the relationship between people and places: what role do places play in the emotional exchanges between individuals and how are power and status affected by different places? Can places become an expression of power and status or even an emotional commodity in power and status struggles? In the next paragraph I will therefore investigate the role of place in Sociology. Can this literature tell us more about the emotional ties of residents to places?

2.5 Sociology of Place

Thomas Gieryn (2000) awakes us rudely from this mission before we have even started. He argues that there is a worrying lack of attention to places in Sociology. In his review of the sociological literatures, Gieryn (2000) concludes that, “although there is an enduring tradition of robust sociological studies of place, they often remain invisible because they are rarely framed as such” (464). There appears to be ‘no space for place in sociology’: summing up popular sociological opinion Gieryn states, that in the post-modern network society, the importance of places is greatly reduced. The flow of goods, capital and information moves through nodes in one or another network and is no longer anchored at any place necessarily. Instead, places become more alike in a cosmopolitan society in which cities have to compete with another over creative capital and the latest establishment of retail and food giants. Even iconic places are no longer tied to specific places: if you would like to see the Eiffel Tower, the Egyptian Pyramids...
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and the Statue of Liberty, you can visit them all in one day by playing the slot machines in Las Vegas. Place just does not seem to matter any more.

However, this conception is misleading, as several authors have pointed out. Globalisation goes hand in hand with processes of localisation: increased mobility and homogenisation of places increase rather than reduce the need for differentiation. Setting yourself apart from other places becomes necessary to gain an advantage in the global competition for goods, capital and information. This effect is known as ‘glocalisation’ (Swyngedouw, 2004). In particular anthropologists have recently become interested in the continued or even increased distinctiveness of places in a globalised society while sociologists, on the other hand, have been quick to accept the homogenisation-hypothesis.

Whoever is right, the fact remains that sociologists have not showed a great interest in places or have been successful in disguising their interest. Gieryn (2000: 464) blames a false modesty by which sociologists stick to their guns and prefer to leave the matter of places to specialists from geography out of fear that environmental determinism would rob special and cultural variables of their explanatory power, or because sociologist worry that the particularities of discrete places might compromise the generalising and abstracting ambitions of the discipline. Instead Gieryn argues for a more place-sensitive sociology:

*Nothing of interest to sociologists is nowhere* (cited in Casey, 1993). *Everything that we study is emplaced; it happens somewhere and involves material stuff* (2000:466).

Comparing behaviour patterns, structural changes and attitudes is, in his view, futile if nothing more is hypothesised about the effects of the geographic locations where these patterns and change take place. Places are for Gieryn more than racial proportions or neighbourhoods and unemployment rates of cities, where place becomes a stand-in for clusters of variables. For sociological studies to become place sensitive, they need to feed in information about relative location of the collected data and, for instance, the significance of architecture, landscape and the perceptions and understandings of place by the people who live there or not.
An example of ‘misplaced’ sociological research is the work of Claude Fischer and his Subcultural Theory of Urbanism (1975, 1995). Fisher argues that cities are the breeding grounds of subcultures\(^3\). According to Fischer, subcultures flourish in cities, not because of the social breakdown in cities where people are freed from their traditional community ties and can engage in norm-less and deviant behaviour (Wirth, 1938), or because cities attract particular kinds of people, like ethnic minorities and artistic avant-garde (Gans, 1962), but because of the sheer size of the place. Due to their size, cities stimulate subcultures to diversify and intensify\(^4\). Although Fischer emphasises the power of place, he reduces place simply to a backstage for subcultural exchanges.

A sociologist who is more sensitive to places is Dolores Hayden. In her classic article (1994) on the power of place, she argues that places can be a powerful source of identity. In the article she describes the struggle of local residents in Bunker Hill with the local Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) over the preservation of rundown buildings in the neighbourhood. While the CRA opts for massive commercial development to provide the downtown area with a new identity, she presents an alternative account of place building by emphasising the importance of women from diverse backgrounds and women’s work, both paid and unpaid, to urban survival. Instead of preserving buildings which represent the identity of a small white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant male elite, she argues for the re-use of more modest urban buildings that represent the social and economical

\(^3\) Fisher defines subcultures as “large sets of people who share a defining trait, associate with one another, are members of institutions associated with their defining trait, adhere to a distinct set of values, share a set of cultural tools, and take part in a common way of life”.

\(^4\) Large places, like cities, attract migrants, who bring along their cultures and create a greater diversity in subcultures through economic, spatial, institutional and cultural specialisation. Size does not only stimulate diversity, but also intensifies the different subcultures that live close to each other, because larger places have larger subcultures which more easily sustain institutions and resist outside influences, while the diversity of subcultures increases the chances of encounters and conflicts with members of different groups, which reinforce group boundaries. Which is not to say that different groups do not influence one other: between-group contact also leads to the diffusion of (similar) traits. However, Fischer argues that the net result is more diversity, because at the same time cultural traits of atypical subcultures are diffused to others in the area. Thus, place (size) matters for the diffusion of and adherence to cultural traits.
struggles of the majority of ordinary citizens in an area where half of the residents are women and 60 percent are people of colour.

The power of place to nurture social memory - to encompass shared time in the form of shared territory - remains untapped for most working people’s neighbourhoods in most American cites. The sense of civic identity that shared history can convey is lost or repressed. Even bitter experiences need to be remembered - so as not to diminish their importance (1994: 467).

By stating that places nurture social memories she directly links place to social interactions. Another important element in her work in the struggle she describes over the identity of place. Her empirical research demonstrates that the meaning of places is contested. This point is further developed by Ed Soja, who suggests that space cannot be dealt with as if it were merely a passive, abstract arena on which things happen. Space is for Soja not an innocent backdrop to social position, but is filled with politics and ideology. Soja argues that space has been misrecognised by contemporary social theory. Either space is reduced to a concrete form, where space is fixed, dead and undialectical, or space is reduced to a mental construct.

However, according to Soja, space is more than the outcome of social relations and more than one of the dimensions through which the social is constructed. It is an active, constitutive, irreducible, necessary component in the social’s composition. Soja, and many other authors in this field are indebted to Lefebvre, who argues there is a dialectic in the lived world between spaces of representation and representation of spaces. In his classical work ‘The production of space’ Levebre makes clear that “place is not merely a construct of social interaction to be consumed by people, but is actively produced and re-produced in an ongoing struggle of power”.

This poses a new problem, if space is actively produced and reproduced by many different actors through time, what is then the true meaning of a place at a given moment in time and who decides this? Lefebvre tried to solve this puzzle by developing the notion of different forms of produced space: a typology of spatialities that covers a range from sensory, sensual representational spaces
through to the space of the Greek city that is assumed in classical philosophy. According to Lefebvre, there is a succession from natural to absolute to abstract space, progressively erasing nature from our sense of spatiality. In each stage a different form of produced space and the meanings attached to it is dominant, whereby each stage increases human domination over space and its meanings depriving places of their ‘real’ meaning.

This worry is shared by Sharon Zukin who argues that landscapes of power triumph over the vernacular. Hard cash decides in today’s world the meaning of space and what is left for the masses is the consumption of economically produced spaces. To describe these spaces, she introduced the notion of liminal spaces that are ambiguous and ambivalent; they slip between global markets and local place. A key example of liminal spaces and thorn in the eye of Zukin is Disneyland in Los Angeles, USA. She describes Disneyland as a place where:

*Stage-sets evoke the social production of visual consumption, with its history of resort and fantasy architecture, its fictive nexus in Disney World, and its dependence on the markets to foster products that in turn create a sense of place. In this landscape, socio-spatial identity is derived purely from what we consume* (1992:243).

Zukin paints a bleak picture of a society based on the motto ‘I consume therefore I am’. In her view the post-modern urban landscape imposes multiple perspectives which are not only wedded to economic power but also facilitate ‘the erosion of locality’ - the erosion of the archetypical place-based community by market forces (1992; 240). Her analyses demand the recovery of authentic, good landscapes, which contrast to the Mickey Mouse worlds of capital.

Although not many scholars would agree there is only one true meaning of place and many would find the recovery of authentic landscapes somewhat naïve, Zukin raised, together with Ed Soja, an important debate in the 1990s on the social, cultural and political contexts of place production and consumption. They set out to uncover, as Soja called it, ‘the political economy of space’. Other contributors to this debate were Massey (1992) and Somerville (1998). Particularly in Britain, a fierce debate took place on the politics of place and the politics of
identity. New social movements introduced a politics of resistance, exemplified by black politics, feminism and gay liberation, with a strong focus on culture and identity. They employed a richly spatialised vocabulary, focusing on how identity is forged and the role places play in forging a new identity, turning space into places of resistance. An important question in the debate was whether “concrete geographical and historical circumstances can be understood as expressions of abstract social relations?” (Keith & Pile, 1993:1).

This debate is reflected upon in a book edited by Michael Keith and Steve Pile titled ‘Place and the Politics of Identity’. The authors conclude that “spatialities are political, because they are the (covert) medium and (disguised) expression of asymmetrical relations of power” (220). With regards to the debate on true and false meanings of space, the editors argue that “spatialities draw on a relationship between the real, the imaginary and the symbolic that is not beyond truth and falsity, but is different from it”. In other words space is both real and false, because it is socially and politically produced, but not by one dominant group or stage in time, but by an ongoing struggle for the meaning of places between different social and political groups who change alliances and sides during the conflict.

In this struggle places act, according to Keith and Pile, as neutralisers for conflicts and contradictions: “We would like to argue that spatiality needs to be seen as the modality through which contradictions are normalized, naturalized and neutralized” (224). Places hide power struggles and these need to be identified (politics of place) to understand the different meaning of place that are at stake. (“Politics is necessary territorial but these territories are simultaneously real, imaginary and symbolic” (224)). What a place represents at a given moment in time is, in the view of Keith and Pile, a particular political mobilization round a particular concept of space. The meanings different groups attach to places are related to the identities they present in these places: “Spatialities represent both the spaces between multiple identities and the contradictions within identities” (225).

This viewpoint is closely related to the Symbolic Interactionalist theories on emotions discussed earlier, where individuals constantly try to confirm their self (identities) in interaction with others. The Politics of Identity provide a spatial
dimension for the interactionalist theories by focussing on the places that represent these identities and allow groups and individuals to present different identities. Furthermore, by identifying the Politics of Place the power struggles stressed by Power and Status theories on emotions are uncovered and redefined as a struggle over the appropriate identity in a particular place. This connects sociological theories on emotions and place: whereas emotions are the outcome of power struggles, places tend to hide these struggles. (According to Keith and Pile spatialities of urban renewal are to be understood as an identity politics of space).

2.6 Emotions and Places: Feeling at Home

Although I have collected clues on the relationship between people and place for both disciplines, the study of emotions and the study of places remain thus far largely separate and marginalised disciplines within sociology. Both subjects, however, have also been studied at large and more interdisciplinary in other social sciences. The study of the relationship between humans and their environment is a fundamental subject of social scientific research and theory generated by geography, history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology and environmental psychology. It is impossible to do justice to this volume of knowledge in the scope of this chapter. Therefore, I started with one particular emotion: feeling at home. This emotion is directly connected to a place; home, where ever and whatever home may be, but that is a subject I will deal later with. For now it is sufficient to stress that home is always in some way tied up to a place or has least a strong spatial connotation. (Even Marvin Gay, who felt at home where ever he laid his hat, marked his home spatially by symbolically putting his hat down in a specific place. Where he felt at home was spatially defined, however small and temporarily). By researching how people feel at home I was able to analyse a particular emotional relationship between people and places. Until recently, sociological discussions have tended to ignore the experiential significance of home.

Many of the early quotations of home refer to the country or land. Domestication of the word began in the 17th and 18th centuries in England. The house became an essential aspect of the identity and self-definition of the middle
class. Rybczynski (1987) traces the origins of our current, cosy idea of home to 17th century Amsterdam, where merchants started separating their warehouses from their living quarters and so began the familiar work/home division. For the working class, home centeredness became a permanent feature of cultural life since the industrial revolution. The study of (feeling at) home has a central focus within the disciplines of phenomenology and philosophy (Heidegger, 1971, Bachelard, 1964). Their work has highlighted the human qualities of places and the bonds that develop. Early psychological exploration examined the affective bonds between people and places (Fried, 1963). This link has been more extensively studied by philosophers and psychologists.

Jeanne Moore, who researched the literature on home for her PhD dissertation (2000), argues that previous discussions of the concept of home within psychology have tended to focus more on the experiential and personal aspects of home than the social and cultural aspects. Most researchers focussed on the different meaning of home and this resulted in a wide range of largely unrelated listings. However, from the meanings of home studies a new theory framed in a transactionalist perspective emerged, called place attachment, which is the main theory used in relation to home. Rather than identifying types of bonds with home places, the attachment approach emphasises the process by which people and home places develop relationships. Adopting the transactional approach provided by the concept of place attachment enabled me to explore the different elements or facets of home as part of a single complex process. The transactionalist perspective highlight important aspects of the study of emotions and place in sociology: people attach meanings to places and form affective bonds with these places when they present their identities in these spaces. Positive place bonding results in feelings of home. The concept of place attachment provides a bridge between emotion and place, by focusing on the affective relationship between people and places.

I do not wish to imply that no other useful concepts exist, nor that the concept of place attachment is by far the best. On the contrary, I am aware that my specific focus on this concept disregards other potential useful concepts for bridging the gap between the spatial and social dimension of urban renewal. However, the task I set myself in this research is not to compare the value of
different theoretical concepts and to assess the relative value of the concept of place attachment within the rich scientific tradition of urban research, but to explore the specific theoretical and empirical value of this concept for studying and influencing the relationship between people and places. Does the concept of place attachment allow me to gain a better understanding of the relationship between the social and spatial dimension of urban renewal and does this knowledge help me to formulate useful suggestions for architects, urban planners and social workers in urban renewal that enable them to combine social and spatial interventions more successfully? In short, I would like to test one specific theoretical concept on its empirical usefulness within a specific context: urban renewal programmes in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

2.7 Place Attachment

When studying the scientific literature on place attachment, one is confronted with many different concepts and notions. There are many similar terms such as community attachment, sense of community, place identity, place dependence, sense of place, place attachment, etc. These different notions are seemingly interconnected and are often used interchangeably without much attempt to distinguish them from each other. This makes the concept of place attachment a slippery term and difficult to define.

The concept of place attachment dates back to the sixties when it was primarily of interest to earlier phenomenological scholars such as Bachelard (1964) and Eliade (1959). They emphasized the emotional experiences and bonds of people with places, particularly homes and sacred places. Unfortunately their work resonated poorly among many environmental and behavioural researchers, whose work was dominated by positivist philosophies, leaving little room for emphasis on subjective experiences. More recently, the subject gained renewed interest among scientists, particularly in geography and anthropology. Geographers’ focus on regional studies has sparked their interest in human action and an acknowledgement of the cultural significance of everyday life. Anthropologists on the other hand were criticized for
their unproblematic treatment of place: places were merely settings, albeit exotic ones, were things happened.

Insufficient attention has been paid to conceptualizing place in anthropology as something other than a physical setting or a passive target for primordial sentiments of attachment that flow from life’s ‘assumed givens’ (Geertz, 1973:259).

To readdress these critics, anthropologists started paying attention to the material and spatial aspects of culture and acknowledged space as an essential component of social-cultural theory. Both disciplines, therefore, try to study the ways in which social behaviour shapes the environment and vice versa: the effects that the environment has on social behaviour. The concept of place attachment provided a useful theoretical framework by conceptualising the bond between people and places. This bond is captured in the meaning of the words attachment and place. According to Setha Low and Irwin Altman (1993), ‘attachment’ emphasizes affect, while the word ‘place’ focuses on the environmental setting to which people are emotionally and culturally attached. In their much-quoted work on place attachment Low and Altman (1993) offer the following, somewhat confusing, description:

Place attachment is a complex phenomenon that incorporated several aspects of people-place bonding. This means that place attachment has many inseparable, integral, and mutually defining features, qualities, or properties; it is not composed of separate or independent parts, components, dimensions or factors” (1993: 4).

The basic assumption behind these notions, however, is a simple one: “In general, place attachment is defined as an affective bond or link between people and specific places.” (Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001: 274). People become emotionally and culturally attached to the environmental settings where they interact with other people. “Place is a space that has been given meaning through personal, group, or cultural processes” (Low & Altman, 1992: 5). Central to the concept of
place attachment is the idea that people form meaningful relationships with the locales they occupy and in doing so, attach meaning to space and transform ‘space’ into ‘place’. Low and Altman talk of ‘inscribes space’ implying that humans ‘write’ in an enduring way their presence on their surroundings (p. 13). The transformation of space into place emphasizes the importance of social action and interaction in place attachment. Although place attachment implies that the primary target of affective bonding of people is to environmental settings themselves, a number of scholars indicate that attachment to place is more based on other people - family, friends, community, and even culture.

The social relations that a place signifies maybe equally or more important to the attachment process than the place qua place (Low, 2003: 7). Or as Riley remarks: It may not be attachment to a particular place that is central; rather, it may be affective attachments to ideas, people, psychological states, past experiences, and culture that is crucial (cited in Low, 2003: 10).

It is through the vehicle of particular environmental settings that these individual, group, and cultural processes are manifested. Place acts more as a medium for cultural processes. (In these processes meanings are established and exchanged). Other scholars take this a step further and not only view places as a medium for cultural process, but as social constructions themselves. Margaret Rodman (2003): “Places are socially constructed by the people who live in them and know them; they are politicized, culturally relative, historically specific, local and multiple constructions”. Many scholars are indebted to the work of Henri Lefebvre on the production of space. Lefebvre (1991): “Space is permeated with social relations; it is not only supported by social relations but it is also producing and produced by social relations”.

2.7.1 Place Identity
Much attention, therefore, has been given to the way places are involved in the construction of personal and social identities, which is captured in the concept of Place Identity. In general terms, place identity can be defined as an interpretation of self that uses environmental meaning to symbolize or situate identity. Like other
forms of identity, place identity answers the question ‘Who am I?’ by countering ‘Where am I?’ or ‘Where do I belong?’. Cuba and Hummon (1993: 112) call this the display-function of place attachment.

To understand how place identities are formed, I turn to the work of Anthony Cohen (2003), a leading anthropologist, who has extensively researched the functioning of personal and group identities in different cultures and places. In his research he developed and coined the concept of identity dynamics, emphasizing the continuous change of identities in our daily interactions. Particularly, his ideas on the context of identity dynamics are useful in explaining the formation of place identities.

According to Cohen, place is, in accordance with the central preposition of place attachment, a social construction; more specifically a construction of identity. He defines identity as a dimension of human interaction. When we communicate with others we are not only expressing what we are thinking (contents dimension) and what our relation is to the others with whom we are communicating (relational dimension), but we also express who we are, what our identity is. Human interaction materialized into a ‘sediment’ of identity: a sense of a feeling of who we are, to whom we do and do not belong and how we do the things we do. These feelings are more abstractly labelled as identity and culture. Because identities are formed and expressed in human interaction they are, according to Cohen, constructions. In the course of our lives we build this construction and use it to tell other people ‘who we are’.

Cohen argues that these constructions are not static, but change continuously in our daily interactions with others. Although they remain in some ways consistent because new interactions are evaluated in the light of previous interactions and the meaning we inferred from them. New interactions build on the existing meaning systems that we constructed. This makes identity in the eyes of Cohen a plural concept. Personal identity is not based on one type of lifestyle or network, but on a whole pattern of relations that we maintain with others. People are not only part a family, but of different friendship groups, colleagues’ networks, sport societies and many other networks people join in the course of their lives. Interestingly, the neighbourhood can be one of these networks. With each group an individual shares experiences and, based on these experiences, norms and values.
Depending on the people we meet or the contexts in which we move, we accentuate different aspects of our identities.

Cohen emphasizes that the construction of identity has to be understood from multiple viewpoints. Change of context not only causes identities to collide and differ, but also to change. In interaction with different groups and contexts, meanings are adjusted or new meanings arise. The giving of meaning to actions never ceases, but is a process that redefines and reconstitutes itself continuously. Identity is, in other words, a dynamic process. Scientists such as Cohen, therefore, rather speak of identity dynamics or identity processes instead of the more static notion of identity. The dynamics of which Cohen speaks are present at different levels in society that mutually influence each other, ranging from the street and neighbourhood level to the scale of entire cities and regions and also play at the international stage. The relevance of plural groups bonds is increased in a globalizing society where we and our networks become more mobile. Different social scientists (i.e. Castells, 1997) have pointed to the relation between identity and globalization causing people to change increasingly faster from position (in their networks) and therefore of the identity to assume/express to other people.

Different contexts play an important role in the construction of identities, by providing different meeting places for social interactions and also, as Cohen argues, by becoming part of these interactions. According to Cohen the exchange of meanings is not limited to people. Objects and rituals can also acquire meaning based on their place in the human interactions; they can be ‘charged’ with meaning. The same can also happen with an entire neighbourhood. Individuals, and the groups to which they belong, use these spatial meanings to express who they are and where they belong. Cohen defines them as ‘symbolic and ideological map references’ that people use as markers for the communities they belong to. In the same way neighbourhoods can have a symbolic function/meaning. This means that identity is not simply a passive sediment, a mere by-product of human interaction⁵. From Cohen’s concept of identity dynamics it becomes clear that identity is a productive power that can strengthen or destroy a place. As part of identity

⁵ This argument was made earlier by Geertz, who criticised anthropologists for conceptualizing place as nothing more than ‘a physical setting or a passive target for primordial sentiments of attachment’. Cohen rephrases this debate in terms of identity construction.
constructions, places acquire possibilities that other places do not offer. By charging a place with meaning, certain groups can identify with it, stimulating certain activities and interactions in that place.

Low refers to this mechanism when she speaks of ‘imbuing places with meaning’. With identity dynamics we are able to explain how places are imbued with meaning: they become symbolic and ideological map references for the communities that people belong to. Places are more than social constructions; they are material markers for the personal and group identities that people construct in their daily interactions. They are not merely a setting but play an active role in the construction of identity. As symbols, they can have different meanings for different people. Rodman (2002) uses the notion of multi-locality to describe the diverse meanings of place symbols.

*Place can have a unique reality for each inhabitant, and while the meanings may be shared with others, the views of place are often likely to be competing, and contested in practice.* (p. 208).

According to Rodman, places have multiple meanings that are constructed spatially and therefore to understand the construction of places they need to be analyzed from multiple viewpoints. Moreover and in line with the comments of Cuba and Hummon, she states that identities need to be analyzed from different places:

*Some activities arise from the actions of multiple agents in different places and can only be understood by identifying both intended and unintended consequences in the network of complex connections within a system of places.*

Rodman stresses the constructive and hence temporary nature of place attachment: “The social contested, dynamic construction of places represents the
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*temporary grounding of ideas*. People attach meaning to places in the process of producing and reproducing their identities. Low points to this connection:

*The social relations that a place signifies may be equally or more important to the attachment process than the place qua place [...] It is through the vehicle of particular environmental settings that individual, group and cultural processes are manifested. [...] Extending to this idea, place attachment may contribute to the formation, maintenance and preservation of the identity of a person, group, or culture*” (Low & Altman, 1992:7).

### 2.7.2 Sense of Home

Although social interaction is an important identifier for place attachment, other scholars warn of losing sight of the spatial component of place attachment. Cuba and Hummon (1993) criticize the strong emphasis in research on the social construction of space in their conceptual study on place attachment. They stress the need to take into account the physical component of place, which is often neglected in studies on place attachment. While places defined as social constructs may help to describe the relationship between people and places, the concept of place attachment tend to overemphasize the people in this relationship, neglecting the role of places and particularly the question “how places become social constructs?”

Therefore, Cuba and Hummon contrast the earlier mentioned display function of place attachment to a second function, named affiliation. While display is concerned with the communication of qualities of the self to self or other, affiliation focuses on the use of places to forge a sense of attachment or home. In using a place, people acquire a sense of attachment or home. Such identification with place often involves emotional ties to place. The second function of place attachment, therefore, focuses on the (individual) emotional ties of people with particular places, instead of the social interactions between people in places to

---

6 Elsewhere she states that: “*From a cultural perspective, place attachment is the relationship formed by people giving culturally shared emotional/affective meanings to a particular place or piece of land that provides the basis for the individual’s and group’s understanding of and relation to the environment*” (Low, 1992: 165).
form identities. By distinguishing between display (place identity) and affiliation (sense of home) Cuba and Hummon put the concept of place back in place attachment as a separate spatial factor with its own importance. Place attachment defined as purely social constructs and researched by social bonds, neglects the constitutive relationship between people and places where people not only construct places, but where places also affect the behaviour of people. Both functions of place attachment, place identity and sense of home are of course linked. Research on emotional ties to place shows that the environmental quality of the local neighbourhood as objectively measured has little impact, though residents’ perceptions of the physical quality of the neighbourhood are associated with attachment. Among objective features of the environment, only housing quality and ownership consistently seem to increase attachment to some degree. Community attachment seems to be most strongly associated with social integration into the local area. Local social involvements, particularly those with friends and those involving kin, organizational memberships and local shopping, prove to be most consistent and significant sources of sentimental ties to local places (Gerson et al., 1977; Guest & Lee, 1983). Therefore, both dimensions of place attachment, social (display) and spatial (affiliation) bonding, need to be studied at the same time to fully understand the concept of place attachment.

In sum, place attachment defines places not just as a stage for social action, battle scenes for power and status, but it is linked to people by an affective bond, in which space is transformed into place by the meaning people attach to this space. Places are involved in the construction of personal and social identities, which is displayed as place identity and can be noticed in their behaviour through their sense of home. In short, places are socially constructed. With the concept of identity dynamics I have tried to explain how places are ‘imbued with meaning’: they become symbolic and ideological map references for the communities that people belong to. However, this does not imply that places are purely mental constructs that only exist in people’s minds. Places have a physical component, which cannot be ignored. Both dimensions are important for my research on emotional ties of residents in urban renewal areas. Therefore, different dimensions of place attachment will be explored in the next paragraph.
2.8 Dimensions of Place Attachment

The distinction between the social and physical dimension of place attachment was originally introduced by Riger and Lavrakas in 1981. In their research article they discussed rootedness or physical attachment opposed to bonding or social attachment. Using data collected from telephone interviews on citizen’s reactions (both behavioural and attitudinal) to crime in their neighbourhoods, Riger and Lavrakas performed factor analysis on a series of items that reflected social, economic and behavioural ties to one’s neighbourhood, to investigate the interrelationships underlying these items. They concluded that two distinct factors underlie the selected items. The first appeared to represent the extent to which a person is settled or rooted in her/his neighbourhood while another factor represented the extent to which a person has formed social bonds with the neighbourhood. The factors correlated with each other (.58), indicating that the more a person is settled in the neighbourhood, the more likely he/she is to have formed strong social bonds.

Furthermore, Riger and Lavrakas criticize the unambiguous use of place. “Not much attention is paid in research to the different spatial levels of places towards which attachment is developed. Most studies focus on the neighbourhood or community level”. The few studies that analyze different spatial levels indicate that neighbourhood is not the most important level of attachment (Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). Cuba and Hummon (1993) pick up this thread. They distinguish in their research on place identity, three different loci of place identity; dwelling, community and region. Their survey research in three towns in Barnstable County in the region of Cape Cod shows that most respondents locate a sense of self in more than one place: each of the three loci of place identity- dwelling, community, and region- are identified with roughly the same frequency (respectively 70.7, 67.1 and 65.5 percent), although a slightly higher percentage reported a dwelling-based place identity (Respondents were allowed multiple responses to the question of where they feel at home).
In an attempt to establish if some configurations of place loci are more likely to arise than others, Cuba and Hummon disaggregate the results for the three groups and compare these to a hierarchical model of place attachment.

It is possible to conceive of the various combinations of place association as ranging from singular and sparse (linking one’s identity to a single place) to multifaceted and dense (linking one’s identity to a number of places. If place identity referents were ordered from least to most spatially expansive, one would expect the greatest number of those who report a single place identity locus to identify with their dwelling. Concomitantly, the most common dual loci identified should be dwelling and community (Cuba and Hummon, 1993:121).

In their data respondents were most likely to place themselves at either end of this continuum of place association, with relatively few falling in between. About two-fifths of the sample (39.3 percent) reported ties to only one place, with region being the most probable locus of a singular place identity and community being the least probable locus. A group of comparable size (42.6 percent) exhibited the opposite pattern, claiming a sense of place at all three loci. The remaining group, those who report attachments to some combination of two place loci, is the smallest of the three. Less than 20 percent of the respondents comprise this middle group; most of these represent a pairing of dwelling and community-based place identities, the other two possible combinations of place loci being quite rare. They conclude therefore that:

It is prudent to argue simply that although there is a good deal of variation in where people feel at home, most respondents locate a sense of self in more than one place and that some configurations of place loci are more likely to arise than others” (Cuba and Hummon, 1993: 121-122).

To identify why people feel at home at different places Cuba and Hummon distinguished six levels of place affiliation by categorizing the answers respondents gave to the question “Why do you feel at home here?”:
1. Self-based (e.g., general psychological feeling of adjustment, “feeling comfortable”);
2. Family-based (e.g., reared family here, nearness to family);
3. Friend-based (e.g., meeting people, getting to know neighbours);
4. Community-based (e.g., attractive lifestyle, sense of community);
5. Organization-based (e.g., participation in work, formal organizations); and
6. Dwelling-based (e.g., home ownership, variety of personal possessions).

They hypothesized that different levels of place affiliation should relate to different loci of place identity. For example, those who report dwelling-related place affiliations should be most likely to locate their place identities within their houses or apartments. Place affiliations based on friends, community, or organizational attachments, on the other hand, may lead to community-level place identities. These expectations are confirmed in their research. Reasons for feeling at home linked to friends or organizational involvement, such as work, were positively related to a sense of community as home, while self-related place affiliations were negatively related to a community-based place identity. Not surprisingly, dwelling-related place affiliations are strongly and directly associated with a dwelling-based place identity.

However, the same does not hold true for the relation between community-based affiliations and identifications at the community level. Although community-related place ties related negatively to both dwelling and regional senses of place, they do not influence the adoption of a community-level place identity. In short, if you know other people in your neighbourhood through friendship or work you generally feel more at home in your community. Neighbourhood ties are more important than the way you feel about your neighbourhood: you might like the people in your neighbourhood and think you are getting along well, but that does not necessarily mean you identify with the community and feel at home there. Your regional sense of identity is least affected by your place affiliations.

These results are in line with earlier research identifying local social ties as the best predictor of community sense. Cuba and Hummon elaborate on this relationship by taking into account the different levels people develop a sense attachment with and prove that residents attach themselves to different levels of
People and Places: A Theoretical Exploration

places simultaneously, but that each level is related to different connections to these places. Home is not a single place, but the way we feel at home at every place very much depends on the people we meet there. How and why we feel at home can be described with the different dimensions of place attachment, which are summed up in the table below.

Table 2.1 Dimensions of Place Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Place Attachment</th>
<th>Place Identity</th>
<th>Sense of Place</th>
<th>Place Affiliation</th>
<th>Locus of Place Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>Do you feel at home here?</td>
<td>Rootedness or Physical Attachment</td>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Place (How do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Rootedness or Physical Attachment</td>
<td>Bonding or Social Attachment</td>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliation (Why do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>Friend-related</td>
<td>Organization-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliation (Why do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>Friend-related</td>
<td>Organization-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliation</td>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>Friend-related</td>
<td>Community-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity (Why do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Region-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Region-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the different dimensions of place attachment the emotional ties of residents particularly in urban renewal areas can be studied. The concept of place attachment enables me to distinguish between different emotional ties. Although, one critical issue remains: place attachment as defined in table 1 overwhelmingly emphasises positive attachments to well defined places; the neighbourhood (or region) as a place where residents feel at home. However, I started this chapter by questioning the positive effects of urban renewal programmes on emotional ties. Feelings of home surface, and become challenged by the regeneration process. Will I feel at home in the new house or neighbourhood? Will I still feel at home in the same neighbourhood when all the people I know have left?

Therefore, urban renewal can also evoke negative feelings of attachment: residents can become detached and can feel alienated from the place where they live due to changes in the population and their living environment, which are caused by urban renewal. They might not feel any attachment for their new
neighbours or the new design of housing and public spaces in their neighbourhood. To talk of place attachment in urban renewal, one needs to take into account negative feelings of home or positive feelings of home that disappear or change in magnitude and type of attachment. Therefore, when I talk of place attachment I refer to a wider array of at home feelings that can include negative feelings\(^7\). This issue will be explored in more detail in chapter four.

I use the term of feeling at home, however, as a positive connotation of place attachment, with strong spatial connotations. Whereas place attachment can be negative and not place specific, feeling at home refers to positive emotions tied to a specific place. As such this concept is particularly useful for studying emotional ties in urban renewal. Can urban renewal affect the place attachment of residents positively, in that they increase the feelings of home in the neighbourhood for residents? This raises an interesting question: When does urban renewal fail and turn positive feeling into negative or indifferent feeling? To incorporate both negative and positive feelings of home, I have use the distinguished dimensions in table 2.1 to analyse different patterns of place attachment among Dutch (chapter 4) and English (chapter 5) residents. The patterns do not only describe different dimensions of place attachment, but also the connotation of these dimensions. This allowed me to study the change of positive feelings into negative ones and vice versa.

---

\(^7\) This point has also been recognised by other researchers who study place attachments by increasing the focus on the negative and darker side of home experiences. Home can be a prison and a place of terror as well as a haven or place of love. For the unemployed life can be home-centred in a negative retreatist way (Binns & Mars, 1984), while elderly people may be homebound (Deem, 1986).
3. Research Design

3.1 Introduction

My data collection relied on quantitative and qualitative sources. For both the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, existing quantitative survey data on housing needs and neighbourhood satisfaction were be re-analysed to explore the emotional ties of residents in deprived neighbourhoods in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, based on the concept of place attachment. The quantitative data analyses tried to establish diverse patterns of place attachment for different groups of residents in these countries and tracked these patterns through time by longitudinal analyses on data of different survey years.

The qualitative data focused on four case studies. In each country two case studies were conducted to research how different urban renewal programmes affect the place attachments of residents. In each case study data was gathered on proposed goals and interventions, the implementation and usage of these interventions and the ways residents were involved in restructuring programmes. Special attention was given to interventions that influence, both implicitly and explicitly, the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood. By comparing the four case studies, the influence of different context variables could be assessed, particularly the differences between the Dutch and UK housing sectors.

3.2 Quantitative data

For the Netherlands, survey data has been used from the Housing Needs Survey/ het WoonBehoeftte Onderzoek (WBO), a national survey developed by the Dutch Ministry of Spatial Planning, Housing and the Environment to inform their policy making on the urban renewal of the Dutch big cities (Dutch Big Cities Policy). The survey collected data from all major cities in the Netherlands every four years on
the compositions of households, their housing situation, housing demands, and relocation, making it one of the largest random sample surveys in the Netherlands. Next to objective indicators on neighbourhood composition (levels of education, income, household compositions and tenure) residents were asked to access the physical and social quality of their neighbourhood and expressed their wishes for future housing. Among these attitudinal indicators were questions on neighbourhood ties, neighbourhood perception and sense of belonging. These indicators were used to analyse place attachment in urban renewal projects in the Netherlands. Data from 1993 to 2006 has been re-analysed and will be discussed in chapter 4.

For the UK, data has been used from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), collected by the University of Essex. BHPS started in 1991 and follows a representative sample of households, annually interviewing every adult member face-to-face, making it one of the longest running panel surveys in the world. The panel consists of some 5,500 households and 10,300 individuals drawn from 250 areas of Great Britain. The questionnaire covered a wide range of topics including housing conditions, residential mobility, social activities and memberships and neighbourhood perceptions. Tracking individuals through time allowed for stronger assumption about causality. Data for the period 1998 - 2003 has been re-analysed for different patterns of place attachment and the changes that took places in these patterns over time.

3.3 Qualitative data

Qualitative data has been gathered in four neighbourhoods; two in the Netherlands and two in the United Kingdom. In each country two case studies have been conducted to research how specific urban renewal programmes affect the place attachments of residents. Case studies were selected on their specific attention to social issues and particularly emotional and social ties to the neighbourhood. Three of the four case studies were based on earlier research on urban renewal programmes that I was involved in as a researcher at the Verwey-Jonker Institute. This made the qualitative data readily available for analyses, although new data
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has been gathered for this research. The case studies were not intended as a representative overview of urban renewal programmes, but merely as interesting examples in the wide range of urban renewal research I came across in my work as a researcher, which triggered my curiosity and desire to revisit the collected data from my own perspective. This was not possible at the time the research was commissioned. The case studies were expanded upon and revisited to allow for new analyses from the perspective of this research: how are the emotional ties of residents triggered in urban renewal projects and what do these projects accomplish? In each case study data was gathered on proposed goals and interventions, the implementation and usage of these interventions and the ways residents were involved in restructuring programmes. By reviewing relevant literature and documents, the implementation process was reconstructed, followed by interviews with key informants to reflect on the implementation process.

3.3.1 Description of Case Studies

For the Netherlands the council of Hoogvliet in Rotterdam and the neighbourhoods Angelslo, Bargeres and Emmerhout in Emmen have been studied. For the UK qualitative data have been gathered in two areas, Sale in Manchester and The Quayside in Newcastle and Gateshead. The four case studies will be discussed at large in chapter 7 to 10. Each case study is shortly introduced below.

Angelslo, Bargeres and Emmerhout, in Emmen

The first Dutch case study was on Emmen Revisited, a coalition of the city of Emmen, two regional housing associations and local residents, forged in 1997 to stop the exodus of families out of three post-war neighbourhoods (Angelslo, Bargeres and Emmerhout). These neighbourhoods were faced with high levels of nuisance, crime, unemployment and rising tensions between residents. The city government and the housing association Woomcom feared further deterioration and proposed an integral approach of town planning, public housing and social issues with all parties involved. To assess the results of this approach after almost ten years and to evaluate the effectiveness of the coalition, the planning and execution of interventions were reconstructed based on document analysis, interviews and existing monitor data. To complement the picture a survey was
conducted among active residents, professionals and city council members and staff. The research was part of evaluation research commissioned by Emmen Revisited (Van der Graaf & Duyvendak, 2005) and the collected data was re-analysed for the purpose of this research to explore the effects of urban renewal on the emotional ties of residents.

Hoogvliet, in Rotterdam

The second Dutch case study took place in Hoogvliet in Rotterdam. In this municipality a large scale restructuring programme is executed, as part of a citywide programme to make the south side of the city more attractive for middle and higher income groups. In Hoogvliet much attention was given to residents’ attachment to the area: the building plans were based on images, constructed with a wide variety of participants, which projected the present and future identity of the municipality. In the execution of these plans innovative projects were designed to record and influence people’s place identity. The research in Hoogvliet was conducted as part of a larger research project for the borough of Hoogvliet, in collaboration with the University of Amsterdam and the OTB research institute in Delft (Veldboer et. al., 2008). The larger research project was commissioned by the borough of Hoogvliet in Rotterdam and two local housing associations, Woonbron and Vestia. The project sought to assess the impact of the urban renewal programme developed in Hoogvliet on the social mobility of residents. The research project consisted of three parts: an extensive literature review to explore topics for half-structured interviews with a sample of residents, which were consequently developed into questions for a large scale survey among all residents in Hoogvliet who have lived in the area since the start of the urban renewal programme. The data used for my research originated from the second part of the research project, in which interviews were carried out with residents to record their changes in socio-economical status and to investigate the sources of their reported changes.

Sale, Manchester

The first English case study was on Sale in Manchester. In this neighbourhood the local housing association has tried to regenerate the deprived area into a more pleasant place to live. Instead of focusing on the housing stock, Irwell Valley
Housing Association (IVHA) has taken residents as their starting point by defining them as local customers and putting their needs first on the regeneration agenda. They experimented with the concept of Gold Service: a reward scheme that rewards ‘well behaving’ residents with additional services and amenities. By providing these extra services the associations try to increase the involvement and independency of residents (mostly on welfare benefits) and in doing so, their attachment to the housing association and the neighbourhood. An explicit distinction is made between good and bad tenants forcing local governments to rethink their equality-based housing policies.

The Quayside, Newcastle and Gateshead

Newcastle-Gateshead is often portrayed as an exemplar of the revitalizing benefits of culture-led regeneration: urban renewal in which cultural facilities take centre stage in the redressing of an area with a deprived reputation. By designing eye-catching museums and theatres filled with important works of arts and artists, the area should acquire a new purpose and identity. In addition, both councils have set up a public art programme and used this programme as a participatory tool in urban renewal. By employing public art they claim to have linked the regeneration of the area to the local culture and identity of its residents, strengthening their attachment to the area. In this case study I will investigate if there is any evidence to support this claim.

3.4 Measuring Dimensions of Place Attachment

Most research on the emotional ties (sense of home) of residents has been carried out using surveys data on community satisfaction. This data is readily available for a wide range of cities in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. However, community satisfaction is not the same as place attachment. While surveys on community satisfaction evaluate the places where people live, place attachment focuses on the emotional investments of people in places. Where surveys on community satisfaction ask residents to assess the physical and social quality of their environment, research on place attachment queries residents about their
feelings about moving from the community and whether they feel ‘at home’ in an area. According to Hummon (1993), local satisfaction and attachment are relatively distinct dimensions of community sentiment and are only modestly related: some individual may be quite satisfied with their community without developing deeper emotional ties to the locale; others may express feelings of attachment to places they find less than satisfactory.

Therefore, indicators have to be used that indicate different feelings of residents towards to the places where they live, rather then indicators that assess their satisfaction with these places. For each dimension of place attachment that was distinguished in the last chapter, suitable indicators will be discussed to measure the emotional ties of different groups and areas in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. I will first discuss the indicators used in the international literature (see also appendix A) and have tried to replicate these indicators as closely as possible for the Dutch and English data. The following dimensions need to be operationalised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Place Attachment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong></td>
<td>Do you feel at home here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Place</strong></td>
<td>Rootedness or physical attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(How do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Bonding or social attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Affiliation</strong></td>
<td>Self-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Why do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Family-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Place Identity</strong></td>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Where do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first dimension, sense of place, is based on the distinction made by Riger and Lavrakas (1981) between “Rootedness” or “Physical Attachment” and “Bonding” or “Social Attachment”. They used the following questions to define rootedness:
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- How many years have you personally lived in your present neighbourhood?”
- Do you own your home or do you rent it? and
- Do you expect to be living in this neighbourhood two years from now?

Their scale for bonding was based on the questions:
- In general is it pretty easy or pretty difficult for you to tell a stranger in your neighbourhood from somebody who lives there?
- Would you say that you really feel a part of your neighbourhood or do you think of it more as just a place to live? and
- How about kids in your immediate neighbourhood? How many of them do you know by name: all of them, some, hardly any, or none of them?

The factors correlated with each other (.58), indicating that the more a person is settled in the neighbourhood, the more likely he/she is to have formed strong social bonds. The third dimension, loci of place identity, is based on Cuba and Hummon (1993). They distinguished in their research on place identity three different loci of place identity; dwelling, community and region. They started by asking the question “Do you feel at home here?”, which is often used to measure emotional ties to places. When respondents answer this question positively they were presented with the next question: “Do you associate feeling at home with dwelling, community, and/or Cape in general?”. Their survey research in three towns in Barnstable County in the region of Cape Cod shows that most respondents locate a sense of self in more than one place.

To identify why people feel at home at different (configurations) of place loci Cuba and Hummon distinguished six levels of place affiliation by categorising the answers respondents gave to the question: “Why do you feel at home here?”. This resulted in the six levels of place affiliation discussed in chapter two:

1. Self-based;
2. Family- based;
3. Friend- based;
4. Community- based;
5. Organisation- based; and
3.5 Selection of WBO/WoOn Variables

The indicators discussed above for the different dimensions of place attachment were not all readily available in Dutch WBO data for 1993-2006. Some indicators had to be modified to model them for the Dutch residents. This was particularly the case for the dimensions of place affiliation and locus of place identity. For the scales on senses of place (physical and social attachment) identical or similar questions were used. The three items, used by Riger and Lavrakas (1981) for measuring physical attachment, were also used in the WBO data and therefore an identical scale could be constructed. However, this scale scored low on the Cronbach’s Alpha test (.250), indicating that, contrary to the data of Riger and Lavrakas, the items did not correspond well. In spite of several attempts to construct a better scale (using different variables and factor rotations) the association between the items remained poor. To be able to replicate the research I decided to stick with the scale they originally constructed. Other research (Hummon, 1993) is consistent with the findings of Riger and Lavrakas, arguing that the items they selected are important indicators for a separate, physical dimension of place attachment. For the scale on social attachment the items used by Riger and Lavrakas could not be exactly replicated. However, similar questions were available on contacts with close and more distant neighbours and the involvement residents personally felt for their neighbourhood; this time with a satisfying Cronbach’s Alpha (.688).

The operationalisation of the dimensions on place affiliation and locus of place identity proved to be more difficult. Although respondents were asked in the WBO data if they felt at home in the neighbourhood (which is most often, and also in my research, used as an indicator for place identity), no questions were used in the survey asking respondents why they felt at home. Different questions therefore had to be selected to model the different place affiliations of Dutch residents. Questions on contact with family members and friends were chosen to represent family- and friends-related place affiliation. To distinguish feelings of community as a reason for feeling at home, a scale was constructed using five items, in which respondents had to evaluate their emotional ties to the community at large (code
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of conduct, feelings of responsibility, neighbourhood atmosphere, perceived contact between neighbours, and nice place to live). This scale is also used in additional analyses as an indicator for neighbourhood involvement. Scales for organizational- and dwelling-related place affiliations proved difficult to construct and were omitted from the analyses. The only suitable items on working at home and owning multiple properties were not discriminating enough to distinguish between different groups of residents: few worked at home and owned more than their house (no holiday home/boat/site caravan or allotment).

It proved equally challenging to find variables for the different loci of place identity. No direct questions were asked in the survey on associations of feeling at home with different geographical levels. Instead questions where used on the importance that residents assigned to different aspects of their dwelling and the community they lived in: the value they attached to the size and arrangement of their house and the urgency they put on fighting vandalism, graffiti and nuisance. Both scales for loci of place identity (dwelling- and community-based) correlated quite strongly and, therefore, further attempts were made to distinguish between different loci of place identity with the community. Factor analysis revealed three different neighbourhood orientations: a concern with neighbourhood cleanliness and safety, a focus on neighbourhood amenities and a high value placed on contact with neighbours and feeling of solidarity. The three orientations were disaggregated into four distinct combinations that represented the majority of residents. These five combinations, illustrating the most dominant patterns of neighbourhood orientation, were tested in a 2K-Clusteranalysis, reducing the five patterns to two main clusters: one cluster with residents who valued diverse aspects of their neighbourhood; their dwelling, the cleanliness and safety of their neighbourhood and also their neighbours and another cluster that was exclusively concerned with the amenities in their neighbourhood. The items in the Dutch Housing Needs Survey that were eventually used to model the different dimensions of place attachment for Dutch residents are summed up in the table below.

For neighbourhood satisfaction several variables were tested in factor and discriminant analyses, revealing satisfaction with the house, the environment surrounding the house and the neighbourhood population as the best variables to use in a scale for neighbourhood satisfaction. Finally, to measure social
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participation various variables were used separately on the amount of time respondents spent in front of the television and at sport activities, and the number of times they visited local societies, pubs, museums and friends & family each month or week.

Table 3.2 Variables Description in WBO 2002-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Place Attachment</th>
<th>Items Used</th>
<th>α 2002</th>
<th>α 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong></td>
<td>I feel at home in this neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Place</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootedness</td>
<td>How many years have u lived at the current address?</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you own or rent your house?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would you like to move within the next two years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding</td>
<td>How active do you feel involved with what goes on in your neighbourhood?</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(only available for 2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a lot of contact with my direct neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a lot of contact with other neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>Contact with family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend-related</td>
<td>Contact with friends and well known acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related/Community</td>
<td>In this neighbourhood people are nice to each other</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement</td>
<td>I feel responsible for the liveability in my neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I live in a cozy neighbourhood with lots of solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People hardly know each other in this neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is dull to live in this neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization-related</td>
<td>Working from home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
<td>In possession of second home or holiday home, boat, on-site caravan or allotment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Place Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td>Importance of size, division, “feel” of house and garden</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based: ‘Cleanliness and Safety’</td>
<td>Importance of feeling at home, no graffiti, vandalism, and littering, no dog fooling, youth nuisance and sound pollution, and traffic safety</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Contacts’</td>
<td>Importance of contact with direct neighbours and other residents, solidarity in the neighbourhood</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Amenities’</td>
<td>Importance of shops, public transport, play areas and facilities, primary schools and nurseries</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Satisfaction with present home, present home surrounding, and population composition</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Participation</strong></td>
<td>Watch TV (hours weekly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport activities (hours weekly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit Societies (number of monthly visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pub Visits (number of monthly visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Visits (number of monthly visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Visits (number of weekly visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends Visits (number of weekly visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next problem occurred when trying to replicate these scales across the different survey years. Although the Housing Needs Survey is repeated on average every four years, the questionnaires and the data collection methods used vary considerably over the years. The survey started out in 1964 as the successor of the “Algemene Volks- en Woningtellingen” (General and Housing Census), but new developments in the housing market and in housing policy, particularly decentralisation, regionalisation and area-based programmes, quickly outdated the chosen format and methods of data collection, especially with the introduction of the computer in the seventies. Furthermore, a stronger emphasis on qualitative housing needs and social aspects of the housing environments added additional questions and complexity to the survey. To increase the efficiency of the data collection and improve the up-to-date-ness of the collected data a large scale revision of the survey took place in the mid nineties, resulting in a new modular and flexible structure of the survey. This new format was first used in 1998 among 60,000 respondents, allowing local councils to conduct additional surveys in their areas to acquire the necessary amount of data for low level statistical analyses for the first time.

Using 1998 as a base line the Housing Survey was intended as a yearly survey, however, after two years (1999 and 2000) it became apparent that the fewer respondents used (15,000) was not sufficient to warrant reliable data at the regional level and therefore the survey was restored to its former proportions (60,000 respondents) and repeated only once every four years from 2002 onwards. Also the data collection and processing was outsourced by the Ministry of Housing: instead of by the Central Bureau of Statistics, the survey was conducted and the data processed by four different research institutes (GFK Dongen, Intomart, R&M, and ABF Research from Delft). New methods were introduced for data collection by telephone, face-to-face interviews and by the internet. The final change took place in 2006 when the Housing Need Survey was combined with the “Kwalitatieve Woning Registratie” (Qualitative Housing Registration) and became a three yearly survey with separate modules for different respondent groups. A basic module was presented to 40,000 respondents and 24,000 over sampling respondents; additional modules on social and physical aspects of the housing environment, consumption...
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and energy use and awareness were only presented to a selection of these respondents.

These changes meant that several scales, particularly on place affiliations and loci of place identity, could not be reproduced over the years, since the necessary variables were missing. Hardly any of the required variables were present in the 1993 survey and therefore most of the analyses start from 1998. For 1998 the variables on social attachment were missing and therefore only the scale on physical attachment could be reproduced for sense of place. Most scales are available for the 2002 Survey and onwards and because of this, the regression analyses focus on the time period 2002-2006, while previous survey years are used to analyse trends in place identity and physical and social attachment and make comparisons between groups of residents and deprived and non-deprived neighbourhoods. To be able to compare the data over the different survey years weights have been used to make the data of the each survey year representational for the Dutch adult population (over 18 years old) at a personal level.

For the comparison between deprived and non-deprived areas four digit postcode data has been used to distinguish between five types of neighbourhoods. First a distinction is made between residents in the thirty biggest cities of the Netherlands on the one side, which are part of the Dutch Big Cities Policy, and the rest of Holland on the other side, were no special national attention and money is given to deprived urban areas. Within the group of big cities, a further distinction is made between the four main cities of the Netherlands (Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht) and the other 26 big cities. Finally, neighbourhoods are divided between those that do and those that do not belong to the so-called ‘prioritaire wijken’ (priority neighbourhoods), which are the focal points of the Big Cities policy and in which the majority of the budget is spent. These areas will be compared to other less troubled areas in the four main and the 26 big cities in the Netherlands. Population density and the severance of the problems of deprivation might be a contributing factor to differences in place attachment.

This results in five groups of neighbourhoods: priority neighbourhoods in the four main cities, priority neighbourhoods in the other 26 big cities (in total 56 areas classified as most deprived), non-priority neighbourhoods in the four main cities and in the other 26 big cities and finally, neighbourhoods in smaller Dutch cities
and the more rural area of Holland (outside the 30 biggest Dutch cities). Although the majority of Dutch residents live outside the 30 biggest cities (67.6% in 2002), sufficient respondents remain in the other groups of neighbourhoods to allow for reliable comparisons. The different groups allow an assessment of the Dutch Big Cities Policy and especially the priority areas of this policy, where the budget is allocated on the basis of combined social and spatial interventions. Do these combined efforts make a difference for the emotional ties of residents in these neighbourhoods? The variables and respondents used for each survey year are summarised below.

Table 3.3 Variables and respondents, WBO 1993-2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>63,049</td>
<td>115,126</td>
<td>18,752</td>
<td>16,481</td>
<td>75,043</td>
<td>64,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attachment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attachment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight used</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question that remains is: what exactly is a neighbourhood? Residents will have different opinions on what they view as their neighbourhood: for some this is only the street they live in, while others might classify an entire village as their neighbourhood. Usually, natural barriers like roads and parks act as general demarcations of a neighbourhood; unifying residents’ perceptions on what is their neighbourhood, although variation remains. An easy solution is to use the administrative demarcation used by local councils. Although not many residents would exactly agree with the boundaries set by their local council, they offer a set demarcation that allows for comparisons through time. A more refined version of these administrative boundaries is provided by the four digit postal codes used in the Netherlands, which split these neighbourhoods into smaller sections of three to four streets. This level corresponds roughly with the average size perception of residents of their neighbourhood and allows for fixed boundaries. This does not rule
out all the variation in answers when people talk about their neighbourhood, but is probably as close as we can quantitatively get to it, allowing for a generalized view of the neighbourhood and comparisons of this neighbourhood over time.

3.6 Selecting BHPS variables

For the United Kingdom data will be used from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), collected by the University of Essex. BHPS started in 1991 and follows a representative sample of households, annually interviewing every adult member face-to-face, making it one of the longest running panel surveys in the world. The panel consists of some 5,500 households and 10,300 individuals drawn from 250 areas of Great Britain. The questionnaire covers a wide range of topics including housing conditions, residential mobility, social activities and memberships, and neighbourhood perceptions.

I have tried to replicate the indicators used in the Dutch WBO data for the BHPS data but, as with the Dutch data, modifications where necessary based on the availability of variables. In the English data residents are not asked if they feel at home, but whether they feel they belong to the neighbourhood and consequently this question has been used as an indicator for place identity. The questions, used by Riger and Lavrakas for their scale of physical attachment, were also available in the English data, although different items had to be selected for the scale of social attachment: four items on different forms of contacts in the neighbourhood were used to construct a new scale. Place Affiliations scales were constructed using the answers respondents provided on the question “Why is the neighbourhood a good or bad place to live?”. The answers were categorised in different positive and negative responses which related to the different Place Affiliations distinguished by Cuba and Hummon, for instance, “Because of family, friends, neighbours, or people in the neighbourhood” or “Because of local facilities and services”. The different answers within each category were recoded to fit Cuba and Hummon’s definition.
The question preceding this question in the BHPS survey (Is the neighbourhood a good or bad place to live?) was used, together with a question on the willingness of
residents to improve their neighbourhood, as an indicator for the emotional value residents put on their community and consequently the locus of their Place Identity (community-based). Alternatively, the importance residents assigned to their own house was used to indicate whether their place identity was more dwelling-based.

Although the BHPS collect data yearly from 1991 onwards, the topic list varies over the years and some topics are only covered periodically, because the researchers do not expect large changes over time and therefore see no need to ask the more topical questions every year. The questions on neighbourhood characteristics, which are relevant for my research, appeared in wave 8 (1998) and 13 (2003) and will be compared in longitudinal analyses. The analyses focus on the 86 most deprived areas in England, based on the Indices of Deprivation 2000 and 2004, established by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). The indices are based on a study under the same name that aimed to identify the most ‘deprived’ neighbourhoods in England based on ‘multiple deprivation indices’. It is based largely on administrative data at area level in seven ‘domains’; income, employment, health and disability, education and skills, barriers to housing and services, living environment and crime. The overall area index is referred to as the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). The most deprived area has a rank of one and the least deprived has a rank of 32,482. Any local authority district which falls within the top 50 most disadvantaged nationally against any of the six district level summaries of the Indices of Deprivation 2000 and 2004 are eligible to receive support from the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund (NRF), allowing for a total of 86 local authorities to benefit from the NRF.

The Neighbourhood Renewal Fund was set up by the Labour government as part of the National Strategy Action Plan “A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal” to tackle deprivation in England, narrowing the gap between deprived areas and the rest of the country. A key element of the strategy is the improvement of mainstream services; this means increased employment and improved economic performance, reduced crime, better educational attainment, improved health, better housing and cleaner, safer, greener public spaces. The Neighbourhood Renewal Fund has provided £1.875 billion over the period 2001-2006 to 88 of the most deprived authorities in England.
In addition, 39 of these areas were granted support as part of the New Deal for Communities (NDC). This programme was set up before the Neighbourhood Fund in 1998, after the publication of the SEU’s Report ‘Bringing Britain Together: a National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal’. The report painstakingly pointed out that, despite many years of area based regeneration, there remained at least 4,000 deprived neighbourhoods in England. To address the acute and multiple problems of exclusion evident in these more disadvantaged localities longer term Area Based Initiatives (ABIs) were recommended, designed to improve outcomes across a range of themes including housing and the physical environment, unemployment, crime, health and education. 17 pathfinder partnerships were announced in 1998 followed by a second round of 22 partnerships in 1999. Approximately £2bn has been committed to the 39 partnerships. In these 39 areas, typically housing about 9,800 people, partnerships are implementing approved delivery plans, each of which has attracted approximately £50 million of NDC programme investment. The total cost of the 10 year programme is about £2 billion. All the NDC partnerships are tackling five key themes: poor job prospects,
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high levels of crime, educational under-achievement, poor health and problems with housing and the physical environment.

Using the distinction between the 86 most deprived areas and the NDC partnership three neighbourhood groups were constructed for the English analyses: NDC neighbourhoods, who are part of the 86 most deprived areas, other neighbourhoods in the 86 most deprived areas and neighbourhoods outside the 86 most deprived area. A small numbers of questionnaires (n=6) were from respondents in NDC areas who did not belong to one of the 86 most deprived areas and were, for ease of distinction and lack of comparability, omitted from the analyses.

To be able to compare neighbourhoods across waves, longitudinal respondent weights were used, while for the base line analyses of the 1998 wave (M) cross-sectional respondents weights were used to maximise the number of residents in the analyses. For the purposes of panel analyses, only cases which responded to all waves were generally of interest. The longitudinal respondent weights selected cases who gave a full interview at all waves in the BHPS files. At each wave these cases are re-weighted to take account of the previous wave respondents lost through refusal at the current wave or through some other form of sample attrition. Thus the longitudinal weight at any wave will be the product of the sequence of attrition weights accounting for losses between each adjacent pair of waves up to that point, as well as the initial respondent weight at wave one (BHPS User Manual, Volume A, 2007: 171).

Table 3.5 Respondents in BHPS, 1998-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>9,315</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>17,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Sample Members (OSM)</td>
<td>7,992</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>15,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents of Sample Members (PSM)*</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Sample Members (TSM)**</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>2,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A PSM is a parent of an OSM, who has joined the household of the OSM parent
** A TSM is someone who is not themselves an OSM but is living in the same household as an OSM (at any wave).
3.7 Data Collection and Analyses in the Case Studies

The quantitative survey analyses tell us much about the emotional ties of residents in the Netherlands; how and why different residents feel at home at different places and how these place attachments are affected by urban renewal. However, the analyses cannot tell us what the particular effects are of different urban renewal programmes on the emotional ties of residents in deprived areas. Each city designs its own urban renewal programme and although ambitions and goals are often similar, the ways in which urban renewal programmes are implemented differ widely between cities and therefore the potential effects of each urban renewal programme: THE urban renewal programme does not exist. To study the effects of different urban renewal programmes more detailed information is needed on the specific make-up and implementation of different urban renewal programmes. This information will be gathered in four case studies. In the case studies, data will be gathered on the goals that are set and the type of interventions that are used in the urban renewal process. The case study data will allow further elaboration on the analyzed effects from the WBO survey data and the BHPS panel data. Analysed effects of spatial and social interventions can be connected to the implementation of these interventions to establish their effectiveness.

**Emmen Revisited**

To assess the results of the urban renewal programme in Emmen ten years after it started, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership Emmen Revisited, the planning and execution of interventions was reconstructed based on document analysis, interviews with key figures and analyses of existing monitor data. Many documents, ranging from official policy reports and research papers to more informal project proposals, resident newsletters and even minutes of meetings were analysed to paint a first picture of Emmen Revisited and describe the way urban renewal was conducted, especially how spatial and social interventions were developed alongside each other. To add more detail to the picture 20 key figures, who were intimately involved with the partnership over the years and represented the different parties that participate in the partnership, were interviewed. The interviews focused on the development of Emmen Revisited in the last ten years.
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and the progress (and setbacks) they witnessed in the three neighbourhoods as a result of these developments. The research in Emmen was commissioned by Emmen Revisited and re-analysed for the purpose of this research to explore the effects of urban renewal on the emotional ties of residents.

Hoogvliet, Rotterdam

The participation of Hoogvliet in the innovation programme “Neighbourhood Identity and Branding” was reconstructed based on documents analyses. The results of the historical research, branding sessions with local professionals and residents and the so-called life style sessions are discussed to access the impact of the programme on the neighbourhood reputation of Hoogvliet and the place identity of its residents.

Another route to changing the area reputation and identity of people is explored by researching changes in the socio-economic mobility of individual residents in line with one of the key aims of the urban renewal programme in Hoogvliet, which states that every remaining resident should be better off after the programme has finished. Do improved life conditions lead to improved area attachments? Therefore, the change in socio-economical status for residents between 1998 and 2006 still living in the area was assessed on six dimensions: work, education, income, housing, and health and independence.

The research in Hoogvliet was conducted as part of a larger research project for the borough of Hoogvliet, in collaboration with the University of Amsterdam and the OTB research institute in Delft (Veldboer et. al., 2008). The research project consisted of three parts: an extensive literature review to explore topics for half-structured interviews with a sample of residents, which were consequently developed into questions for a large scale survey among all residents in Hoogvliet who have lived in the area since the start of the urban renewal programme. The data used for my research originated from the second part of the research project, in which interviews were carried out with residents. 24 residents were interviewed, who have lived in Hoogvliet since the start of the urban renewal in 1998, to record their changes in socio-economical status and to investigate the sources of reported changes. All selected candidates were characterised by low education and low income, as it was anticipated that the effects of the urban renewal projects should
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be largest among this group of residents. Residents were approached by local community workers. Out of 32 potential interview candidates 24 were interviewed. Interviews lasted on average 1.5 hours and were conducted face to face in the respondents’ homes. The interviews focused on different routes of social mobility: which dimensions of social mobility are affected by urban renewal and do these changes affect the social emotional ties of residents?

Gold Service in Sale, Manchester

The data used in this case study was collected earlier in explorative research for housing association Beter Wonen Vechtdal, who commissioned the Verwey-Jonker Institute in 2003 to investigate the possibilities for implementing tenant reward schemes developed in England, particularly by Irwell Valley Housing Association (IVHA) (Van der Graaf, 2003). In May 2007 I revisited IVHA to collect new data for the case study. Interviews were conducted with staff members of Irwell Valley Housing Association and resident representatives, social workers and members of the evaluation panel. Furthermore, visits were paid to areas where Irwell Valley has implemented Gold Service. On-site observations were made and existing documents on the urban renewal of the area were reviewed, including neighbourhood plans, policy documents and scientific studies on the regeneration of (East) Manchester. I have also made use of data I collected in follow-up research for Beter Wonen Vechtdal (Van der Graaf 2007a; 2007b), in which a survey was distributed among housing associations in the Netherlands, England and Scotland to compare and share experiences on tenant rewards schemes.

The Quayside, Newcastle and Gateshead

This case study is based on a literature review. Originally, a case study was planned on the tenant reward scheme developed by a housing association in St. Pancras in London, but the material collected for this case study did not provide any additional insights into tenant reward schemes, as already discussed in the Manchester case study. By the time a new case study was selected, there was not enough time available to conduct interviews, although I have visited the Quayside a number of times and talked to some people involved by email. I have used different sources (reports from the two councils, newspaper articles, websites on
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the internet, academic papers, brochures and art book) to reconstruct the culture-led regeneration of the Quayside.
4. Place Attachment in the Netherlands

4.1 Introduction

Using data from the national Housing Needs Survey\(^8\), this chapter explores the emotional ties of residents in deprived neighbourhood in the Netherlands, founded on the dimensions of place attachment distinguished in chapter two and operationalised in chapter three.

I have started by looking at differences in sense of place: how are Dutch residents attached to their neighbourhood? Differences in place attachments are related to different places: does where you live in the Netherlands affect how you feel at home? To understand why Dutch residents feel more at home in one place then the other, next I have examined their place affiliations: what do they particularly like about their neighbourhood, and at which level do they identify with it (locus of place identity): are residents more attached to their houses or do they value their community more? If so, what it is that they particularly value within their communities; the amenities they have access to, the green space in which they can unwind from a hard day’s work, or are they most content with the people they live with? How, where and why residents feel at home is also likely to be affected by their personal characteristics: some people feel attached to a place while other can’t wait to leave that same place. Therefore, socio-demographic characteristics have been compared between groups of residents with different place attachments: are different senses of place related to income, age, education and having children? To find out what has the biggest impact on the emotional ties of Dutch residents, a multinomial regression analysis have been performed on different senses of place using demographic and geographic characteristics and various place affiliation-variables. For these analyses, I have used the WoonBehoefte Onderzoek (WBO) data for 2002 which, unlike previous years,

\(^8\) Own calculations from Peter van der Graaf based on the data files made available by CBS in the Netherlands, and archived by DANS.
included all the variables required to complete the analyses. The data for 2002 was set a baseline for the longitudinal comparison.

Having established different patterns of place attachments for Dutch residents in 2002, a comparison was made between patterns in 1998, 1999, 2000, 2002 and 2006 to analyse trends in place identity and physical and social attachment. Comparisons were also made between groups of residents in deprived and non-deprived neighbourhoods. In analyzing these emotional ties and the changes that occur to them during the process of urban renewal I hoped to shed new light on the effect of urban renewal: did residents in urban renewal neighbourhoods, especially in the 56 priority areas, develop different emotional ties to the place where they live? And if so what caused these differences? To answer this question auto-regression analyses were performed at the end of this chapter on the changes in physical and social attachment of Dutch residents between 2002 and 2006 using the different explanations discussed in the chapter. Auto-regression analyses were used to correct for dependency between the error-terms. Most time series have some trend, either up or down, and any two trending series will correlate simply because of the trends, regardless of whether they are causally related or not. Auto-regression analyses allow the removal of the auto-correlation inherent in many time series and ascertain any statistically significant relationships between the dependent and regressor variables. Which socio-demographic and -geographic characteristics of Dutch residents explain best their affection for the neighbourhood, controlling for changes in their affection and their characteristic between 2002 and 2006?

4.2 How Do We Feel at Home? Senses of Place

The distinction Cuba and Hummon make between the social and physical dimension of place attachment posed an interesting question for the Dutch context: were there differences in the Place Attachment of residents in the 56 deprived areas targeted by the big cities policy and the rest of Holland where no urban renewal takes place? Does neighbourhood renewal lead to an overall decline in place attachment due to gentrification or is this change only noticeable in one particular
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dimension? For instance, in a reduction of social attachment due to more segregated networks and, alternatively, in an increase in physical attachment because residents are more occupied with their housing in times of demolition and forced reallocation? Or, does urban renewal have the desired effect of raising the social attachment of residents by creating a more mixed neighbourhood? Do new faces in the neighbourhood make residents more aware of and invest in their emotional ties to the neighbourhood?

Combining the two dimensions of Sense of Place yields four groups: those low in both social and physical attachment, those high in both dimensions; those high in social and low in physical attachment; and visa versa. Both dimensions are positively correlated (r=.27), but the weak association indicates that there are respondents in all four combinations.

Table 4.1 Cross-Classification Frequencies of Bonded (Social Attachment) and Rooted (Physical Attachment) Scores in the Netherlands, 2002 (N=75,043)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonding</th>
<th>Rootedness</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15714</td>
<td>13506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11821</td>
<td>23330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27535</td>
<td>36836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common combination in the Netherlands is high social and physical attachment: more than a third of the Dutch residents feel at home in the place where they live and with the people that live there. However, on the opposite side stands a substantial group of 24% of the residents that does not show any attachment to their neighbourhood and neighbours. 18% is only socially attached, while 21% experiences only physical attachment.

To investigate whether geographic location makes a difference to residents’ sense of place, further analyses were performed between residents in the thirty biggest cities of the Netherlands on the one side, which are part of the big cities policy, and the rest of Holland on the other side were no special national attention and money is given to the deprived urban areas. Within the group of big cities a
Further distinction is made between the four main cities of the Netherlands (Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht) and the so-called ‘prioritaire wijken’ (priority neighbourhoods) in the big cities, which are the focal points of the Big Cities policy and in which the majority of the budget is spend. These areas were compared in turn to the other less troubled areas of the four main and of the 26 big cities in the Netherlands. In 2002 12.9% of the respondents lived in priority neighbourhoods; 3.5% in the four main cities and 9.4% in the other 26 big cities. In total 32.4% of the respondents lived in the big cities, 67.6% lived in smaller cities and the more rural areas of Holland.

Although all four senses of place are present in each location, residents, who show little attachment or primarily physical attachment, are more often found in the priority areas of the 30 biggest cities, and especially in the four main cities.

Figure 4.1 Sense of Place in the Netherlands by location, 2002 (N=75,043)

Respondents who display high levels of attachment or mainly social affection for their neighbourhood reside more often in the smaller cities and more rural areas of the Netherlands, suggesting that place seems to matter for our sense of place.
4.3 Why and Where Do We Feel at Home? Place Affiliations and Locus of Place Identity

To understand why we feel more at home in one place than the other, we need to know more about people’s place affiliations. Is it because they like the house in which they live or do they value the community in which they live; or maybe both? And what is it they like about their community: a clean and safe area or is access to a range of amenities more important? Or, do the people you know in your neighbourhood make the difference to whether you feel at home or alienated? To answer this question data on community satisfaction has been used. It is hypothesised that people are more likely to feel at home when they are satisfied with different aspects of their neighbourhood.

The table below shows that the main differences in attachment are related to satisfaction with the present home and its surroundings and the population composition. Residents with low physical and social attachment to their neighbourhood are relatively more dissatisfied with their present home and its surroundings and the people they are surrounded by. Contrary, residents with high levels of rootedness and bonding are generally very happy with their house and neighbours. Interestingly, social bonding is related to public transport stops: residents who are more satisfied with the public transport stops in their neighbourhood display high levels of bonding, while less socially attached residents are more dissatisfied with the possibilities to move in and out of the neighbourhood. Do they feel trapped and faced with no other alternative than to look for social support inside the neighbourhood?
Table 4.2 Neighbourhood Satisfaction by Sense of Place in the Netherlands 2002, in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Very) Satisfied in the neighbourhood with:</th>
<th>Low Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>Low Rootedness High Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness High Bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present home</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present home surrounding</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population composition</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking areas</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport Stops</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Amenities</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(75,043)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discriminant analyses confirm these finding: satisfaction with the present home accounts for most differences in attachment between residents, followed by satisfaction with the surrounding and the neighbourhood population\(^9\). A separate (third) discriminant function is constructed for public transport stops, indicating that the mobility in and out of the neighbourhood is a unique discriminator for social attachment.

However, community satisfaction should not be confused with place attachment, as has Hummon (1993) pointed out earlier in chapter 3. Community satisfaction evaluates the places where people live, while place attachment focuses on the emotional investments of people in places. Local satisfaction and attachment can be distinct dimensions: some individual may be quite satisfied with their community without developing deeper emotional ties to the locale; others may express feelings of attachment to places they find less than satisfactory. Therefore to understand the emotional ties of people another type of information is needed: what do people find important in their neighbourhood? While some residents value the bus stops in their neighbourhood other residents are more focused on their contacts with neighbours. Different neighbourhood loci might lead to different place attachments by residents.

In the Dutch Housing Need Survey respondents were asked to rate the importance of different aspects of their neighbourhood, e.g. the value they

\(^9\) These three variables were combined into one scale for neighbourhood satisfaction to be used in analyses later on in this chapter (\(\alpha=6.23\) for 2002 and \(\alpha=6.01\) for 2006).
attached to the size and arrangement of their house, or the urgency they put on fighting vandalism, graffiti and nuisance. The answers were used to distinguish between two levels of place affiliation used by Cuba and Hummon (1993) to identify different loci of place identity in their research on Cape Cod; dwelling and community. Do residents feel more at home in the neighbourhood because of their house or the community where they live? Both scales for loci of place identity (dwelling- and community-based) correlated quite strongly and, therefore, further attempts were made to distinguish between different loci of place within the community. Factor analysis revealed three different neighbourhood orientations: a concern with neighbourhood cleanliness and safety, a focus on neighbourhood amenities, and a high value placed on contacts with neighbours and feelings of solidarity. The three orientations were disaggregated into four distinct combinations that represented the majority of residents.

Unfortunately for the analyses, Dutch residents are in remarkable agreement on their neighbourhood orientation: the majority of residents value their dwelling, as well as their community in every sense of the way: cleanliness/ safety, the presence of amenities and contacts with their neighbours. More than 90% appreciate the importance of their home and the cleanliness and safety of their neighbourhood.

Table 4.3 Locus of Place Identity in the Netherlands, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregate frequencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (any combination)</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cleanliness and Safety (any combination)</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Amenities (any combination)</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Contacts (any combination)</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaggregated frequencies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling only</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Cleanliness and Safety only</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Amenities only</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Contacts only</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most common combinations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness/ safety</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness/ safety and Amenities</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness/ safety and Contacts</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness/ safety, Amenities and contacts</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(70,673)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A further 70% value their community contact and over 60% says the amenities in their neighbourhood are important. When these responses are disaggregated a single preference for the dwelling or any type community orientation is very rare. Instead residents all value their dwelling and the cleanliness/safety of their neighbourhood. Differences occur between residents on their additional value for either the amenities (11.9%) or the people they know (18.5%) in their neighbourhood. Although, the most common combination valued by residents is their house and all three aspects of their neighbourhood: cleanliness/safety, amenities and contacts (54.7%). No substantial differences were found in neighbourhood orientation between different Dutch cities and neighbourhoods.

These results contradict the findings of Cuba and Hummon (1993) who found clear distinctions between Cape Cod residents in their orientation to place. What Dutch residents value in their neighbourhood does not help to explain why they feel more attached to one place than the other. However, different place orientations appear to be associated with different senses of place. Surprisingly, residents who are less physically attached to the neighbourhood value more the material aspects of their area (dwelling, cleanliness and amenities), while residents who are more physically attached show an appreciation of the social ties in their neighbourhood. These results are puzzling, unless a greater concern with the material aspects of the neighbourhood illustrates the need for physical attachment, which the resident is currently lacking, while an additional appreciation of social ties in the neighbourhood might display a deeply rooted sense of place and a less exclusive need for these aspects.

Table 4.4 Sense of Place by Locus of Place in the Netherlands, 2002 (N=75,043)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Place</th>
<th>Senses of Place</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Rootedness,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling and Cleanliness</td>
<td>Low Bonding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness and Amenities</td>
<td>Low Rootedness,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness and Contacts</td>
<td>High Rootedness,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness, Amenities and Contacts</td>
<td>High Rootedness,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Personal Characteristics

How, where and why residents feel at home is likely to be affected by their personal characteristics: some people feel attached to a place while others cannot wait to leave that same place. In order to understand what kind of residents make up each of the four senses of place, socio-demographic characteristics were compared between the four groups.

Table 4.5 Mean Socio-demographics by Sense of Place in the Netherlands, 2002 (N=75,043)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Low rootedness</th>
<th>Low bonding</th>
<th>High rootedness</th>
<th>High bonding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>32,165.86</td>
<td>48,435.03</td>
<td>31,826.62</td>
<td>48,849.31</td>
<td>41,563.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>48.07</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>47.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income is based on household income in €; age is measured in years; education is measured in increments from primary education (=1) to academic degree (=5); children is 1 if no children are present in the household, 2 if one or more children are present. N=75,043.

To discriminate between the four groups three discriminant analyses were performed comparing the dimensions separately; first, by comparing the two low-rooted with the two high-rooted groups, followed by a comparison between the two low-bonded and the two high-bonded groups and lastly, by examining both dimensions together. When comparing residents with low and high levels of rootedness, having children and age are the major discriminators among those physically attached to their neighbourhood. Comparing residents on the social dimension of attachment shows age again as the main discriminating characteristic. The other characteristics contribute to a lesser but roughly equal extent to the differences between residents with low and high levels of bonding to their neighbourhood.

Comparing residents on both dimensions simultaneously, the four demographic variables combine to significantly discriminate among the attachment groups: income, age, education and having children, although age is the biggest contributor to the different senses of place for Dutch residents. Thus the different
senses of place of Dutch residents can be characterized as follows. People who are low in both types of attachment are young adults with a relative high education. They are less likely to have started a family and their income appears to be relatively low. People who are high in social attachment but low in physical are older, slightly more educated adults with a higher income to spend. They are also more likely to have no children living at home. People who are high in physical attachment but low in social involvement are also older but less educated and with less money to spend and are also more likely to have children. Finally, residents who display high levels of both social and physical attachment are older and more educated; they have more money to spend and are also likely to have children living at home.

These results are partly in line with the findings of Riger and Lavrakas. Their analyses also prove age to be a decisive factor in discriminating between the different groups, although in their data having children is a main discriminator for the level of bonding and not, as in my analysis, for rootedness. Furthermore, the boundaries of age found by Riger and Lavrakas differ for the groups in the Dutch data. While Riger and Lavrakas find that residents with high bonding and low rootedness are somewhat younger, less educated and bring home less money, the reverse is true in my data; the Dutch residents in this group are older and highly educated and, therefore, bring home more money. They characterised this group as working class young adults who have started a family. Whereas the Dutch population in this category can be described as older, upper middle class singles and families without children who value particularly the place where they have lived for a relatively long time without really caring for the people that live around them. This explains the greater importance of children in the Dutch data for discriminating between high and low levels of rootedness and why age is more important for distinguishing between high and low levels of bonding for Dutch residents.
4.5 Social Interaction and Community Involvement

Why people feel at home in certain places might have less to do with what they find important in the neighbourhood and more with their lifestyle in general and what they find important in other areas of their life. Income, education, having children and especially age were used earlier to describe differences in place attachment. In the reviewed literature the importance of social action and interaction for place attachment is emphasized.

Earlier research suggests that local social involvements, particularly those with friends, but also those involving kin, organizational memberships, and local shopping, are significant sources of sentimental ties to local places. Who and what matters most for our attachment to the place where we live? In the Dutch Housing Needs Survey residents were asked how much time they spent on average inside the house in front of the television, and outside doing sport activities; how often they joined civic societies, visited pubs and museums; and how often they met up with family and friends. Unfortunately, the data does not tell us anything about the places where they spent their time. Therefore, it is unknown whether these activities take place in or outside the neighbourhood. To measure local social involvement, the scale that was earlier constructed for place affiliation with the community (see table 3.4) was used as an indicator for community involvement, because both concepts are closely related: people with a strong affiliation for the community will also experience a strong sense of involvement with that community.

Table 4.6 Social Participation by Sense of Place in the Netherlands, 2002, in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>Low Rootedness High Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness High Bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watch TV (&gt;15 hrs. weekly)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport activities (&gt;2 hrs wk.)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Societies (&gt;Monthly)</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub Visits (&gt;Monthly)</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Visits (&gt;Monthly)</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Visits (&gt;Weekly)</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Visits (&gt;Weekly)</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement (High)</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(75,043)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place Attachment in the Netherlands

The table above shows that social participation differences relate largely to low and high levels of social attachment. In particular community involvement is a major discriminator between levels of attachment. Residents with low social attachment watch more television, are less sporty and visit museums less often. On the other side, residents with high physical attachment visit their family and friends less often. Social participation and community involvement is especially low for residents with low overall attachment, with the exception of pub visits. Residents with low physical and social attachments show the highest percentage of weekly pub visits (43.3%). Do pubs provide an alternative home? Discriminant analyses confirm that community involvement is the main contributor to different senses of place. Pub visits and the amount of time spent in front of the television discriminate second best for residents with low and high levels of rootedness. However, on the social dimension of attachment contact, with friends, and visits to civic societies and pubs differentiate most between groups, next to community involvement. Comparing residents on both dimensions simultaneously, community involvement, contact with friends, watching television and visits to the pub combine to significantly discriminate among the attachment groups.

4.6 What Matters Most?

In searching for the how, why and where of place attachment I have only used discriminant analysis to establish differences between groups of residents. To establish the relative contribution of each explaining factor a multinomial regression analysis was performed on the four senses of place using the different dimensions of place attachment, plus variables on social participation and community involvement, and various demographic and geographic characteristics of residents. The results, summed up in the table below, indicate that community involvement contributes the most to the different senses of place. Compared with residents who are actively involved in their neighbourhood, residents who are marginally involved are 14 times as likely to show little attachment, physically and socially, than to have strong physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood. Residents who have little involvement are also 9 times more likely
to show only social attachment and 2 times more likely to be only physically rooted in their neighbourhood compared to having strong physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood.

Other contributing factors are a strong focus on social networks in the neighbourhood, satisfaction with the house, age and last but not least location. Residents who do not value social contact in the neighbourhood are 7 times more likely to feel only marginally attached to their neighbourhood, or to feel only attached to their neighbours, compared to being highly rooted and bonded to the neighbourhood. This result is somewhat counterintuitive: apparently having no desire to meet your neighbours does not mean you can not feel attached to them, although it makes it less likely that you feel both socially and physically connected to the neighbourhood.

Low satisfaction with ones house increased the odds of feeling little physical and social attachment to the neighbourhood (by a factor of 9) or feeling only a physical connection to the place where you live compared to being highly rooted and bonded to the neighbourhood. Again, being unsatisfied with your house does not stop you from feeling attached to it, although it makes it more unlikely that you feel both socially and physically connected to the neighbourhood.

Young residents (18-24 years) are also more likely to feel no attachment to the place where they live and the people that live there (5 times more likely) and are more likely to only develop a physical attachment (3 times), compared to having strong physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood. As new arrivals or busy career makers they are not involved with the neighbourhood and their neighbours and, therefore, lack a strong sense of attachment. Finally, residents in the priority areas, both in the G4 and the G26, are 4 times more likely to develop no emotional ties to the neighbourhood and its people, compared to being highly rooted and bonded to the neighbourhood. Residents in the priority areas of the four largest cities are also more likely to develop only physical ties to the neighbourhood. This indicates that place does contribute to the emotional ties of residents regardless of demographic and place affiliation differences.
Table 4.7 Odds-Ratios of Sense of Place, by Place Identity, Place Affiliations, Locus of Place Identity, Satisfaction, Social Participation and Community Involvement, Children, Education, Income, and Age in the Netherlands, 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>Low Rootedness High Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High</td>
<td>2.631***</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Affiliations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak versus Strong Social Network-related</td>
<td>7.401***</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>1.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak versus Strong Community-related</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak versus Strong Amenities-related</td>
<td>1.553***</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak versus Strong Dwelling-related</td>
<td>2.123***</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>2.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Place Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak versus Strong Neighbourhood-based</td>
<td>3.817***</td>
<td>2.197</td>
<td>2.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Satisfaction with House</td>
<td>8.782***</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>6.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Satisfaction with Living Environment</td>
<td>.935***</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>1.028**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Satisfaction with Community Composition</td>
<td>2.083***</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>1.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Participation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Versus High Society Membership</td>
<td>1.654***</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Sport Activity</td>
<td>1.406***</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Contact with Friends</td>
<td>1.356***</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Pub Visits</td>
<td>.895***</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High TV Watching</td>
<td>.735***</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Community Involvement</td>
<td>13.659***</td>
<td>9.404</td>
<td>1.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children Present in Household versus Present</td>
<td>1.889***</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Social Minimum versus &gt;3x Modal</td>
<td>2.619***</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>1.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Minimum Wage versus &gt;3x Modal</td>
<td>2.046***</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>2.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Modal Income versus &gt;3x Modal</td>
<td>2.646***</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>2.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5x Modal Income versus &gt;3x Modal</td>
<td>2.170***</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>2.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x Modal Income versus &gt;3x Modal</td>
<td>1.497***</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x Modal Income versus &gt;3x Modal</td>
<td>1.211***</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 4.7 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years versus &gt; 64 Years</td>
<td>4.587***</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>3.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-44 versus &gt; 64 Years</td>
<td>1.385***</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>1.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 versus &gt; 64 Years</td>
<td>.721***</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native versus Western Immigrant</td>
<td>.566***</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western versus Western Immigrant</td>
<td>2.630***</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>3.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4 Priority Areas versus Rural Areas</td>
<td>3.438***</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>3.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G26 Priority Areas versus Rural Areas</td>
<td>3.457***</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>2.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 other Areas versus Rural Areas</td>
<td>1.828***</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G26 Other Areas versus Rural Areas</td>
<td>1.677***</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>1.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Log Likelihood: 6,220,727.58
Pseudo R Square (Cox and Snell): .285

Notes: Reference category for the equation is High Rootedness, High Bonding (N=2,805,269.628).
(*) p < .1 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

4.7 Patterns of Place Attachment

The different dimensions and indicators for place attachment can be used to distinguish between different patterns of place attachment. If we know how, why and where residents feel at home, can we use this information to track different trajectories of place attachment over time? An earlier attempt has been made by Hummon (1992). Reviewing the research on social-emotional ties of residents to their community, he discovered three distinct approaches for researching these ties: one focusing on community satisfaction, another on community attachment and a third on identity and community life. The most popular one is research on community satisfaction. Hummon criticized this approach: he argued that satisfaction and attachment are distinct concepts, which are only modestly related: some individuals may be quite satisfied with their community without developing deeper emotional ties to the locale; others may express feelings of

---

10 The different approaches he distinguishes are similar to dimensions of place attachment looked at so far. Although using somewhat different terminology, Hummon makes a similar distinction within place attachment between place identity (community identity) and sense of attachment (community ties). He adds to this the concept of community satisfaction, which is often, but incorrectly used by quantitative researchers to measure the emotional ties of people to places.
attachment to places they find less than satisfactory. He did, however, believe that community satisfaction has an independent effect on place attachment. More appropriate, according to Hummon, was the second approach, community attachment, which focused on emotional investment in place instead of community evaluation. This approach was central to this paper. The third approach, on identity and community life, “explores the ways locales are imbued with personal and social meanings, and how such symbolic locales can serve in turn as an important sign of locus of the self”. In other words, how place identity is constructed and used.

In an attempt to unite the different approaches, Hummon proposed an integrative conceptualization of, what he calls, community sentiment in terms of sense of place, which he defined as “people’s subjective perceptions of their environments and their more or less conscious feelings about those environments” (1992:262). According to Hummon, community satisfaction, attachment and identity made up the emotional matrix out of which different sense of place are formed. He combined these different dimensions of community sentiment is his research to produce profoundly different senses of place. Based on in depth interviews with residents in Worcester, Massachusetts he distinguished four senses of place:

1. **Community Rootedness**: high satisfaction, local sense of home, local identification and attachment;

2. **Alienation**: low satisfaction, no sense of home, no local identification and attachment;

3. **Relativity**: variable satisfaction, variable sense of home, local identification but marginal attachment; and

4. **Placelessness**: moderate satisfaction, marginal sense of home, no local identification and marginal attachment.

Residents whose sense of place is characterized as rooted, experience a strong, local sense of home and are emotionally attached to their local area. On the opposite side are residents, who are separated from valued locales and feel displaced. They are unhappy with their neighbourhood; they do not feel at home and have no emotional and social ties to their community. They feel alienated from
the place where they live. Hummon associated their displacement with restrained mobility or from the transformation of a place. A commonality between both senses of place is that the community matters a great deal for the residents who live there. A third group values the community they live in at that time, but do not value a particular community over time. They have usually lived in a variety of communities and identify with these places but show no particular attachment to any one of them. This group indicates that residents may cultivate a feeling of home in a community without becoming emotionally tied to that locale. A fourth and final group of residents expresses a sense of place in which community is less valued or plays a more ambivalent role. These residents do not identify with their neighbourhood and they display few emotional attachments to the area they live in. Their neighbourhood is simply a place to live with good and bad sides but they feel basically neutral about their place (as a home).

It would be interesting to test Hummon’s classifications in a quantitative analysis based on the different dimensions of place attachment distinguished earlier. For this purpose a 2K-Cluster analysis was performed, combining the different dimensions of place attachment that have been discussed separately above (place identity, sense of place, neighbourhood orientation, social participation and community satisfaction), to distinguish four different clusters of residents.

Table 4.8 Patterns of Place Attachment in the Netherlands, 2002 (N=75,043)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attachment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attachment</td>
<td>Dwelling, Cleanliness</td>
<td>Dwelling and Cleanliness</td>
<td>Dwelling Cleanliness and Amenities</td>
<td>Dwelling Cleanliness and Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with friends</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub Visits</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Satisfaction</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Dutch residents</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>23,1%</td>
<td>17,9%</td>
<td>17,1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four clusters that are identified correspond closely to the Sense of Place distinguished by Hummon in his interviews with residents of Worcester, Massachusetts. A quarter of the Dutch resident can be characterized as community rooted. They identify with and are physically and socially attached to the neighbourhood they live in. They value their community for its social and material aspects: the house they live in, the cleanliness of the neighbourhood, the amenities they can use and the social ties with their neighbours. Their community rootedness is further illustrated by a relatively strong involvement in the neighbourhood and active social participation. Not surprisingly, they show the highest satisfaction with their community.

A roughly equal group of residents feel exactly the opposite; displaced, alienated and unhappy with their neighbourhood. They identify less with and show less physically and social attachment to their neighbourhood. Their main concern is the house they live in and the cleanliness of its surroundings. They are less involved with their neighbourhood and their social participation is average. 18% of the Dutch residents have no special affection (positive or negative) for their neighbourhood. The neighbourhood is a neutral place to them; they are happy to live there and are mainly concerned with the material aspects of their community (dwelling, cleanliness and amenities). They like to be involved but are less keen on social participation and show less social attachment to their neighbourhood.

Finally, a similar sized group of Dutch resident shows affection for their neighbourhood in that they identify with it and appreciate the neighbourhood and its neighbours, but they are not especially attached to it by social-emotional ties. They show, however, relative high involvement with their neighbourhood, although their social participation is less. Instead of visiting friends they prefer to watch television. This group is comparable to Hummon’s characterisation of relativity. Compared to Hummon’s senses of place, the clusters in the Dutch data show higher levels of community satisfaction, particularly for clusters 3 and 4 where residents, in spite of their lack of social-emotional ties, show more than marginal satisfaction with their neighbourhood. Also, in spite of their lower social activity they show more involvement in their community.
The four pattern of attachment are not equally distributed over the Dutch cities. Although all four senses of place are found in every Dutch city, residents in the priority areas of the 30 biggest cities experience alienation more often, while residents, who live in neighbourhoods where no urban renewal takes place, are the more often rooted in their community. Surprisingly, residents in the priority areas of the biggest four cities show the lowest amount of placelessness: living in these areas leaves less space for indifference and neutral feelings for the neighbourhood. Living in deprived neighbourhoods has an ‘affect’ on residents, whether positive (community rootedness) or negative (alienation). A relatively large amount of the residents in Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Utrecht identify with their neighbourhood but are less social-emotionally connected to their area. This might be due to a higher mobility rate in these areas, allowing insufficient time to develop social-emotional ties, although these residents value and identify with the neighbourhood they live in.
4.8 Place Attachment in Time

An important question in this research is whether urban renewal affects the social-emotional ties of Dutch residents. With a clearer understanding of how, why and where people feel at home, we are ready to explore this question. Is urban renewal causing residents in the priority areas to feel less at home or does their lack of affection give rise to the start of urban renewal programmes? Does living in deprived areas cause people to feel displaced from their community and can urban renewal increase the rootedness of these residents, or does urban renewal do more harm than good by (even temporarily) forcing residents to leave the places where they live and feel attached to? To be able to answer this question data from the Woon Behoeftes Onderzoek for different years (1998-2006) is compared, allowing for longitudinal analyses of place attachment patterns. In the next paragraph different senses of place and different patterns of attachment are tracked through time. Do different patterns emerge in time, and are the differences related to urban renewal programmes?

The results indicate that both the attachment of Dutch residents to their neighbourhood and their neighbours has increased between 1998 and 2006, although the physical attachment of the Dutch has declined again in most areas after 2002. Only in the non-priority areas of the 26 largest cities is the increase in physical attachment larger than the increase of social attachment; after 2002 residents in these areas feel more at home in their neighbourhood than they do with their neighbours, while in all the other urban areas residents continue to have stronger bonding to the people in their neighbourhood than to the place where they live. The opposite is true for the more rural areas where residents continue to feel more attached to the place where they live than to the people they live with. Residents in the priority areas of the G4 remain at the bottom of the attachment table, while residents in more rural areas display throughout the research period the most affection for their neighbourhood, residents in the priority areas of the largest 26 cities and those in the non-priority areas of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht take the middle position.
In spite of the general trend towards more physical and social attachment, remarkable differences can be witnessed in the amount of progress between different areas in the Netherlands. The largest increase of physical attachment is visible in the areas outside the 30 largest cities, while the non-priority areas in the 26 largest cities benefit the least. The priority areas in the four largest cities demonstrate the most erratic trend with an initial decline of rootedness between 1998 and 1999 followed by a sharp increase in the following year, only to decline again after 2002.

This decline after 2002 can also be witnessed in the priority areas of the 6 largest cities. However, between 1999 and 2002 the priority areas, both in the G4 and G26 show the biggest growth in physical attachment of all the Dutch neighbourhoods. The growth is even clearer when the social bonding of residents in the priority areas is considered. Between 1999 and 2006 these residents improve their attachment to their neighbours more than anywhere else in the Netherlands, while in the more rural areas neighbours effectively lost social affection for one another in the same period. The loss of social affection is also witnessed in the non-priority areas of the four largest cities, although social bonding increases again after 2002.
The residents in the strategic urban renewal areas of the Netherlands felt more at home in their neighbourhood, and especially to the people, since 1998 than any other place in the Netherlands.

Differences in change are even more pronounced for attachment patterns, where residents are divided into four groups based on their place attachments, neighbourhood satisfaction, and community involvement. Feelings of alienation are strongly reduced for residents between 1999 and 2006 (20-30%), particularly in the 30 largest cities, although this is less pronounced in the priority areas of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht. Also, feelings of placelessness (+4-16%), relativity (+7-13%) and community rootedness (+3-8%) increased almost everywhere in the Netherlands. Residents in the priority areas feel more neutral towards their neighbourhood (placelessness), while residents in the non-priority areas are more relatively connected to their neighbourhood. It is only in the priority areas of the four largest cities that slightly fewer residents feel rooted in their community (-2%). Identification with the neighbourhood appears harder for residents in the G4 priority areas and residents in these areas are more likely to
develop a marginal attachment to their neighbourhood in the period between 1998 and 2006.

Residents in the more rural areas are the most stable in their attachment compared to the other areas and show the smallest amount of change in patterns of attachment. For the other areas the changes are more convulsive and change both in a positive and a negative direction between 1998 and 2006. For instance, feelings of alienation are not reduced in every survey year: between 2000 and 2002 more Dutch residents feel alienated from their neighbourhood, and this number declines again after 2002. Even the residents in the more stable rural areas are not free from sudden changes in their attachment to the neighbourhood: in 2002 their community rootedness is greatly improved, following by a steady downwards trend.

Figure 4.5 Patterns of Place Attachment in the Netherlands, 1998-2006 (N=174,281)
4.9 Urban renewal and Place Attachment

It is almost impossible to contribute the differences in change over time to specific urban policies or practices; the number of policies and interventions involved, and the variety of situations faced by the neighbourhoods under study is simply too great to allow for any generalised statement about the effect of urban renewal on the emotional ties of residents. However, what is clear from the analyses is that the strategic urban renewal areas in the Netherlands have made remarkable progress since 1999 in the strengthening of physical and social bonds of their residents. The increased attachment does not mean that all is well in these neighbourhoods: emotional ties have improved but this does not imply more satisfied tenants and actively involved residents. The direction of change is towards less negative feelings for the neighbourhood and a more neutral stance towards the place where they live, in which the neighbourhood is no longer a (negative) framework for the emotional well being and identity of its residents. For residents in the non-priority areas of the big cities the direction of change is towards more positive feelings for the neighbourhood; they feel more at home, however, they do not feel especially attached to the place where they live (relativity).

These changes can be judged in the light of earlier explanations offered for differences in place attachment. Which factors contribute most to the changes in the emotional ties of residents? Is it more important that people evaluate their neighbourhood positively, and that they are actively involved in their neighbourhood or do personal differences, based on income, age and household, matters most? In short, is urban renewal more effective for the emotional ties of residents when dealing with the neighbourhood as a whole or when focussing on individual problems and needs? To research the causes of changes in emotional ties to the neighbourhood, regression analyses (with first-order auto-correlated errors) were performed on the changes in physical and social attachment of Dutch residents between 2002 and 2006. These analyses used the different explanations offered separately before: various place affiliations variables, variables on neighbourhood satisfaction and orientation (locus of identity), indicators for social
participation and community involvement and various demographic (children in the household, education, income and age) and geographic characteristics. Which characteristics of Dutch residents explain best their affection for the neighbourhood where they live, controlling for changes in their affection and their characteristics between 2002 and 2006?

The different explanations were tested in 3 nested models, with each step adding new explanations and increasing the complexity of the model. Firstly, the two remaining dimensions of place attachment, place affiliations and locus of place identity were tested. Can we predict residents’ feelings of attachment to their neighbourhood in 2003 when we know what their reasons are for living in the neighbourhood and at which level they identify with it? Or are additional variables necessary to explain their social-emotional ties to the neighbourhood? In the second model residents’ satisfaction, social participation and involvement in the local community were added to the analyses. Finally, the third model added geographical and demographical characteristics of residents to test whether these put more weight in the balance for the explanation of differences in social-emotional ties over time to the neighbourhood.
Table 4.9 Auto-Regression Coefficients for Change in Physical Attachment (Rootedness) in the Netherlands, 2002-2006 (N=42,228)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rho (AR1)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>.474***</td>
<td>.133***</td>
<td>.089***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network-related</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.081***</td>
<td>-.093***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related</td>
<td>.393***</td>
<td>.338***</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities-related</td>
<td>.085***</td>
<td>.092***</td>
<td>.297***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.107***</td>
<td>-.090***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood-based</td>
<td>.402***</td>
<td>.285***</td>
<td>.188***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-based</td>
<td>-.093***</td>
<td>-.047***</td>
<td>-6.7E-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Satisfaction</td>
<td>.702***</td>
<td>.519***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Friends</td>
<td>-.042***</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Pubs</td>
<td>-.193***</td>
<td>-.027***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching Television</td>
<td>-.009***</td>
<td>-.006***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>.260***</td>
<td>.161***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Household</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Qualification</td>
<td>.018**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Labour Income</td>
<td>.268***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.025***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (0=Dutch; 1=Non-Dutch)</td>
<td>-.309***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved House between 2002 and 2006</td>
<td>-.973***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Priority Areas</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G26 Priority Areas</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Other Areas</td>
<td>.347(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G26 Other Areas</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.028**</td>
<td>-.069***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-27.355</td>
<td>50.602**</td>
<td>131.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood (Residual)</td>
<td>-106,051</td>
<td>-103,743</td>
<td>-94,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) p < .1 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

The results confirm that place identity is an important predictor for changes in rootedness, although the strength of this predictor decreases considerably when other explanatory variables are entered into the model. The two other main predictors in the first model are a Neighbourhood-based Locus of Identity and a Community-related Place Affiliation: if residents identify with their neighbourhood and like to live there because of the community they experience, then they will display stronger physical attachments to their neighbourhood.
The model improves significantly when neighbourhood satisfaction and social participation are added, particularly when residents are more involved with the community. Visiting friends or pubs and watching telly at home have a small but negative effect: they take people outside the neighbourhood or keep them confined indoors, reducing the physical attachment to the neighbourhood.

Neighbourhood satisfaction is the strongest predictor of high rootedness in model 2. When demographic and geographic characteristics are added to the model, income and ethnicity exert the strongest influence of the demographic characteristics on the physical attachments of residents: more well off residents feel more rooted in their neighbourhood (because they can afford to buy their home?), while non-native Dutch residents feel less physically attached to their neighbourhood (because they live in poorer housing?).

The effect of place identity and community-based place affiliations and identities are further reduced in the third model: personal characteristics matter more than place characteristics. This is further stressed by the absence of any significant effect for the location variables: whether (similar) residents live in one of the deprived priority areas of the four largest Dutch cities or in a rural village in the west or north of Holland does not significantly impact their physical attachment to the neighbourhood. Although place affiliations based on the facilities in the neighbourhood become more important: different resident groups attach different importance to shops, schools, play areas and bus stops in their neighbourhood and this affects their physical attachment to their neighbourhood.

However, the most contributing factor in the final model is whether residents have moved houses between 2002 and 2006. If they have moved house their rootedness is strongly reduced. This effect is not surprising considering the variables used to define physical attachment (see appendix), however the magnitude of the effect is more surprising, especially considering the fact that most house moves take place within the same city. A third of the Dutch changed their house keys between 2002 and 2006) of which a considerable number moved house within the same neighbourhood. This confirms earlier research indicating (Kleinhans, 2005) that a (forced) move due to urban renewal strongly affects residents’ social-emotional ties. Interestingly, this mainly affects residents’ physical ties to the neighbourhood. When the same models are tested for changes
in social attachments between 2002 and 2006, moving has much less effect on the social bonds of residents to their area.

Controlling for the year residents were interviewed in, showed a weak negative effect on rootedness; all residents felt slightly less rooted in their neighbourhood in 2006 regardless of their place affiliations and identities, their neighbourhood satisfaction, participation and their personal characteristics. The effect of time was not significant in the three models below for social attachment: there was no overall decline in the bonding of residents to their neighbourhood between 2002 and 2006.

Table 4.10 Auto-Regression Coefficients for Change in Social Attachment (Bonding) in the Netherlands, 2002-2006 (N=42,228)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rho (AR1)</td>
<td>2.56E-005</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>.387***</td>
<td>-.018(*)</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network-related</td>
<td>1.576***</td>
<td>1.186***</td>
<td>1.201***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related</td>
<td>-.488***</td>
<td>-.399***</td>
<td>-.386***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities-related</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.040**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
<td>.123***</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.034(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood-based</td>
<td>.270***</td>
<td>.141***</td>
<td>.131***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-based</td>
<td>-.038**</td>
<td>-.028**</td>
<td>-.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Satisfaction</td>
<td>.082***</td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Friends</td>
<td>.136***</td>
<td>.133***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Pubs</td>
<td>-.015***</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching Television</td>
<td>-.001(*)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>1.397***</td>
<td>1.362***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>.180***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.014**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Labour Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>.028***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (0=Dutch; 1=Non-Dutch)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.037*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved House between 2002 and 2006</td>
<td>-.139***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Priority Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G26 Priority Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Other Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G26 Other Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>.093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-.017*</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>28.627(*)</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>-39.230*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood (Residual)</td>
<td>-100,768</td>
<td>-95,112</td>
<td>-93,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) p < .1 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed)
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Place identity matters less for the bonding of residents: feeling at home in the neighbourhood is only a significant predictor for social attachment in the first model. Far more important is the importance residents attach to their social network; the more they value their neighbours, the stronger their social attachment to the neighbourhood. Surprisingly, the value residents attach to the cleanliness and safety of their community has a negative effect on their social attachments: when graffiti, litter and nuisance become more an issue for residents it reduces their affection for their neighbours. (Instead of uniting neighbours in their fight to improve the appearance of the neighbourhood, this place affiliation divides them.)

When satisfaction and social participation are added to the model for bonding, community involvement becomes the strongest predictor for social attachment. Where neighbourhood satisfaction had a strong effect on the rootedness of residents, it only has a surprisingly small and negative effect on the bonding of residents. The happier people are with where they live, the less they feel attached to their neighbours. Does increased satisfaction perhaps reduce the need for social ties?

When demographic and geographic details are entered into the third model, the number of children and the amount of education and income are significant for the place attachment of residents: when family and income grow larger, they feel more socially at home in the neighbourhood. Ethnicity is less important in the models for bonding; it has a much smaller effect on the social than the physical attachments of residents. As stated earlier, moving has much less effect on the social bonds of residents to their area. Neither does place matter; none of the location variables are significant for the social bonds of residents to the area where they live. For both physical and social attachments, it are the personal differences that matter more for Dutch residents than place characteristics.

4.10 Discussion

In this chapter I have explored the emotional ties of Dutch residents, particularly how residents in deprived areas feel at home and the factors that affect their
emotional ties to the neighbourhood. Analysing data for 2002 from the Housing Needs Survey showed that a third of the Dutch residents felt at home in the place where they lived and with the people that lived there. A quarter of the Dutch felt exactly the opposite and did not have any attachment to their neighbourhood and neighbours. The latter residents were more often found in the priority areas of the 30 biggest cities, particularly in the four main cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht.

Age and having children accounted for most differences in how residents felt a home: age improved physical and social attachment, with children at home further increasing the rootedness of residents. Also, more social participation, in particular community involvement, was strongly related to higher levels of social attachment.

Adding community satisfaction and involvement to the different dimensions of place attachment resulted in four patterns of place attachment expanding the repertoire of emotional ties. Next to residents who where community rooted or, the opposite, alienated from their neighbourhood, were residents with no special affection (positive or negative) for their neighbourhood. For these residents the neighbourhood was a neutral place (relativity); they were happy to live there and were mainly concerned with the material aspects of their community (dwelling, cleanliness and amenities). A fourth group of residents did show affection for their neighbourhood but was not especially attached to it by emotional ties. Residents in the priority areas of the 30 biggest cities experienced alienation more often, while residents who lived in neighbourhoods where no urban renewal took place were more often rooted in their community. Ethnicity (white), home ownership and high income were the best indicators for community rootedness. These findings suggest that urban renewal programmes, which aim to improve owner occupation rates by selling their property to tenants and which aim to increase the social mobility of residents by offering job training and opportunities, are also likely to contribute to more emotionally attached, satisfied and involved tenants.

To research cause and effect (What causes changes in the emotional ties of residents?) Dutch neighbourhood were compared through time (1998-2006). In this time period both the attachment of Dutch residents to their neighbourhood and their neighbours increased. Interestingly, the priority areas in the 30 largest cities
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showed the biggest improvement, particularly in social attachment. Between 1999 and 2006 residents in these areas improved their attachment to their neighbours more than anywhere else in the Netherlands, while in the more rural areas neighbours effectively lost social affection for one another in the same period. A similar trend was visible for physical attachment, although in a smaller time frame, with the priority areas demonstrating the biggest growth in rootedness of all the Dutch neighbourhoods between 1999 and 2002.

Comparing patterns of change over time added more detail to the picture, confirming the trend in the priority area with feelings of alienation being strongly reduced for residents between 1999 and 2006, and clarifying the nature of the change. For the priority areas the direction of change was towards less negative feelings for the neighbourhood, while for residents in the non-priority areas change was towards more positive feelings for their neighbourhood: feeling more at home but not feel particularly attached to their neighbourhood.

These findings suggest that urban renewal has in general a positive effect on the emotional ties of residents. However, when analysing the factors causing more or less place attachment, moving house turned out to be the biggest factor in reducing the physical attachment of residents. This explanation fits uneasily with the larger increase of attachment in the priority, considering the large scale relocation of residents that is caused by urban renewal. How are emotional ties improved in urban renewal when a large number of the residents is forced to move (temporarily) out of their houses? The answer is that moving mainly affected the emotional ties of residents with the neighbourhood as a place and not so much their ties with the neighbours. Moving house has no effect on the social attachment of residents and these ties show the biggest increase in urban renewal areas. The reduction in physical attachment is compensated by a larger increase in social attachment.

This confirmed earlier research by Kleinhans (2005) who demonstrated that social ties escape relatively unharmed from urban renewal. My research refined this outcome; urban renewal does not harm the social-emotional of residents but their physical-emotional ties to the neighbourhood. The latter ties are already weak in deprived neighbourhoods, compared to the social bonds that exist in these areas, and are further reduced by urban renewal programmes. This makes
neighbourhood attachment a tough but high priority for urban policy and practise: physical attachment is a precious commodity in deprived areas which urban professionals need to be chary of. Projects which take into account the place attachments of residents in urban renewal (and the effect of changing places) are therefore of great value.

Changes in social attachment are caused by differences in the importance residents attach to their social network: the more they value their neighbours, the stronger they feel socially attached to their neighbourhood. This underlines earlier research, stressing the importance of social action and interaction in place attachment: the social relations a place signifies are more important than the place qua place. (Low 1993; Lefebvre, 1991) The present research helps to distinguish more clearly between different places and people, and more importantly, their interconnectedness.

Finally, the strength and importance of emotional ties to the neighbourhood depend on the course of live of residents. The importance of life transitions is stressed by the effect of the number of children and the amount of education and income on both physical and social attachment; when family and income grow larger, they feel more socially and physically at home in the neighbourhood. Families attach more importance to the neighbourhood as safe and suitable place to raise children, while increase in education and income allows residents to invest more in their house (and ultimately buy their house) increasing their commitment and attachment to the place where they live. The most contributing factors to the place attachments of Dutch residents to their neighbourhood are summed up in the figure below.
In sum, urban renewal has an initial negative effect on the emotional ties of residents, particularly on their physical attachments. Although urban renewal will be able to contribute to the attachments of residents, when they are able to help residents cope emotionally with moving house (even when they cause them to move in the first place). By setting up projects aimed at increasing the value residents put on their neighbours urban renewal can improve the social bondings of residents. The place attachments of residents are further enhanced if they are also able to change the personal circumstances of residents by improving their income and education.
5. Place Attachment in the United Kingdom

5.1 Introduction

Having studied the place attachments of Dutch residents in the previous chapter, this chapter is concerned with the emotional ties of British residents in deprived neighbourhoods. In a similar vein to the previous chapter the place identities (Do residents feel at home?) senses of places (How do residents feel at home?), place affiliation (Why do residents feel at home?) and loci of place identities (Where do residents feel at home?) are analysed using the concepts distinguished in chapter 2. The four patterns of place attachment found for Dutch residents were replicated for the British data to compare experiences between Dutch and British residents; Do the latter experience home differently and how do these experiences develop over time in different areas where urban renewal programmes take place?

For the UK, data have been used from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), collected by the University of Essex. The survey annually interviews a representative sample of households, making it one of the longest running panel surveys in the world. The panel consists of some 5,500 households and 10,300 individuals drawn from 250 areas of Great Britain. Comparable to the Dutch Housing Needs Survey, the questionnaire covered a wide range of topics including housing conditions, residential mobility, social activities and memberships and neighbourhood perceptions.

A key difference between the Dutch and British data is that for the United Kingdom panel data is available, which allows the tracking of individuals over time. Whereas the Dutch data only allows for comparisons of areas over time due to the cross-sectional nature of the data, with the British data it is possible to see how

---

11 The data used in this publication were made available through the ESRC Data Archive. The data were originally collected by the ESRC Research Centre on Micro-social Change at the University of Essex (now incorporated within the Institute for Social and Economic Research). Neither the original collectors of the data nor the Archive bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.
the place attachments of each resident develops over time, allowing for more precise analyses of the factors influencing place attachments: what changes in individual lives affect their social-emotional ties to the neighbourhood?

5.2 How Do We Feel at Home? Senses of Place

The majority of residents identify with the place where they live and feel they belong to their neighbourhood: 70% (strongly) agree with this statement, only 11% (strongly) disagree and 19% are not sure.

Figure 5.1 Place Identity of English Residents, 1998 (N=10,548)

To analyse how English residents feel at home the two dimensions of Sense of Place distinguished by Cuba and Hummon (1993) were used again to define four groups; those low in both social and physical attachment, those high in both dimensions, those high in social and low in physical attachment and vice versa. Both dimensions are positively correlated \((r=.25)\) but the weak association indicates that there are respondents in all four combinations.
Table 5.1 Cross-Classification Frequencies of Bonded (Social Attachment) and Rooted (Physical Attachment) Scores in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N=10,119)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonding 1998</th>
<th>Rootedness 1998</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>4,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>3,852</td>
<td>5,584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>10,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English experience their neighbourhood in a similar way to the Dutch. The most common combination in England is high social and physical attachment; more than a third (38%) of English residents feel at home in the place where they live and with the people that live there. Contrary to these residents is a group of 22% that does not show any attachment to their neighbourhood and neighbours. A further 17% is only socially attached, while 23% experience only physical attachment. These percentages are very similar to the Dutch data: at first sight there is not much difference in the way Dutch and English resident attach to their neighbourhoods.

Figure 5.2 Sense of Place by location in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N=10,548)
However, how residents feel about their neighbourhood does not differ a great deal between deprived and non-deprived areas, which is contrary to the Dutch findings. Only residents living in one of the New Deal for Community-areas have less physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood and are more often rooted than bonded to their community. Place appears to matter less for senses of place in England than in the Netherlands.

5.3 Why and Where Do We Feel at Home? Place Affiliations and Locus of Place Identity

To understand why English residents feel more at home in one place than the other, their place affiliations were investigated. Firstly, data on community satisfaction was used to link different aspects of the neighbourhood to residents’ place attachments.

Table 5.2 Sense of Place by Community Satisfaction in the United Kingdom, 1998, in % (N=10,548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Identity, 1998</th>
<th>Low Rootedness, Low Bonding</th>
<th>Low Rootedness, High Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness, Low Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness, High Bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with house/flat</td>
<td>(Completely) satisfied</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of area for raising children</td>
<td>Excellent /Good</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of local services: Schools</td>
<td>Excellent /Good</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of local services: Leisure</td>
<td>Excellent /Good</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of local services: Medical</td>
<td>Excellent /Good</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of local services: Transport</td>
<td>Excellent /Good</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of local services: Shopping</td>
<td>Excellent /Good</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows that residents with low physical and social attachment to their neighbourhood are generally more dissatisfied with their house and neighbourhood. In particular, they find their neighbourhood less suitable for children. Contrary to this, residents with high levels of rootedness and bonding show the highest amount...
of satisfaction on all neighbourhood services, and are most happy with their house. The main differences in attachment are related to satisfaction with the present home and the suitability of the area for raising children, including the standard of local schools.

Differences in satisfaction with local transport are related to the rootedness of residents: residents who are more satisfied with their local transport display high levels of rootedness, while less rooted residents are more dissatisfied with the possibilities to move in and out of the neighbourhood. Where in the Netherlands these differences were related to the amount of social bonding of residents, in the United Kingdom public transport is linked to the physical attachment of English residents. Does this relate to a different function of public transport for the emotional ties of Dutch and English residents? Is public transport a meeting place for Dutch residents, while the English residents value it more as a mode of transport enabling them to return to the place they feel most attached to?

Discriminant analyses confirm these finding: satisfaction with ones present house or flat and the suitability of the area to raise children account for the majority of differences in attachment between residents. A separate discriminant function is constructed for local transport, indicating that the mobility in and out of the neighbourhood is a unique discriminator for physical attachment.

Next to the evaluation of different services within the neighbourhood, different levels of place identity might be related to different place attachments of residents. Following Cuba and Hummon (1993), two levels of place affiliation were constructed to identify different loci of place identity: dwelling and community. Do residents feel more at home in the neighbourhood because of their house or the community where they live? In the British Household Panel Survey respondents were asked to rate the importance of owning their house. This question was used as an indicator for the lower level of place identity; residents who stress the importance of owning their house are more prone to locate their place identity at the dwelling level. For the community-based level a scale was constructed using two questions in which residents are asked if their neighbourhood is a good or bad place to live and whether they are willing to improve their neighbourhood. While the first question assesses their affective relationship with
the neighbourhood, the second question indicates a mobilization potential based on
the identification with their community.

Table 5.3 Sense of Place by Loci of Identity in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N=10,548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Identity, 1998</th>
<th>Sense of Place 1998</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Rootedness, Low Bonding</td>
<td>Low Rootedness, High Bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling High</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community High</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>1,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the Dutch residents, there are differences in loci of place identity and these
differences relate to different senses of place. More residents locate their identity
at the dwelling level (on average 79% versus 70% at the community level), however
both types of loci co-exist; the majority of residents identify both with their
dwelling and their community. Although, for residents who do not strongly identify
with their house is it more common to identify with their community.

Figure 5.3 Locus of Identity by Location in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N=10,548)
Residents in deprived areas identify more often only with their dwelling or do not locate their place identity at all with the neighbourhood, while residents in non-deprived areas identify more often with the community or both their community and dwelling. Residents were not only asked if they thought their neighbourhood was a good or bad place to live but also why they thought this. Each resident could name a maximum of six reasons. The different answers were categorised according to four different themes and ranked from positive to negative and neutral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive: Family, Friends, Neighbours,</td>
<td>10,514</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive: Local Facilities and Services</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive: Crime and Security</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive: Other Area Characteristics</td>
<td>6,625</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Family, Friends, Neighbours,</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Local Facilities and Services</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Crime and Security</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Other Area Characteristics</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Responses</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,378</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>250.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost every resident mentions the people that live in their neighbourhood as a positive reason to live there themselves, be it family, friends, neighbours or other people. Of all the reason given, this is the most common explanation given for a neighbourhood to be a good place to live (40%). A third of the residents quoted local facilities as reason to feel positively attached to their neighbourhood, while a quarter lists (the lack of) crime and security in their area as an explanation for their positive verdict. Negative reasons are much less stated; only 29% of the residents offer an explanation for their negative feelings towards their neighbourhood, of which crime and (lack of) security are most often mentioned. 5% of the residents prefer to stay neutral and offer no particular good or bad reason to live in their neighbourhood.

The reasons for residents to feel good or bad about their neighbourhood can be used as more reliable indicators for place affiliations. Remember that community satisfaction and attachment can be distinct dimensions; some
individuals may be quite satisfied with their community without developing deeper emotional ties to the locale; others may express feelings of attachment to places they find less than satisfactory. Therefore, the positive reasons given by residents were regrouped according to the different place affiliation distinguished in chapter two.

Table 5.5 Place Affiliations of English residents, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Affiliations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate frequencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self (any combination)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (any combination)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends (any combination)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (any combination)</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (any combination)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaggregated frequencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family only</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community only</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most common combinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Community</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Community</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Organisation</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation and Dwelling</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(10,478)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents’ positive affection is most often based on the (social) community (95%) where they live. Their neighbours matter considerably more in their assessment than social-emotional ties with family (8%) and friends (4%) living in the area. Second to their community affection, is the way they generally feel about themselves. If residents are happy with the life they are living, then for one in ten of them this rubs off on their affection for their neighbourhood. These findings confirm that place attachment is much more a social construct than an individual state of mind. When these responses are disaggregated community affection remains the single most important reason for resident to feel positively attached to their neighbourhood (74%). The presence of family only accounts for 5% of the reasons why people think their neighbourhood is a good place to live. The most common combination of place affiliations is self- and community-related: 9% of the residents feel attached to their neighbourhood, because they are generally happy and they affiliate with their community.
5.4 Personal Characteristics

In order to understand what kinds of residents make up each of four senses of place, socio-demographic characteristics were compared among the four groups.

Table 5.6 Mean Socio-Demographics by Sense of Place in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N=10,548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Place 1998</th>
<th>Low Rootedness, Low Bonding</th>
<th>Low Rootedness, High Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness, Low Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness, High Bonding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>7790.66</td>
<td>11378.74</td>
<td>5331.01</td>
<td>8157.58</td>
<td>8347.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>46.16</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>47.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income is based on annual labour income; age is measured in years; education is measured in increments from no qualifications (=1) to higher degree (=12); children is 1 if no children are present in the household, 2 if one or more children are present. (N=10,548).

As with the Dutch data discriminant analyses were performed to discriminate between the four groups: firstly, by comparing the two low-rooted groups of residents with the two high-rooted groups, followed by a comparison between the two low-bonded and the two high-bonded groups of residents, and lastly by examining both dimensions together. Comparing residents with low and high levels of Rootedness, education and age are the major discriminators among those physically attached to their neighbourhood. Comparing residents on the social dimension of attachment shows age again as the main discriminating characteristic. The other characteristics contribute to a lesser extent to the differences between residents with low and high levels of bonding to their neighbourhood.

Comparing residents on both dimensions simultaneously, the three of the four demographic variables combine to significantly discriminate among the attachment groups: age, education and income, although age is the biggest contributor to the different senses of places of residents in England. Interestingly and contrary to the Dutch population, having children makes no difference for the way residents feel attached to their neighbourhood. While for Dutch residents having children increases their rootedness to the neighbourhood, having children does not make the neighbourhood more emotionally significant for the English residents.
Thus the different senses of place of English residents can be characterised as followed. People low in both types of attachment are younger adults with moderate education (Commercial qualifications/ GCE O Levels) and relatively low income (at the present time). People who are high in social attachment but low in physical attachment are older, more educated adults (GCE Levels) with a higher income to spend. People who are high in physical attachment but low in social involvement are also older but less educated and with the least money to spend. Finally, residents who display high levels of both social and physical attachment are older, moderately educated people (Commercial qualifications/ GCE O Levels) who have more money to spend.

These results are largely comparable with the socio-demographic attachment profiles that were constructed for the Dutch residents, except for their family status. However, there are differences in education qualifications between the four senses of place in England and the Netherlands. Residents at the extreme ends of the scale, with the lowest and highest levels of attachment are less educated in the UK, compared to their Dutch counterparts.

5.5 Social Interactions and Community Involvement

In the reviewed literature the importance of social action and interaction for place attachment is emphasized. Earlier research suggests that local social involvements, particularly those with friends, but also those involving kin, organizational memberships, and local shopping, are significant sources of sentimental ties to local places. Who and what matters most for the place where we live? In the British Household Panel Survey residents were asked how often they are physically active (walk, swim and play sports), go out (watch live sport, go to the cinema, theatre, a concert and out for a meal or drink), stay in (work in the garden, DIY and car maintenance), attend evening classes and local groups, or do voluntary work. Except for the question on local group attendance, the answers provided by the residents do not tell us anything about the places where they spend their time. Therefore, it is unknown whether these activities take place in or outside the neighbourhood. To assess their local social involvement a scale was constructed,
using six items, in which respondents were asked if they were active in tenant groups or any other community or social group and whether they were a member of any of these groups. The answers were added up into one variable for local social involvement indicating the amount of groups in which residents were active in and of which they were a member. The variables show that the majority of residents (78%) are not active or a member in any group; only 9% are active or a member of one particular group, while 11% are active or a member in two local groups.

Table 5.7 Social Participation by Sense of Place in the United Kingdom, 1998 in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Low Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>Low Rootedness High Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness Low Bonding</th>
<th>High Rootedness High Bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk, swim, play sport</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch live sport</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the cinema</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to theatre/concert</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat out</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go out for a drink</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in the garden</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIY, car maintenance</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend evening classes</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend local groups</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do voluntary work</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,548)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working in the garden is the main discriminator between high and low levels of rootedness, followed by doing DIY and car maintenance; jobs in and around the house contribute to and signal the physical attachment of residents to their neighbourhood. By doing these jobs they claim the space, make it their own place and develop an affection for the neighbourhood. Furthermore, it strengthens the social-emotional bonds of residents: residents who often work in the garden show high levels of bonding. Residents with high social attachment also attend local groups more often and are active or a member in one or more local groups.

This outcome contradicts the earlier finding that other people in the neighbourhood are the main reason for residents to feel at home in the area where they live. Apparently, there is a difference in what residents say makes them feel at home and what residents do to make them feel at home in the neighbourhood.
Discriminant analyses confirm that work in the garden is the main contributor to different senses of place. Comparing residents on both dimensions simultaneously reveals going to the cinema and eating or drinking out as additional discriminators between different senses of place. Residents who are both low in physical and social attachment visit the cinema more often; while Dutch residents with low levels of attachment visit the pub, English residents prefer the cinema as a hideaway from their neighbourhood. Residents with strong bonds to the neighbourhood eat out more, indicating that this serves a social function for meeting neighbours in public restaurants, while going out for a drink is the preferred choice for more rooted residents. This might be due to the closer proximity of pubs in most English neighbourhoods, allowing residents to stay rather than escape their neighbourhood when they want to go out.

5.6 Do Places or People Matter?

In searching for the how, why and where of place attachment I have established differences between groups of residents. To establish the relative contribution of each explanation a multinomial regression analysis was performed on the four senses of place using demographic (age, children in the household), and geographic characteristics and various place affiliations variables (neighbourhood satisfaction and orientation, community involvement and social participation).

Although all factors contribute significantly to the explanation of different Senses of Place that UK residents’ experience, place identity is the most contributing factor. Compared with residents with strong place identities, residents with weak identities are over 32 times more likely to have little attachment to the people and places in their neighbourhood than to have strong physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood. Residents with weak place identities are 9.5 times more likely to attach only to their neighbours and 3.5 times more likely to attach only to the places in their neighbourhood, compared to having strong physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood. Other large contributors are locus of place identity, satisfaction with the house or flat and age. A lack of identification with the community or dwelling where people live increases their
odds of less attachment, both physical and social to the neighbourhood. In other
words the identification with either dwelling or community increases the chance of
high rootedness and high bonding.
Residents who do not identify with their community are 4.4 times more likely then
residents who identify with their community to have no attachment to their
neighbourhood. They are also 2.8 times more likely to only attach to the people in
their area, compared to being strongly rooted and bonded to the neighbourhood.
The same hold true for (lack of) identification with the dwelling; residents who do
not identify with their dwelling are 4.6 times more likely to only feel rooted in
their neighbourhood as a place, and 3.4 times more likely to have no physical and
social ties to their neighbourhood, compared to being highly rooted and bonded to
the neighbourhood. Interestingly, a lack of dwelling-based identity increases more
strongly the odds for less attachment to the people in the neighbourhood, while a
lack of community-based identity increases the odds for less physical attachment
to the neighbourhood.
In other words, identifying with your dwelling increases the chance of feeling
attached to your neighbours, while identification with your community makes it
more likely for UK residents to feel physically attached to their neighbourhood.
Similar results are visible for satisfaction with ones house or flat; compared with
residents who are highly satisfied with their home, residents who are unsatisfied
with the house of flat in which they live are more than 3 times as likely to have no
attachment or only physical attachments to their neighbourhood, than to have
strong physical and social attachments to their neighbourhood.
This outcome explains the earlier found discrepancy in the motives residents
reported for feeling at home; while residents say that other people are the key
factor in making them feel most at home in their neighbourhood, the analyses
showed that time spent in and around the house is more important for the amount
of attachment. This discrepancy is caused by the different levels at which residents
identify with their neighbourhood: time in and around the house increases mainly
the social attachment, while an appreciation of the wider community stimulates
the physical attachment of residents. Therefore, when resident say they feel at
home because of their neighbours, they refer to their rootedness, while their
passions for gardening and DIY is an indication of their bonding to the neighbourhood.

Of the demographic variables in the analyses, age and education have a substantial effect on the senses of place of UK residents. Young residents (below their thirties) are 3 times more likely as residents in their sixties to have no social and physical ties to their neighbourhood or only physical ones. When compared to residents with secondary education, residents with no qualifications are 2 times more likely to feel only physically attached to their neighbourhood or hardly any attachment at all.

Socio-geographic characteristics have much more of an impact than social-demographic differences on the way UK residents feel attached to their neighbourhood: place appears to matter more than people. However, people still play an important role in defining the importance of place, which can be witnessed in the effect of place affiliations on the odds-ratios for different senses of place. Residents who have no friends to affiliate them to the neighbourhood are almost 3 times more likely to have low attachments to their neighbourhood, while residents with a lack of family ties to the neighbourhood are 1.8 times more likely to be only socially attached, compared to being highly rooted and bonded to the neighbourhood.
Table 5.8 Odds-Ratios of Sense of Place in the United Kingdom by Place Identity, Place Affiliations, Locus of Place Identity, Satisfaction, Social Participation and Community Involvement, Children, Education, Income and Age in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N = 4,451).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Rootedness</th>
<th>Low Rootedness</th>
<th>High Rootedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Bonding</td>
<td>High Bonding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High</td>
<td>32.756***</td>
<td>9.527***</td>
<td>3.486***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral versus High</td>
<td>8.571***</td>
<td>4.930***</td>
<td>1.908***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Family-related</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>1.806**</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus Family-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Friends-related</td>
<td>2.994**</td>
<td>1.697(*)</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus Friends-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Organisation-related</td>
<td>.528*</td>
<td>.675***</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus Organisation-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Dwelling-based</td>
<td>3.357***</td>
<td>1.260(*)</td>
<td>4.562***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus Dwelling-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Community-related</td>
<td>4.402***</td>
<td>2.754***</td>
<td>1.564**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versus Community-related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with house/flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High</td>
<td>3.338***</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>3.081***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium versus High</td>
<td>2.106***</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>2.346***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Community Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.395**</td>
<td>1.357***</td>
<td>.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Versus High Going Out</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>1.577**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Staying in</td>
<td>1.514***</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>1.316**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Volunteer Work</td>
<td>1.628*</td>
<td>1.303(*)</td>
<td>1.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low versus High Community Involvement</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>1.369**</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Children Under 12 Present in Household versus Present</td>
<td>.753*</td>
<td>.811(*)</td>
<td>.726*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No QF/ Still in school versus Secondary</td>
<td>1.858***</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>2.243***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary versus Secondary</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>.832(*)</td>
<td>1.459**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No income versus &gt;£4,388</td>
<td>.723*</td>
<td>.554***</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1.00-£3,040 versus &gt;£4,388</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.676**</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-30 Years versus &gt; 60 Years</td>
<td>2.941***</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>3.141***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-42 versus &gt; 60 Years</td>
<td>1.641*</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-59 versus &gt; 60 Years</td>
<td>1.336(*)</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>7370.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R Square (Cox and Snell)</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference category for the equation is High Rootedness, High Bonding

(*) p < .1 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)
The figure below shows a summary of the most contributing factors for differences in place attachment between English residents.

Figure 5.2 Most Contributing Factors to Differences in Place Attachments for English residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification with Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Physical Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Social Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of Neighbourhood for Raising Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent In and Around House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 Patterns of Place Attachment

Similar to the previous chapter, the different dimensions of place attachment were combined into four clusters that replicate the four senses of place distinguished by Hummon (1992) is his attempt to unite different research approaches to social-emotional ties.

1. **Community Rootedness**: high satisfaction, local sense of home, local identification and attachment;
2. **Alienation**: low satisfaction, no sense of home, no local identification and attachment;
3. **Relativity**: variable satisfaction, variable sense of home, local identification but marginal attachment; and
4. **Placelessness**: moderate satisfaction, marginal sense of home, no local identification and marginal attachment.
For a more detailed description of Hummon’s senses of place, I refer to paragraph 4.7 in the previous chapter. To replicate the four patterns a 2K-Clusteranalysis was performed, combining the different dimensions of place attachment that have been discussed separately above (place identity, senses of place, place affiliations and locus of place identity, plus community satisfaction and social participation) to distinguish four different clusters of residents.

Table 5.9 Patterns of Place attachment in the United Kingdom, 1998 (N=10,548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attachment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attachment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-related</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Satisfaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying In</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of UK residents</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than a quarter of the UK residents can be characterized as community rooted. They identify with and are physically and socially attached to the neighbourhood they live in. They like their neighbourhood for the people and friends that live there and identify both with the house they live in and with the community they are part of. Their community rootedness is further illustrated by a relatively strong involvement in the neighbourhood and a preference for spending their social time in rather than outside the neighbourhood. Not surprisingly, they show the highest satisfaction with their community.

A much smaller proportion of the English residents (compared to Dutch residents) feel exactly the opposite: displaced, alienated and unhappy with their neighbourhood. They identify less with their neighbourhood and show less physically and social attachment to where they live. They like their neighbourhood more for the family that lives there, than other people. They are less involved with
their neighbourhood and their social participation is below average, both inside and outside the neighbourhood.

Twenty percent of the English residents have no special affection for their neighbourhood, labelled as placelessness, although bordering more on the negative side than the Dutch. The neighbourhood is for them an indifferent place: they like the people that live there, but do not feel attached to or identify with the neighbourhood. They are less likely to be involved in their neighbourhood and are keener on social participation outside then inside the neighbourhood.

Finally, 15% of the English residents show affection for their neighbourhood in that they identify with it and appreciate the neighbourhood and its neighbours, but they are not especially attached to it by social-emotional ties. They are, contrary to their Dutch counterparts, less involved in their neighbourhood and prefer to spend their social time outside the neighbourhood. They have a sense of place to their neighbourhood that can be classified as relativity.

Compared to the Dutch, English residents feel less alienated from their neighbourhood, although the residents who are more indifferent (placelessness) to their neighbourhood display more negative affections for their area than their Dutch counterpart.

Figure 5.4 Attachment Patterns by Location, 1998 (N=10,548)
Overall, the clusters in the English data show lower levels of community satisfaction and social participation is generally lower. Similar to the Netherlands, the four pattern of attachment are not equally distributed over the English cities. Although all four senses of place are found in every English city, residents in deprived areas, particularly in the New Deal for Communities areas, experience alienation more often, while residents who live in neighbourhoods with little or no deprivation are more often rooted in their community. Again, residents in the most deprived areas show the lowest amount of placelessness: living in these areas leaves less space for indifference and neutral feelings towards the neighbourhood. Living in deprived neighbourhood has an ‘affect’ on residents, whether positive (community rootedness) or negative (alienation). Finally and contrary to the Dutch, feelings of relativity are more equally distributed around the country.

5.8 Place Attachment in Time

The analyses in the previous paragraphs give us a clearer understanding of how, why and where people feel at home and how residents in urban renewal areas differ in their emotional ties from residents in more affluent areas. However, to research the effect urban renewal has on the social-emotional ties of English residents we need to compare residents over time. Therefore, in the next paragraph different senses of place and different patterns of attachment are tracked through time. An added bonus of the British Household Panel Survey data is that it is possible to track individuals through time, allowing for stronger assumptions about causality. The cross-sectional nature of the Dutch data allowed only for longitudinal analyses at neighbourhood level, making it more difficult to distinguish cause and effect. With the BHPS data, I was able to look at individual residents and their changes in place attachment and to analyse what caused these changes.

For these analyse data from 1998 to 2003 were used. Although the BHPS has collected data annually from 1991 onwards, the topic list varies over the years and some topics are only covered periodically (because large changes over time are not expected and therefore there is no need to ask these questions every year). The questions on neighbourhood characteristics, which are relevant for my research,
appeared in wave 8 (1998) and 13 (2003) and were compared in longitudinal analyses. Do the social-emotional ties of British residents change over time and are urban renewal areas affected differently?

Table 5.10 Change in Place Identity, Rootedness and Bonding for English residents between 1998 and 2003, in % (N=5,624)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Place Identity</th>
<th>Rootedness</th>
<th>Bonding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of British residents experience no change in their belonging to their neighbourhood, 12% are less attached, while 17% identify more with the place where they live. Similar changes are visible in the ways residents attach to their neighbourhood: 14% feels less connected to the people and 8% less to the place where they live, while 13% increased their bonding with and rootedness to the neighbourhood. Place identity shows the largest changes with 29% of residents identifying differently with their neighbourhood five years later. Changes in place identity appear not to be related to location; there are no significant differences between the deprived (NDC and 86 most deprived areas) and non-deprived areas.

Differences in change are more pronounced for senses of place. In New Deal-areas residents with low physical and social attachment to their neighbourhood more often increase their affection for their neighbourhood, while residents living in one of the 86 most deprived areas of the UK more often lose their affection when, particularly when they are strongly bonded to and rooted in their community. In non-deprived areas most change occurs for residents who only feel attached to their neighbours; more often they lose their affection for their neighbours than increase it.
Changes in patterns of place attachment are more frequent with 85% of the UK residents altering the way they feel about their neighbourhood between 1998 and 2003. Residents who feel rooted in their community change most often (43%), while residents who experience alienation towards their community are the least likely to change (6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has changed between 1998 and 2003?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placelessness</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativity</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rootedness</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direction of change is mostly towards less attachment; a large number of the residents who felt indifferent towards their neighbourhood (placelessness) in 1998 admits 5 years later to feel displaced and alienated from their area, while a similar group of residents who identified with their neighbourhood in 1998, without having strong attachments to it (relativity), were indifferent to their community in 2003.
A similar trend is visible for residents who felt strongly rooted in their community in 1998; 5 years later a considerable number of these residents take a more relative stand towards their community.

Figure 5.6 Changes in Attachment Patterns for English residents, 1998-2003 (N=5,624)

The declining trend in patterns of identification and attachment is less severe in the most deprived areas. Particularly in the New Deal for Community-areas, more residents lose their feelings of alienation to the neighbourhood and change to placelessness than in the other deprived and non-deprived areas.
Is this a proof of success for the New Deal-approach? Are New Deal partnerships stopping residents from feeling displaced and alienated?

This requires more research into the causes of these changes. Therefore and similar to the Dutch data, regression analyses (with first-order auto-correlated errors) were performed on the changes in physical and social attachment of English residents between 1998 and 2003 using the different explanations offered separately before. To research more clearly the effect of each explanation on the emotional ties of residents, the variables were regressed on the change in place attachment between 1998 and 2003. Also, for each explanation new variables were constructed measuring the change in these variables in the same period, effectively relating changes to the explanatory variables to changes in the independent variables. Which changing characteristics of English residents between 1998 and 2003 explain best their altered affection for the neighbourhood where they live 5 years onwards? Which changes matter most for their Physical and Social Attachments? The different explanations are again tested in 3 nested models, with each step adding new explanations and increasing the complexity of the model. In the first model the different dimensions of place attachment were tested, while in the second model residents’ satisfaction, social participation and involvement in
Social Housing and Urban Renewal in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom

the local community are added to the analyses. Finally, the third model adds geographical and demographical characteristics of residents.

Table 5.12 Auto-Regression Coefficients for Change in Physical Attachment for English residents (Rootedness), 1998-2003 (N=5,624)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998 Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rho (AR1)</strong></td>
<td>.212***</td>
<td>.170***</td>
<td>.124***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong></td>
<td>.280***</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.111(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Affiliations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-related</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related</td>
<td>.496*</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.483*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation-related</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Place Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td>.024(*)</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>.232***</td>
<td>.205***</td>
<td>.134***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with House/flat</td>
<td>.246***</td>
<td>.205***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Community</td>
<td>.161*</td>
<td>.122*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going Out</td>
<td>-.108(*)</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying In</td>
<td>.199***</td>
<td>.059(*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Work</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Household</td>
<td>-.135**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Qualification</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Labour Income</td>
<td>-6.40E-006*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.236(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mover</td>
<td>-.2.314***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood (Residual)</td>
<td>-10.544</td>
<td>-7.437</td>
<td>-6.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) p < .1 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

The results confirm that place identity is an important predictor for changes in rootedness, although the strength of this predictor decreases when other explaining variables are entered and even becomes insignificant in the third model which includes demographic and geographic characteristics. Two predictors that remain strong in all three models are a community-based locus of identity and a community-related place affiliation; if residents identify with their neighbourhood
and like to live in their neighbourhood because of the community they have there, then they will display stronger physical attachments to their neighbourhood. The model improves significantly when satisfaction with the house and the community are added and social participation is included, particularly whether residents tend to spend time in and around the housing, doing DIY or cleaning the car. Increasing satisfaction with the house and time spent in the house increase the rootedness of residents in their neighbourhood.

However, the effect of spending time in the house disappears when demographic and geographic characteristic are added to the model: the number of children in the house and the income earned by the parents become more significant. More children and more money equals more rootedness and explains the effect of time spent in the house, since larger and richer family spend more time in their neighbourhood.

Although as with the Dutch, the most contributing factor in the final model is whether residents have moved in the period between 1998 and 2000. If they stayed in their house and neighbourhood their rootedness is more than double that of resident who moved houses. Again and similar to the Dutch, this only affects residents’ physical ties to the neighbourhood. When the same models are tested for changes in social attachments between 1998 and 2003, moving has no effect on the social bonds of residents to their area.
Table 5.13 Auto-Regression Coefficients for Change in Social Attachment (Bonding) for English residents, 1998-2003 (N=5,624)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998 Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rho (AR1)</td>
<td>.061***</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td>.080**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>.402***</td>
<td>.368***</td>
<td>.361***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.071*</td>
<td>.074*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends-related</td>
<td>.086(*)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-related</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation-related</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
<td>-.111*</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Place Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td>3.37E-005</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>.119***</td>
<td>.139***</td>
<td>.142***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with House/flat</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>.106***</td>
<td>.105***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going Out</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying In</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Work</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children in Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.053**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Labour Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.52E-006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood (Residual)</td>
<td>-5,360</td>
<td>-3,730</td>
<td>-3,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) p < .1  * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 (two-tailed tests)

Again, place identity is a strong predictor and stays strong and significant in all three models. The same holds true for community-based place identities, although Community-related place affiliations have no effect on the bonding of residents to their neighbourhood; only a fondness of the house and judging it a good investment (dwelling-related) matter as a place affiliation for social attachment. When satisfaction and social participation are added to the model for bonding, only satisfaction with the community increases the social attachments of residents; surprisingly social participation and community involvement are not important for the bonding of residents to their neighbourhood. When demographic and geographic details are entered into the third model, the number of children and
the amount of income prove once again significant for the place attachment of residents; when family and income grow larger, they feel more socially and physically at home in the neighbourhood. Finally, in the second and third model a long-standing connection to the area and feeling safe in the neighbourhood (self-related place affiliations) strengthens the social bonds of residents to the area where they live.

If moving reduces physical attachment does it matter where residents move to? And is their move related to the way the felt attached to the place where they used to live? More than a third of the residents changed houses between 1998 and 2003 and the majority of them stayed within the same Local Authority District, only 4% moved away from deprived areas, while 10% exchanged one deprived area for another.

Table 5.14 Where do English residents move to between 1998 and 2003?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where moved to</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Moved</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved within same Local Authority District</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved within 86 Most Deprived Areas</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved Outside Deprived Areas</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,622</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,624</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents who moved outside a deprived area show the largest decline of physical attachment and the highest amount of low physical and social attachment in their new neighbourhood. Residents who moved felt considerably less rooted in the community in 1998 and more alienated from the place where they lived, especially if they changed houses in the same local authority district. Residents who moved outside deprived areas felt more often detached from their neighbourhood (placelessness); they identified with it, but did not feel attached to it.
Figure 5.8 Residents Movements by Sense of Place in the United Kingdom, 1998-2003 (N=5,622)

Figure 5.9 Resident Movements by Attachment Pattern in the United Kingdom, 1998-2003 (N=5,622)
5.9 Discussion

In this chapter I have explored the emotional ties of English residents, comparing and tracking through time the place attachments of residents in deprived and non-deprived areas. By using data from the British Household Panel Survey, I was able to analyse differences at the individual level of residents. The results indicate that English residents experience their neighbourhood in a similar way to Dutch residents. More than a third of English residents felt at home in the place where they lived and with the people who lived there. On the other side of the spectrum was a group of 22% who did not show any attachment to their neighbourhood and neighbours. The middle positions were occupied by a further 17% who was only socially attached, and a group of 23% who experienced only physical attachment.

While in the Netherlands, residents in deprived areas felt less attached to their neighbourhood, residents in the UK showed similar levels of attachment to the people and places in their neighbourhood. What differed in England was the level at which residents identify with their neighbourhood. Residents in deprived areas identify more often only with their dwelling or do not locate their place identity at all with the neighbourhood. Differences in identification with the neighbourhood strongly affected the emotional ties of English residents; identification with either dwelling or community increased the chance of high rootedness and high bonding to the neighbourhood considerably.

Other differences in attachment were related to age, satisfaction with the present home and the suitability of the area for raising children, including the standard of local schools. Interestingly and contrary to the Dutch population, having children made no difference for the way residents feel attached to their neighbourhood. While for Dutch residents having children increases their rootedness to the neighbourhood, having children does not make the neighbourhood more emotionally significant for the English residents.

Another difference with Dutch residents was a much lower level of community involvement among English residents; the vast majority of English residents are not active or a member in any group and therefore community involvement played no major role in social-emotional ties of residents to their
neighbourhood. What mattered more for English residents, was their social participation, especially spending time in and around the house (working in the garden, doing DIY and car maintenance). This was strongly related to high levels of physical attachment; by spending time around the house residents claimed that space, made it their own place and developed an affection for their neighbourhood.

By adding community satisfaction and social participation to the different dimensions of place attachment, the four patterns of place attachment constructed in chapter four for Dutch residents were replicated for the English data. Compared to the Dutch, English residents felt less alienated from their neighbourhood, although the residents who were more indifferent (placelessness) to their neighbourhood displayed more negative affections for their area than their Dutch counterparts. Overall, the clusters in the English data showed lower levels of community satisfaction and social participation is generally lower. Residents in the New Deal for Communities areas experiencing alienation more often, while residents in neighbourhoods with little or no deprivation felt more often rooted in their community. Similar to the Netherlands, residents in the most deprived areas showed the lowest amount of placelessness; living in these areas leaves less space for indifference and neutral feelings towards the neighbourhood.

To analyse the relationship between urban renewal and the place attachment in England, the social-emotional ties of individual residents were tracked through time. The results demonstrated that the majority of British residents experienced no change in their belonging and attachments to their neighbourhood. However, in the New Deal-areas, residents with low physical and social attachment more often increased their affection for their neighbourhood, while in the non-deprived areas most change occurred for residents who only felt attached to their neighbours; these residents more often lost their affection for their neighbours than that they increased it.

Changes in patterns of place attachment between 1998 and 2003 were more frequent with 85% of the UK residents altering the way the feel about their neighbourhood. Residents who felt rooted in their community changed most often, while residents who experience alienation towards their community were the least likely to change. Contrary to the Netherlands, the direction of change was mostly
towards less attachment: a large number of the residents who felt indifferent towards their neighbourhood (placelessness) in 1998 admitted five years later feeling displaced and alienated from their area. A similar trend was visible for the other patterns. Interestingly, the declining trend in patterns of identification and attachment was less severe in the most deprived areas. Particularly in the New Deal for Community-areas, more residents lost their feelings of alienation to the neighbourhood and changed to placelessness than in the other deprived and non-deprived areas.

Analysing the factors causing changes in emotional ties showed that again moving house is the best predictor for losing physical attachments to the neighbourhood. Similar to the Dutch data, this only affects residents’ physical ties to the neighbourhood. However, what matters most for social bonds of English residents is identification with the area, especially at the level of the community. The most contributing factors to the place attachments of English residents to their neighbourhood are summed up in the table below.

Figure 5.9 Most Contributing Factors to Place Attachments of English Residents (1998-2003)

The figure illustrates that place identity and identification with the community play a much larger role in the emotional ties of English residents to their neighbourhood compared to the Dutch. For English residents, the neighbourhood is
much more part of their personal identity, while, for the Dutch residents, the
neighbourhood is more important for developing and maintaining social contacts.
What causes the different place of the neighbourhood in the emotional make-up of
English and Dutch residents? Are these differences related to structural and
contextual differences in the housing sectors of both countries? Are different
housing and social urban policies responsible for the more personal affection of
English residents for the neighbourhood? Conversely, are politicians and urban
professionals aware of the importance of identification with the neighbourhood
and, if so, how do try to influence the place identity of residents in deprived areas?
Therefore, in the next chapter social housing and urban policy in both countries
will be compared, with particular attention for the role of emotional ties and place
identity in English housing.
6. Social Housing and Urban Renewal in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter the main differences are discussed between Dutch and English social housing in line with the urban policy in both countries. Knowledge of these differences is necessary to be able to compare research results between the two countries. Are differences in place attachments between Dutch and English residents related to differences in social housing and urban policy, or are the issues faced by English politicians and urban professionals radically different, affecting the place attachments of English residents in a very different way (also in the attention to emotional ties in urban policies)? The main focus is on England in this chapter because I assume the reader is more familiar with the Dutch literature on social housing and urban policy and is more interested in the English case.

6.2 Housing in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

Just like the Netherlands, England has a large social rented housing sector, which is even bigger than the private rented housing sector. The main forms of housing in Britain are owner-occupation, local authority housing and private rented housing. Registered social landlords operate in the area of social renting, alongside local authorities and are independent from government. These are often small corporations that manage no more than 250 houses. In total, 1,388 housing associations are active in England but the vast majority of the market is in the hands of a number of “big guys”. Four percent of the corporations own 52% of the

---

12 My research focuses on one of the four countries of the United Kingdom, England, although I will use the terms English, British and the UK interchangeably, referring to the country of England, unless otherwise stated (see also footnote 1).
housing stock. The housing associations mainly serve the lower income groups with 83% of their customers entitled to housing benefits. Within the various forms of living, important shifts have occurred in the 20th century.

The percentage of owner occupation has increased from 10 to 67% of the housing stock. This went at the expense of the privately rented market that saw its share drop from 90 to less than 10%. The social rental sector, mainly consisting of council housing, increased to a third of the housing stock, only to decrease again to 25 per cent.

Table 6.1 Housing stock divided into ownership form for the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership forms</th>
<th>UK Housing Tenure, 2006</th>
<th>Dutch Housing Tenure, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupation</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to England, there is a relatively small percentage of owner occupation in the Netherlands. On the other hand, the social housing sector is very large. 41 percent of the housing stock consists of social housing, compared to 25 percent in Britain. The Netherlands has 783 housing corporations that collectively possess 2.4 million housing units. Compared to England, the Dutch housing stock is young and in relatively good constructional shape. The quality of social housing led to this sector being widely accessible and far less stigmatised as being exclusively for the poor than in England. As a result, the threshold to buy a house is high in the Netherlands, compared to other European countries. Only in the highest quarter of the income division does the majority own a house even though it must be stated that this is currently changing. Because the public housing sector is so large in the Netherlands, there is a different distinction between renting and buying there. The division of incomes is still stronger in England than it is in the Netherlands. In England, the share of owner occupation in the lowest income deciles is smaller than in the Netherlands, whereas in the highest income deciles there is more owner occupation than in the Netherlands.

Table 6.2 Date of construction of Dutch and English housing stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of construction</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>The United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1945</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-1959</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 or later</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>(1985 or later)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Both housing markets show comparable developments in the second half of the 20th century. The role municipalities play in the allocation of accommodation becomes increasingly smaller in favour of (privatised) housing corporations. The central government tightens the financial leash in the 1980s and 90s and tries to stimulate the market focus. (In the Netherlands “the golden strings” between the government and housing corporations are eventually cut and housing corporations become independent private associations). Control is increasingly handed over to
central bodies such as the Housing Corporation, the National Housing Council (NWR) and the Central Housing Fund (CFV). Individual citizens become increasingly subject to centralised control. To a large extent, building subsidies for housing projects make way for individual rental support (housing benefits). Furthermore, the housing sectors in both countries have to deal with comparable problems. Accommodation that is dated and limited, particularly in big cities, the degeneration of central district in big cities, not enough staff in the social housing sector and too little development in new housing projects; all these elements lead to a tight housing market.

Behind seemingly comparable developments in the Dutch and English social housing sector lay major differences between the two systems. These differences can be traced back partly to other historic developments in both countries. What follows is a short summary of the most important developments in the housing sector of post-war Britain, followed by a discussion of the post-war history of the Dutch housing sector.

6.3 A Short History of Social Housing and Policy in the United Kingdom

Local authority housing grew immensely after WWI and WWII (two million new houses after WWI, and four million houses after WWII) in order to satisfy the big need for houses. The working class was the major target group and the stigma associated with them is still more or less attached to council housing. The sector itself is partly to blame for this by mainly using council housing from 1930 onwards to accommodate people after slum clearances. After WWII, references to the working class are removed from documents and councils begin to concentrate on replacing the housing stock, particularly by demolishing old houses. They were mainly replaced by industrial high-rise buildings, heavily subsidised by government. Quantity was more important than quality. However, this does not automatically imply that nothing new was built anymore. Until the end of the 1970s, the sector has been responsible for the majority of production. In the early post-war period, a staggering 70 to 80% of the total English housing production was realised by the municipalities.
In the 1970s, the production of houses for the social housing sector diminished (for local authorities in particular) to around 50 per cent. In these years, the tide turned for council housing because the Conservative government under Thatcher (1979-mid 1990s) withdrew her support in favour of registered social landlords (RSL’s). In the 1970s and 1980s, the council housing sector moved to an increasingly marginal position and started to dedicate itself to welfare work and vulnerable groups. The government increasingly turned off the current of general subsidies and replaces them with an individual subsidy, the housing benefit. The role of local authority housing companies was pushed further back through regulations, like the ‘Right to Buy’ and ‘Pick Your Own Landlord’. Large parts of the municipal stock were passed on to independent housing associations (RSL’s) that were given an important role by the government. This preference was fed by the distrust the Conservative government has towards local governments, which were thought to be too bureaucratic, slow and over centralised. In contrast, RSL’s were perceived as varied and innovative participants in the market that also stimulated volunteer work. In 1988, the tide turned for RSL’s with the introduction of the Housing Act, which compelled RSL’s to invest their own money in addition to the government subsidies they already received. From then on, RSL’s had to make an effort to attract investors to finance them. By doing so, the government shirked its financial risk to the RSL’s and increasingly pulled back from the social rented housing sector.

In addition to the local authority housing stock being transferred to RSL’s, a large part of the social housing stock was sold to tenants in the 1980s. Today, seven out of ten houses in England are owner occupied. The bad and stigmatised reputation of the rental housing sector has led to people preferring to own their homes. Since 1980, 1.5 million households have been able to buy their own home thanks to these measures. Based on the number of years a house has been rented (with a minimum of two), people could get a discount of up to 70% on the sum of their house. People who are unable to find the purchase price in one go could use their rent as mortgage. The corporations were forced to co-operate and had to give huge discounts on the market value of the houses. This programme led to the best part of the social housing stock being sold and RSL’s having trouble keeping the quality up of the remaining stock. At the same time, the corporations’ financial reserves were siphoned off and rents increased considerably.
The quick changes in the 1980s caused a number of problems. The waiting list for social housing was long and residents became highly dependent on housing benefits. Encouraging owner occupation among the lower income groups led to many payment problems when rents rose dramatically at the end of the 1980s. Furthermore, people from the lower income groups experienced problems with the quality of their own homes. This group did not have sufficient means at their disposal to maintain their homes, leading to back repairs and overdue maintenance. Selling one’s home and returning to social housing was not an easy option, considering the long waiting lists. As a result of the problems, policies were changed drastically at the beginning of the 1990s. There was less support for owner occupation and only limited sale of the social rented housing stock.

6.4 New Labour: Social Exclusion, Liveability and Sustainable Communities

As illustrated in the previous paragraph, the (Conservative) UK government strongly believed in the benefits of privatisation in the eighties and early nineties of the last century: it sought to reduce the role of the public sector and to increase that of the private sector in relation to cities. It reduced many of local authorities’ powers and resources. Many local services were privatised or opened up to competitive tendering. Local control over revenue and capital spending was reduced, as was national financial support to local authorities. New players from the private and community sectors became involved in delivering urban services and urban regeneration. Although this resulted in an explicit national urban policy, it was not linked to mainstream programmes. The increased resources for the narrow urban programme were counteracted by reduced expenditure on mainstream programmes for cities and the allocation of resources on the basis of competition rather than need meant a highly fragmented local service provision. The impact of resources was diluted by being spread across too many initiatives.

Therefore, the Labour government, which took office in 1997, decided to change the rudder. They concluded that policymaking had become too centralised, bureaucratic and remote from local people. Furthermore, the creation of large numbers of quangos (quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisations) required
new ways of working between local, regional and national partners. Of great concern to the new government was a rapidly widening gap between poorer and richer urban neighbourhoods and regions combined with declining local voting, which demonstrated the need for democratic renewal, modernisation of local government and new forms of citizen engagement.

This has resulted in an enormous amount of activity and change in England’s urban policy during the past seven years. There has been a large number of independent and government reports assessing the conditions and prospects of English cities. The most notable include: Lord Rogers Task Force on Urban Renaissance (DETR, 1999), the government’s own white paper in 2000, Better Towns and Cities: Delivering an Urban Renaissance; the National Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy in 2001 (SEU, 2001) and The Sustainable Communities Plan in 2003 (ODPM, 2003). There have been white papers, green papers and legislation on housing, planning, regional government and local government. The papers produced different ground rules for urban policy, which largely opposed the policy effort of the past government in the eighties and nineties.

The government no longer regarded cities as liabilities but increasingly as economic opportunities and tried to improve working relationships and to reduce conflicts with cities. National resources to cities were increased and competition between cities for those resources was reduced, as well as controls over local authorities. It established a Social Exclusion Unit to address the problems of deprived neighbourhoods and launched a range of new area-based initiatives, like New Deal for Communities, Education Action Zones, Health Action Zones, Sure Start and Employment Zones. Of particular importance for this research is the New Deal for Communities (NDC) initiative.

Unlike the Zones and Sure Start, New Deal for Communities (NDC) focused on areas as a whole. It was designed as a catalyst for the intensive physical and social regeneration of specific low-income areas, premised on having residents involved in the design and conduct of the regeneration, “putting residents in the driving seat”. There are 39 NDC areas, each with around 4,500 homes. These areas were given £50m over ten years; how this is spent differs from area to area, following needs identified by residents and the NDC Board.
Furthermore, to improve the co-ordination of regional economic strategies and to provide a strategic framework for local regeneration programmes, the government set up business-led Regional Development Agencies. Finally, the government tried to integrate different departments by giving them joint targets for improved urban performance.

According to Caroline Paskell and Anne Power of CASE, who evaluated the local impacts of housing, environment and regeneration policy since 1997 (2005) three themes are central within the UK government’s thinking - ideas that have motivated its commitment to tackling urban and neighbourhood problems. These are: social exclusion, liveability, and sustainable communities. They are key to understanding the urban policies and initiatives of the Labour government.

Labour made clear in its bid for election in 1997 and from the start of its first term that addressing area-based deprivation would be a priority of office. It stated that the aim was to address not only poverty itself (in particular, child poverty) but also broader problems of disadvantage - the complex set of problems referred to as ‘social exclusion’. This had become prominent in Labour’s ideology in the years preceding the 1997 election and within four months of being in office, Peter Mandelson announced that the Cabinet Office would set up a ‘Social Exclusion Unit’ to develop cross-departmental policies for a problem that “is more than poverty and unemployment; it is being cut off from what the rest of us regard as normal life” (Mandelson cited in Paskell & Power, 2005).

The Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) was part of a wider effort to understand and address problems of specific places. This began with an overview of the problems faced by deprived neighbourhoods. In 1998 the SEU published an initial report Bringing Britain Together: A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (SEU, 1998). The report set out new initiatives to address multiple problems faced by low-income areas, and restructured the Single Regeneration Budget to fund these. The creation of the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) in April 2001 reaffirmed this focus on the needs of low-income areas. After further consultation the strategy was published as an action plan for addressing multiple problems in “the hundreds of severely deprived neighbourhoods” (SEU, 2001: 5) in England and Wales. It required local authorities in the 88 most deprived areas to set up local strategic
partnerships (LSPs) involving public, private, voluntary and community bodies to promote joint working and draw up local neighbourhood renewal strategies to improve deprived neighbourhoods. It set up a neighbourhood renewal fund\(^\text{13}\) to support improvements in mainstream service delivery in those areas and appointed neighbourhood managers. By establishing the Social Exclusion Unit and National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, the Labour government quickly identified local regeneration as crucial to improving Britain. The subsequent aim was that “within 10 to 20 years, no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live” (ibid.: 8). The government established a set of floor targets to improve economic and social conditions in the poorest neighbourhoods and convergence targets to close the gap between them and the average.

Better housing and physical environments were specific objectives within this broader goal (ibid: 8), but the government’s efforts to improve housing and local environments are framed not only by this concern with social exclusion, but also by concern for the areas’ quality of life or “liveability”. The government refers to this issue, how quality of life is affected by local conditions, as “liveability”. It sees this as something that is key to the management and renewal of low-income areas and also views it as relevant to other neighbourhoods, indeed to all neighbourhoods: “The quality of our public space affects the quality of all our lives … everybody’s local environment should be cleaner, safer and greener”. (ODPM, 2002: 5) The government’s concept of liveability focuses on public space. This includes housing, as part of the built environment, but the emphasis has tended to be on open and green spaces (Urban Green Spaces Taskforce, 2002) and, more recently, on the ‘street scene’ (CABE, 2002). The government has represented the main challenge as ensuring that local areas in general are ‘cleaner, safer, and greener’. This focus links to the third theme underpinning housing and local environment policy - that areas should not only be liveable now but viable in the future, i.e. that they should be ‘sustainable communities’.

Sustainability is promoted by the government on two levels. The original, over-arching objective is for “sustainable development”, for which the government set out four principles in 1999: steady economic growth; social progress to meet the needs of all; environmental protection and prudent use of natural resources.

\(^{13}\) The NRF provided £200 million in 2001/02, £300 million in 2002/03 and £400 million in 2003/04.
Progress on these has been measured through 15 headline indicators (DETR, 1999). The other, more specific objective is to ensure that neighbourhoods are sustainable, as set out in the Sustainable Communities Plan (ODPM, 2003). The concept of ‘sustainable communities’ develops on ideas from the Urban Task Force, which the government commissioned in 1999 “to identify the causes of urban decline in England and recommend practical solutions to bring people back into our cities, towns and urban neighbourhoods” (mission statement: Urban Task Force, 1999).

Its introduction as a policy objective also reflects the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal in emphasising housing quality and local environmental standards. The Sustainable Communities Plan restated and reinforced the concepts of ‘decent housing’14 and ‘decent places’ (first laid out in the National Strategy) and set clear targets for attaining these standards across all areas. It also aimed to establish how the simultaneous issues of housing shortage in the south-east and low housing demand in the midlands and the north could be addressed, providing housing where needed without undermining established communities in developing areas or areas of low demand. This resulted in new initiatives, like Growth Areas and Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders. Neighbourhood management was identified by the government as a key strategy for addressing social exclusion and promoting local regeneration. In 2000, the government published a report on the nature and potential of neighbourhood management (SEU, 2000) and launched 20 long-term neighbourhood management pathfinders in areas of high deprivation, with an additional 15 pathfinders announced in December 2003.

14 All social housing should reach a minimum standard by 2010. The English standard is for housing to be warm, weatherproof and to have reasonably modern facilities.
6.5 Social Housing and Policy in the Netherlands

Although the housing stock in Dutch neighbourhoods is in pretty good shape and the Dutch cities are mostly doing well compared to other European cities in terms of economic standards, this does not mean that the social housing is without problems in the Netherlands. Particularly in the big cities (>100,000 inhabitants), the once popular post war neighbourhoods situated on the outskirts of city centres are nowadays characterized by low-income populations, relative high unemployment levels, high crime rates, racial tensions and low levels of social capital among its residents. However, the problems are not only social. The housing stock in these neighbourhoods does not comply anymore with the housing demands of today’s market. The houses, mainly built before or shortly after World War II, are often too small, poorly maintained and not designed for a lifestyle that has rapidly changed and diversified over the last six decades. In short, the problems housing associations face are as much spatial as social.

The double-sided nature of the problems became more and more central in the big cities policy initiated in 1994 by central government. The starting aim was to reduce the relative backward social and economic position of cities in terms of employment, educational performances, economic activities and safety. The four big and 27 medium-sized cities were invited to formulate their own initiatives in these fields. If the plans were accepted, the cities could receive extra financial support. Since 2000, physical programmes for urban regeneration (that received national support since 1997) have become incorporated in the big cities policy. Since that time the policy has been redirected at integrated, area based policy, based on three ‘pillars’; economical, spatial and social interventions. In practice, however, despite ideas about coordinated governance, each pillar mostly developed its own programmes with little collaboration between different sectors,
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causing neighbourhood renewal to be dominated by spatial redesigning with spatial players sometimes developing social programmes themselves.

Thus, the spatial interventions are almost in all cases, the dominant and enduring factor in this ensemble. Social programmes by social players are far less intensive, more fragmented and hardly long term, earning the social programme the nickname of being a ‘projectencarroussel’ (ferry wheel of projects). Central to the spatial pillar is a large-scale urban renewal programme developed by the Ministry of Spatial Planning, Housing, and the Environment. Part of this programme is a community based approach of 40 deprived neighbourhoods towards which additional budgets (Investeringsbudget stedelijke vernieuwing) are located to facilitate local initiatives in the hope that this will accelerate the urban renewal of these areas. Every five years, local councils are given the opportunity to submit proposals for urban renewal projects in the selected neighbourhoods.

The biggest slice of the cake is spent on new property development. Housing associations and policymakers assumed that they could kill two birds with one stone (solve both types of problems with one type of intervention, i.e. spatial). Large parts of old neighbourhoods were demolished and replaced by a more diversified housing stock to cater for different population groups. Large-scale ‘restructuring’ would not only solve the problem of a mismatch on the housing market, but would also benefit the people living in these neighbourhoods. By attracting higher income groups to poor city areas the less fortunate living there would benefit from the economical and social capital these groups would bring with them.

However, not all middle class groups are attracted to the newly developed neighbourhoods outside the city centre. Most of the middle class residents prefer spacious single family dwellings in green suburban areas, while urban seekers primarily look for attractive housing and areas close to the city centre. The groups that are attracted to the newly developed neighbourhoods are (ex) students or young workers, who just entered the housing market, social professionals, who can not afford the expensive housing within the city centre, and social climbers who are already living in these post-war areas. The latter are provided with an opportunity to stay on their home-ground as they move up the housing ladder.
Another interesting target group for this research are people labelled as ‘spijtoptanten’. Numerous projects for urban renewal take into account residents who have moved out of the deprived areas but who have regretted their move ever since. They miss their old neighbourhood and neighbours and do not feel at home in their new place. These residents are given priority for the new social housing units in the newly developed area and are targeted by incentives and marketing campaigns to buy houses in their former neighbourhood. A clear example of this policy can be found in the Amsterdam Bijlmer, an area with a traditionally large group of Surinam inhabitants which went through a serious period of decay. For a while, the better off Surinam households left the Bijlmer to live in more ‘decent’ areas (yet returned often during daytime to visit family and participate in events). After the renewal, a large group of these residents who did not feel at home in their neighbourhood moved back to the Bijlmer (Veldboer e.a., 2008).

Less warm welcomes are reserved for new residents: they are sometimes accused of initiating the (forced) retreat of the lower income residents who cannot keep up with the rent and property price increases. Indirectly, housing associations underline this assumption by stating the need to de-concentrate or to regroup different classes at other levels of mainstream society. According to this view, there is a limit to the problems (for example, the influx of poor immigrants) a neighbourhood can take and, therefore the groups that are ‘too much’ need to be taken out of the neighbourhood one way or another. This type of policy is mostly aimed at immigrant groups that, according to local residents, take over the area. Their removal could be the effect of urban renewal, but also the result of specific labelled measures. This type of policy was pioneered by the city of Rotterdam in the first decennium of the new millennium by prohibiting the entrance to poor neighbourhoods for new poor arrivals.

Policies of problem dispersal (which are rarely classified as such) might present troubled neighbourhoods with temporary breathing space, which gives them the opportunity to turn around the negative spiral. On the other hand, such interventions do not solve the problems faced by the dispersed individuals in question. Therefore more recently, housing associations and city councils have expanded their repertoire by recognising the need for investment in local human
capital. Programmes aimed at developing the potentials and skills of vulnerable groups are popular at the moment.

In a recent advice the Ministry of Housing’s official advice counsel, the Vromraad (2006), argues that until now the social mobility of residents has not been emphasized enough. Social mix programmes are labelled too often as ingredients for better social cohesion and neighbouring. The Vromraad urges policymakers to formulate their plans as new opportunities for people. What is needed, according to the advice council, are more stepping stones for poorer and less educated residents on the societal ladder. The counsel argues that the problems need to be addressed on the level where they are most persistent: by providing labour market and educational opportunities for less fortunate residents and by providing and orchestrating contact possibilities with middle class groups. This advice did not weaken but strengthened the spatial-social strategy by housing associations and city councils, although the tone is slightly different. To retain ‘capital rich’ middle and higher income groups for deprived city neighbourhoods, the housing stock needs to be diversified to cater for their needs (and the needs of poor people). However, the social mobility of the ‘capital poor’ is not only helped by the presence of middle class; investments in their human capital and skills have become increasingly important.

So far, the big cities policy is rarely reviewed in terms of individual social mobility. Benchmarks are made on city mobility or neighbourhood mobility (see Boelhouwer et al. 2006; Marlet & Van Woerkom, 2006). The results of these studies show that safety and liveability have increased in renewed areas, as well as the housing prices and the number of better educated people. The size of the middle class housing stock shows only little progress despite large and time consuming operations. Unemployment figures have improved during this time, but not in the same way for immigrants or in the same way as in suburban areas. The least performing city is Rotterdam, which still suffers from its industrial heritage.

So far, attention for the emotional ties of residents in urban renewal has been almost non-existent or, at the very least, has not been framed as such. More implicit references are made in the hot Dutch political debate on immigration, although these references are ambiguous: politicians state that it is important for
new citizens to feel at home in their new country, while at the same time they argue that immigrants should cut all emotional ties to their country of birth. Research on the place attachment of immigrants, however, shows that objects and rituals from their home country are important mediators for feelings of attachment to their new country. A simplistic and implicit conceptualisation of place attachment is used to describe and deal with the emotional ties of immigrants (see also the debate caused by the WRR-report ‘Identificatie met Nederland’ after publication in 2007).

The same holds true for urban policy. In the Dutch urban policy, implicit references are made to the emotional ties of residents: urban renewal programmes should protect and re-attract the original residents, who feel alienated from their neighbourhood by the decline of their area and the arrival of large numbers of immigrants in their neighbourhood. At the same time, Dutch politicians stress the important of making new citizens feel at home in their new country and neighbourhood, resulting in conflicting or at least ambiguous statements on the emotional ties of Dutch residents: one group doesn’t feel at home because of another group’s presence.

6.6 Neighbourhood Identity in Dutch Urban Policy

More explicit references to the emotional ties of residents are made in the more recent focus in housing on lifestyle and branding (the case study of Hoogvliet is good example and is discussed in more detail in chapter 8). Neighbourhood identity is increasingly popular with city planners, architects, housing associations and social professionals alike, seeking new ways to regenerate deprived neighbourhoods. No urban renewal programme is complete these days without a reference to identity of place. Identity is used as a weapon in the war on increasing degeneration and deprivation of inner cities: by emphasising or, if necessary, by reinventing the positive values of an area, city councils and marketing experts try their best to improve the bad reputations of these areas and turn the tide of degeneration. A meeting called by the Dutch Expertise Centre on Urban Renewal in 2006 concluded that:
Searching for the identity of a renewal area can increase the quality of urban renewal programmes; the search unites all parties living and working in the neighbourhood, stimulating co-operation and thought on the direction of change in the neighbourhood. It prevents an approach dominated by an exclusive focus on everyday practices.

The concept of place identity is used in many different ways: ranging from an engaging method to interact with residents and other local parties to an important measure for property value. Used as a participatory tool, it tries to involve local residents in the urban planning by discussing favourite spots in the neighbourhood and the values and meaning attached to the places. The results are used to extract core values for the neighbourhood, which are used to design a new neighbourhood profile. However, the mobilisation of an engagement with local residents is more important: discussing place identity organises and involves residents who would otherwise not show up for public inquiries. This method has been used successfully in the urban renewal programme of Nieuwland in Schiedam.

Place identity has also been used as an enticement for middle class groups to lure them into deprived areas with an improved reputation. To prevent ‘living apart together’ of old (poor) and new (rich) groups, common values are defined for the involved area. This recipe has been tried and tested in Utrecht for the neighbourhood of Ondiep, where the city council promoted their regeneration scheme for the area with the theme of “a proud neighbourhood where residents speak their mind”, in the hope of attracting new families to the neighbourhood who would connect to the brand. However, it proved to be a difficult task for a working class neighbourhood to become attractive as a desired living area for well-off families.

Therefore, other cities, like Rotterdam, have used place identity in exactly the opposite way, by stressing different values and lifestyles between residents’ groups and designing different place in the neighbourhood, where each group can feel at home within its own group of likeminded neighbours. This strategy starts from the (more realistic) assumption that people prefer to live among people that look and behave like them and allows for, even stimulates, spatial segregation. Place identity is used to design different places in the neighbourhood that appeal
to different groups: one part of the neighbourhood can entice residents who prefer privacy and peace, while another part is more suitable for people who enjoy living in a lively working class community. Research has shown that the enticement strategy benefits most of the groups who are already better off: in an evaluation of multicultural housing project, Ouwehand and Van der Horst (2005) conclude that:

*It is more often an oriental gift wrapping for higher income groups, which enable them to feel on holiday in their own back garden, while little room and sympathy is left for the emancipation of ethnic and religious groups, who also try to claim an expressive place in the urban landscape.*

In these last two scenarios, place identity is regarded as an economical or social commodity that can be wilfully redistributed to the resident population, or as a social-cultural glue that can be attached to an area to connect the different groups that live there. They focus more on values and characteristics of people than on identity of places. Two popular models are the mentality-model of marketing agent Motivaction and the brand strategy research-model of SmartAgent. Both models attempt to map the social-psychological and cultural motives of housing consumers by dividing the Dutch population into different lifestyle groups with distinct values and housing preferences and giving them sophisticated names such as “active individualists”, “hasty middle classes”, “tolerant socialisers” and “sketchy idealists”. Both models are criticised for their static views and abstract, stereotypical labelling, which limit the use in practical interventions16.

The different uses reflect the main pillars of the Dutch urban renewal policy: participation of residents in urban renewal is a longstanding tradition in the social pillar, while the enticement of middle class groups to newly flavoured deprived inner city areas reflects the enduring debate on social mix within the physical pillar and “the deprivation policy” (achterstandsbeleid) of the social pillar. Old jackets find new coats in the use of place identity within urban renewal policy. Moreover, the different place identity-strategies in urban renewal share a common belief in

16 Instead, policy makers and researcher return to classical distinction like class, status and social-demographic characteristics for the mapping of housing preferences.
the changeability of society: bad reputations and relationships can be fixed by applying the necessary amount of place identity.

This obscures the other side of the coin: emphasising the positive hides or plainly ignores the negative that caused the bad reputation in the first place and connecting people on the bases of shared values comes at the cost of excluding others who do not share these values; what unites also sets people apart from others. This provides city planners and marketing experts with a new dilemma: how far can you go in facilitating diversity based on different place identities without damaging the social cohesion in the area? And which kind of diversity do you allow: is it possible to promote spatial segregation based on identity or lifestyle, while at the same time combating segregation based on income and ethnicity?

In sum, the images designed by branding and lifestyle approaching often prove very difficult to implement in the urban renewal programme due to their vague and unproblematic nature (negative reputations and differences between residents are ignored) and unrelatedness to the daily practices of residents and professionals. What the different experiences of applying place identity to urban renewal offer us so far, is recognition of the process of identity construction: it proves impossible to dictate a new reputation for a deprived area and unite different residents groups instantly under a new banner or brand. As a social construct place identity needs to be reproduced in everyday life to have any effect on the behaviour of residents. Too often new values, lifestyles and identity are invented overnight, which are detached or too abstract from existing and daily (re)used constructs of place identity. In spite of the urban potential and the good intentions what often remains of all the efforts to incorporate Place Identity into urban renewal is a pile of glossy project plans and brochures.

6.7 Conclusions and Remarks

In the Netherlands, the shift from local authority housing to privatised (social) housing takes place at an earlier stage. Already in 1965, housing corporations are preferred over local authority housing. In the 1980s, the last municipal housing corporations are forced to form separated structures. In England, the sector is still
struggling to catch up. For instance, in Manchester, the IVHA still has to fight for the agreement of residents to take over the housing stock from local authorities (Right to Choice). At the time, both England and the Netherlands were in a transition phase from a housing stock that is mainly characterised by social renting to a housing stock of owner occupied homes. This transition takes place very gradually in the Netherlands, while it was forced upon the English system in the 1980s and came about in fits and starts.

This had far reaching consequences in England. After the forced transmission of social rented houses to owner occupied houses, the rental sector that was left was one for the financially weak. The social housing sector is highly stigmatised in England and is often seen as a shelter for the very poor. If at all possible, you buy a house in England. After the “brutering”-measures, the Dutch social rental sector became one that was financially very healthy, of considerable size and had a reasonably mixed group of tenants. In England, the social housing sector was in a financially awkward position, the best parts of the housing stock having been transferred to the owner occupied sector and the tenant population coping with a very high concentration of the lower income groups.

The differences are also reflected in the nature and size of problems that are unthinkable in the Netherlands. A concentration of households with low incomes and less social possibilities often entails a concentration of social problems (unemployment, degeneration, and criminality). Streets where all the houses are boarded up and where the police do not dare to enter; these images are inconceivable in the Netherlands. The concentration and accumulation of social problems in the English social housing sector have also led to a more explicit link of welfare work to social housing. In the Netherlands, the two sectors are seen as more separate entities. Dutch corporations co-operate or compete with welfare institutions, whilst English housing associations employ youth workers. This difference can also be seen in housing regulations. Under English legislation, eviction is not an option since tenants have no place else to go.

The 90s saw a big change in urban policy in England and in the Netherlands, both by a change of government. In both countries, this signalled a change from predominantly physical regeneration to combined efforts in social, economic and physical renewal of deprived neighbourhoods, accompanied by a sharp increase in
funding and new powers for local governments to tackling deprivation issues. While in the Netherlands, local and national governments are struggling to combine social-spatial interventions, and more often resort to one or the other, in England, the Labour government strongly advocated a leading role for social and economical regeneration. Instead of an exclusive focus on the quality of housing in deprived areas, social and economical targets take priority in fighting poverty and social exclusion, supported by (instead of contributing to) physical regeneration (housing as a social service).

In both countries large scale urban renewal programmes are set up to tackle deprivation. Within these programmes the attention to social and emotional ties varies greatly. Urban social policy in the Netherlands has been primarily concerned with the social cohesion and, more recently, with the social mobility of poor residents. The Dutch case studies in the next two chapters are a case in point. In the urban renewal partnership of Emmen, resident participation and social cohesion take centre stage, while the partners in Hoogvliet emphasise social mobility among residents in deprived neighbourhoods. In both programmes implicit references are made to the emotional ties of residents: urban renewal programmes should protect and re-attract the original residents who feel alienated from their neighbourhood by the decay of the area or the arrival of large numbers of immigrants in their neighbourhood. As a solution, this other group should be spread and educated in order to behave and perform better in order to make new residents to feel at home in their new country. What is asked is adaptation: immigrants should cut all emotional ties to their country of birth.

In spite of the efforts made in the Netherlands to combine spatial and physical interventions in urban renewal, the emphasis is on spatial redesigning. Specific social interventions in renewed areas are usually seen as supporting acts and are aimed at socio-economic skills or social cohesion. In the minority of cases social interventions dominated the scene while spatial measures are lacking. Thus the Dutch cases studies provide examples of the extreme ends of the scale: either spatial (more often) or social interventions are dominant with little room for combined efforts.

The British welfare sector, on the other hand, is historically closer linked to housing; the sell out of social housing by Thatcher resulted in a heavily stigmatised
housing sector for the very poor. The concentration and accumulation of social problems have led to a dominating presence of social services in social housing, instead of an overall reorganisation in social services, which the United States has opted for. In the Netherlands, social services has always been viewed as a separate sector to housing, resulting in a more distant relationship between housing associations and social workers and ultimately, a more marginalised position of social workers in the Netherlands. The dominant presence of social services in the United Kingdom has resulted in innovative housing projects combining social and spatial interventions. In terms of governance, this seems to offer useful learning experiences for the Dutch social and housing sector. Moreover, English policy makers seem to be more aware of the emotional ties of residents. This already becomes clear in the consistent references made in policy documents and scientific articles to housing as homes: dwellings are not merely places of bricks and mortar, but are places of home to the people who live in them.

The English themselves appear to be possessed by their house. No other country in the world spends so much money on DIY (Do It Yourself) for their house and garden: over £8,500 million disappears each year through handy English hands. No house is complete without having ripped something out and having at least one room in the house redecorated: a new house becomes a home for residents by putting their own personal mark on it. According to anthropologist Kate Fox (2004), who spend much time observing the English and their homes in search of the rules of Englishness, a house is, for the English, “the embodiment of their privacy, identity and the most important status indicator and property of an Englishman” (113). The English sensitivity to privacy can also be witnessed in the national discontent with estate agents: even people who had never had any dealing with them have an aversion to estate agents and complain that their stupid, ineffectual and insincere. Estate agents are favourite targets for the general dislike of the British public on par with traffic wardens and salesmen. According to Fox this has everything to do with the central role of home to the British identity:
Everything that estate agents do involves passing judgement not on some neutral piece of property, but on us, on our lifestyle, our social position, our character, our private self. And sticking a price tag on it. No wonder we can’t stand them (2004:124).

Fox continues by connecting the English nesting urge and privacy sensitivity to the typical English characteristics of social inhibition, reticence and embarrassment, which she sums up as “a lack of ease and skill in social interaction”. To compensate for this lack the English retreat to the protectiveness and security of their own homes17. Safe behind their front doors the English do not need to worry about their lack of social skills. “Home is what the English have instead of social skills” (134).

The analyses in chapter 5 confirmed that the house plays an important role for the emotional ties of residents. Jobs in and around the house contribute to the attachment of residents to their neighbourhood. By doing these jobs they claim the space, make it their own place and develop an affection for the neighbourhood. This does not mean that the neighbourhood plays no part in the emotional make-up of residents. The additional analyses in chapter 5 demonstrate that different home feelings are related to different levels of focus in the neighbourhood: time spent in and around the house mainly increases the social attachment, while an appreciation of other residents stimulates the physical attachment of residents. The social community in their neighbourhood is equally important for the emotional ties of residents, but particularly their physical ties, while their passion for gardening and DIY is a signal of their social ties to the neighbourhood. The latter is confirmed by Fox:

If you do spend time squatting, bending and pruning in your front garden you may find this is one of the very few occasions on which your neighbours will speak to you. A person busy in his or her front garden is regarded socially ‘available’, and neighbours who would never dream of knocking on your front door may stop for a chat. [...] In fact, I know of many streets in

17 A notable exception and nuance to this bold statement of Fox, kindly noted by my father in law, Gerry Price, is the popularity of social clubs, especially in the North of England, where (older) working class Englishmen tune their social skills happily outside their homes.
which people who have an important matter to discuss with a neighbour will wait patiently - sometimes for days or weeks - until they spot the neighbour in question working in his front garden (2004:126).

The importance of home is reflected in English urban policy by the recognition of houses as places which residents need to make their own and therefore the government keeps a respectful distance from the front door.

Another point of difference between Dutch and English urban policy is where they start. Whereas Dutch policy makers look for help outside the neighbourhood and aim to attract middle classes to deprived areas, English policy makers and urban planners take the poorest residents as the starting point for their policies and designs. Under the assumption that middle class groups will only feel at home in deprived neighbourhoods when the behaviour of the anti-social residents has changed, much energy and resources are devoted to changing their behaviour before any time is spend on building homes for the middle class. Changing the attitude of the original residents is believed crucial in changing the reputation of an area, which is necessary for higher income groups to even consider living there (see the case study in Manchester).

Moreover, many urban renewal activities focus directly on changing the identity and reputation of an area and its people by using a more culture-based approach to urban renewal described as culture-led regeneration: urban renewal in which cultural facilities take centre stage in the redressing of an area with a deprived reputation. By designing eye-catching museums and theatres filled with important works of arts and artists, the area should acquire a new purpose and identity. Several English cities (Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Cardiff) have sought to incorporate production and consumption of culture as part of their efforts to sustain a new industrial future in the post-industrial world, where cultural investment provides an alternative to the de-industrialised past. The case study of Newcastle and Gateshead is a fine example of this approach: both councils have employed public art to link the regeneration of the area to the local culture and identity of its residents, strengthening their attachment to the area and redressing the reputation of the deprived area, not only by physical but also by symbolic improvements.
The different starting point and emphasis of urban renewal in England appears to pay off, as we have seen in chapter 5, at least in the NDC-areas of England. But also the priority areas in the Netherlands demonstrate remarkable progress with their different focus and approach. The question remains therefore, what different efforts in both countries lead to these results? Which interventions and projects make what kind of a difference to the emotional ties of residents in both countries? This question is answered in the following chapters by comparing urban practices in four cities, two in the Netherlands and two in the United Kingdom. For the Netherlands, the council of Hoogvliet in Rotterdam and the neighbourhoods Angelslo, Bargeres and Emmerhout in Emmen have been studied. For the UK, qualitative data has been gathered in the two areas, Sale in Manchester and The Quayside in Newcastle and Gateshead. By comparing the two case studies the influence of different context variables can be assessed, particular the differences between the Dutch and English housing sector. In each case the urban renewal programmes has been reconstructed with particular attention given to interventions which influence, both implicitly and explicitly, the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood. The four case studies are discussed separately in chapter 7 to 10.
7. Case Study: Emmen Revisited, the Netherlands

7.1 Introduction

One of the case studies in the Netherlands was on Emmen Revisited, a partnership of the city of Emmen made up of two regional housing associations and local residents, forged in 1997 to stop the exodus of families out of three post-war neighbourhoods (Angelslo, Bargeres and Emmerhout). These neighbourhoods were faced with high levels of nuisance, crime, unemployment and rising tensions between residents. The city government and the housing association Wooncom feared further deterioration and proposed an integral approach of town planning, public housing and social issues, involving all local parties. From the start explicit attention was devoted to the social dimension of urban renewal, making Emmen Revisited an appropriate case to study the effects of spatial and social regeneration.

Emmen is one of the 31 big cities in the Netherlands. The city owes its existence to large-scale peat extraction, starting in the middle of the nineteenth century. The 1930s, however, marked an end to this industry, which resulted in poverty and unemployment. After the Second World War, the rapid industrialisation of Emmen provided new employment opportunities, which was accompanied by another population boom. With 110,000 inhabitants nowadays living in the city centre, six newer residential areas and thirteen villages in the immediate vicinity, the city is also known as the Green City. The municipal territory covers no less than 35,000 hectares, making it one of the largest cities in the Netherlands. Each
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inhabitant enjoys at least one tree and 124 m² of green space. Its unique urban planning design received international attention. The “woonerf”, a residential area in which a number of devices are employed to create a safer environment, was invented in Emmen in the 1960s.

In spite of its abundance of green living space, the city is experiencing similar problems to the other big cities in the western, more urbanized part of the Netherlands known as the “Randstad”; deterioration of neighbourhoods, risings levels of crime and vandalism and increasing socio-economical differences within the population of Emmen. Emmen is, therefore, part of the Dutch big city policy on urban renewal, albeit as a somewhat special case. Although one of the 31 big cities in the Netherlands (with over 100,000 inhabitants), its location in the relatively more rural area of the Netherlands (the province of Drenthe in the north east of Holland) allows the city to deal differently with its urban problems. While in the west of Holland, where the majority of the big cities are located, space is scarce and fiercely competed for, Emmen has an abundance of green space at its disposal. Where most big cities can only dream of more space to accommodate new (preferably wealthy) inhabitants or keep hold of their present (wealthy) ones, Emmen has it readily available.

On the other hand the city is faced with the more rural problems of small villages, which are emptying out, due to young people and families moving to the urban west to pursue a career or education. The elderly and less fortunate, who are left behind, face a rapid decline in local amenities, while they need them most to make a living or to be able to live independently. Does this unique geographical setup provide new opportunities for urban renewal that are not only able to tackle big city problems but also small scale village dramas?

Data collection
To assess the results of this approach after almost ten years and to evaluate the effectiveness of the coalition, the planning and execution of interventions were reconstructed based on document analysis, interviews with key figures and analyses of existing monitoring data. Many documents, ranging from official policy reports and research papers to more informal project proposals, resident newsletters and even minutes of meetings were analysed to paint a first picture of Emmen
Revisited. The documents were used to describe the manner in which urban renewal was conducted, in particular how spatial and social interventions were developed along side each other. To add more detail to the picture, 20 key figures were interviewed who were intimately involved with the partnership over the years, and represented the different parties that participated. The interviews focused on the development of Emmen Revisited in the last ten years and the progress (and setbacks) they witnessed in the three neighbourhoods as a result of these developments. The results of the different research strategies are discussed below. This chapter provides an historical overview of Emmen Revisited from the start in 1997 to the present date and discusses important mile stones along the way, which have shaped the integral programme and its specific attention to the emotional ties of residents.

7.2 Why Emmen Revisited?

In 1997 the housing association Wooncom signed a treaty with the city council of Emmen on the regeneration of three neighbourhoods: Angelslo, Emmerhout and Bargeres. These three post-war neighbourhoods were at the forefront of urban design in the 1960s, establishing a new design for residential areas called the “woonerf”, in which a number of devices were employed to create a safer environment. This design has been carefully copied by many Dutch cities. However, the post-war design no longer met the demands of today’s inhabitants. Young families were moving away due to a lack of suitable housing to buy. Elderly residents, looking for independent housing with care facilities close by, were also forced to move to the centre where these facilities were available. This left empty houses behind that were not in high demand, resulting in void properties. The residents that were left behind had limited opportunities on the housing market and were forced to stay, witnessing the decline of local amenities and their neighbourhood. Living in Angelslo, Emmerhout and Bargeres became a negative choice, residents stayed out of lack of alternatives. Poor housing and neighbourhood facilities were not the only problem; the neighbourhoods were faced with high levels of nuisance, crime, unemployment and education deficits.
The arrival of new residents from different ethnic origins and with different custom caused further tensions between residents.

The problems that Emmen was facing are not unique to the city, neither is the solution that the city council initially proposed; building new residential areas on the outskirts of the city, which were more in line with the demands of today's housing market. However, the housing association Wooncom feared this would only aggravate the problems; more residents would leave the city centre, increasing the number of void properties. Research commissioned by the housing association, confirmed these fears; the research conducted by KPMG predicted a void increase of ten percent in the existing housing stock, a sharp increase of economically inactive residents and a decline of social economically more successful residents. In response to these figures, the housing association decided to give priority to the regeneration of the present neighbourhoods and to develop parts of the new residential areas inside these neighbourhoods.

This approach was again not unique for Emmen. More unique was the approach the housing association had to regeneration; from the start the housing association believed that physical regeneration would not be sufficient. Starting from this assumption, the housing association reflected on its social role in the urban renewal of the three neighbourhoods. Wooncom realised that they could not fulfil this role on their own. To tackle the combination of problems that persisted in the neighbourhoods, co-operation was necessary with a large number of local parties that could contribute with their own knowledge in a joint effort to regenerate the area.

7.3 The start of Emmen Revisited

Wooncom established a partnership with the city council of Emmen under the name Emmen Revisited, in which both parties committed themselves to the regeneration of the three neighbourhoods. Three tenant boards, one for each neighbourhood, and the citywide Tenant Federation joined the partnership. The partnership proposed an integral approach of town planning, public housing and social issues, based on equality, whereby each party is involved in the planning and the decision-
making. Each partner remained responsible for their share of the work in their particular field, however, agrees to discuss their work with the other partners before it is put to action. In contrast to other urban renewal programmes, the city council was no longer the director of the regeneration but shared the seat with all parties involved, effectively placing the directory seat between the local partners.

The new approach needed a new organisational structure to accommodate all the parties involved. Each neighbourhood should be able to contribute in their own way, although coherences needed to be observed at the city level. To safeguard the coherence in the proposed plans of the different neighbourhoods, an executive board was installed to which the general directors of both housing associations were appointed, combined with the alderman of the city council who was responsible for housing within the city. For the co-ordination of day to day affairs, a project team was formed headed up by two project leaders; one supplied by the city administration and one supplied by Wooncom. At the neighbourhood level employees from both the housing associations and the city administration joined forces in neighbourhood teams. Each team was responsible for the implementation of initiatives at neighbourhood level and, in order to do so, maintained contact with all parties involved in the neighbourhood. The teams were joined by a representative of the housing association, a neighbourhood coordinator on behalf of the city administration, a social worker and the chairman of the tenant board.

Plans and initiatives were discussed at each level; the partners called this ‘the permanent debate with the neighbourhood’. Realising that physical regeneration spans a much longer period than the time that is needed to put social programmes into action, the partnership tried to bring both programmes closer together by a continuous feedback of spatial planning to the social partners in the neighbourhoods. This cyclic process of informing and decision sharing was needed to prevent the implementations of planning without local support. Local support from partners in the neighbourhoods, including the residents living in these areas, was deemed necessary to prevent not only costly delays in the implementation stage, but also to ensure the contributions and involvement of these parties as essential elements for sustainable and vital communities in these neighbourhoods.
The cyclic process of information and decision sharing started with the drawing up of specific plans for each neighbourhood. Together with local parties so-called district developmental plans were drawn up, which presented an overview of the present situation in each neighbourhood in terms of environmental quality, amenities and social structure. Based on the premises that no actions would be taken to address any of the present problems, a future image of each neighbourhood was projected from these descriptions, spelling doom for the three neighbourhoods. The doom scenarios allowed the parties involved to establish goals for the future, which were translated into clear choices and specific actions, subdivided into five themes that corresponded with the experiences of residents; area reputation, housing, usage of space, co-operation and social cohesion. Actions and choices were documented in so-called ‘starting documents’, which were discussed with local parties in each neighbourhood. From these consultations district platforms were established: twice a year 20 to 25 local organisations (tenant and resident groups, police officers, teachers, youth workers, societies representing disabled citizens, local businesses, etc.) came together to discuss the feasibility and desirability of the proposed measures in each district and readjust the plans accordingly. This resulted in a detailed master plan for the development of each neighbourhood and a complex organisational structure for Emmen Revisited.
7.4 Three Neighbourhoods: Making Plans

Each district development plan meticulously analysed the different problems and potential for urban renewal in each neighbourhood. According to the start documents, Emmerhout was known as an easy going, green neighbourhood with intimate streets; a child friendly area with good quality housing in proximity to country parks and a diverse range of amenities. Nothing wrong at first site, but this image was rapidly changing, according to development plan: the population was in decline due to young families who moved out in search of more suitable housing. The housing stock was considered to be too homogeneous with an abundance of single family homes. The young families who moved out were replaced by singles, couples with no children and ethnic and elderly residents, resulting in a much higher turnover rate, particular for the apartments in the neighbourhood. The increased flow of residents reduced the support for the facilities in the area with more shops and schools available than needed for the number of remaining residents. The higher turnover rate also resulted in the concentration of
In spite of the declining resident numbers, Emmerhout housed a substantial group of residents who have lived in the neighbourhood since it was build. People stayed on average for 11 years in the neighbourhood. These residents were highly involved with the neighbourhood and maintained many contacts throughout the area, in particular with other family members (roughly 30%). Although happy with the social state of the neighbourhood, the residents complained about physical degeneration and criticised the lack of play facilities in the area. According to the start document, recreational opportunities were limited to a stroll around the block. The ample green space in the neighbourhood was described as dull and poorly maintained. The lack of facilities increased the tension between different age groups; bored youth people, who had nowhere else to go, lingered in the shopping centre and on school yards, causing nuisance for other residents.

The start documents painted a similar picture for Angelslo; a population in decline with diminishing support for local facilities. Originally built for the rapidly growing population of industrial workers after the Second World War, the housing stock is considered too homogeneous at present with an increasing number of void properties. Apartments and flats made up almost a quarter of the housing stock in Angelslo. Like Emmerhout, a substantial part of the residents lived in the neighbourhood since it was build, and maintained strong family ties with each other. There was a very active resident board present consisting of equally active cluster committees in each of the six districts of the neighbourhood. In spite of these long term tenants, turnover rates were rapidly increasing, resulting in less social cohesion, more nuisance and tensions between different resident groups. In contrast to Emmerhout, the residents were very satisfied with the green space in the neighbourhood and made extensive use of it.

Bargeres is the youngest of the three neighbourhoods, inhabited by a large proportion of young families. The neighbourhood consists of numerous of “woonerven”19, resulting in a wide architecture range with diverse plot sizes.

19 The “woonerven” is a residential area in which a number of devices are employed to create a safer environment. The concept was invented in Emmen in the 1960s.
However, the “woonerven” were only accessible by a labyrinth-like road network, making it difficult for residents and visitors (including emergency services) to find their way around the neighbourhood. The neighbourhood was literally divided by the Orange Canal, cutting residents on the eastern part from residents in the western part of the neighbourhood. The division was clearly felt in the neighbourhood’s shopping centre where a poor connection between the two parts limited the access of disabled shoppers.

Bargeres was characterised by relatively expensive rental housing. The residents could more easily afford to buy their own property, although this caused a higher turnover of residents who were waiting in a temporarily rental homes in Bargeres for the completion of their new house on the outskirts of the city. The temporarily residence of families reduced, according to the start document, the commitment of tenants to their neighbourhood; why invest in their neighbourhood if they were about the leave it? This mentality was further enhanced by the labyrinth structure of the neighbourhood; the overall design lacked uniformity, while the individual “woonerven” did not have an identity of their own, allowing for animosity to settle in. Also, the design of the houses allowed for little social control of the public space as the reception rooms were located towards the back of the houses, facing the private back gardens instead of the public streets at the front. The lack of social control has seen an increase in vandalism, crime and drugs traffic. Bargeres distinguished itself from the other two neighbourhoods by the scale of its problems; while the problems in Emmerhout and Angelslo were predominantly located at the neighbourhood level, the writers of the start document for Bargeres argued that the image and economical position of Bargeres in the city of Emmen were at stake.

Although the different problems facing each neighbourhood were meticulously analysed in the start documents, the proposed solutions for the three neighbourhoods were in contrast remarkably similar: to halt population decline and increase the diversity of neighbourhood population, the housing stock and public space in each neighbourhood needed to be differentiated. It remained unclear how the different lifestyles would be catered for in the renewed neighbourhoods and how this would affect the design of each neighbourhood. In all three neighbourhood
development plans, centre stage was taken by the regeneration of the local shopping centres, which was at odds with observations made in the start documents, stating that residents (particularly in Angelslo and Bargeres) were less focused on their neighbourhood and preferred instead to use facilities and meeting places outside the neighbourhood. It was questionable whether these residents would become more focused on their neighbourhood with a renewed local shopping centre when there was an abundance of shopping alternatives outside their neighbourhood. Even if the new shopping centres would be entirely devoted to residents who are more dependant on the neighbourhood (youth, elderly, residents on social benefits), it still remains unclear how interaction with the (new) residents that shop elsewhere is facilitated in the neighbourhood, while this is a cornerstone of the regeneration plans.

Furthermore, the perceived higher scale problems of Bargeres might be less exclusive to this neighbourhood since both Emmerhout and Angelslo were equally reporting problems with their image, resulting in a more unfavourable economical position in the city region. This commonality suggested that a different design for each neighbourhood would be more fruitful for attracting different residents groups that complement rather than compete with each other for neighbourhood preference.

In short, the performed diagnosis and the proposed solutions were unclear. Although the problems appeared both spatial and social, the initial plans were mainly spatial; the housing stock and the facilities need to be diversified and upgraded. Between 1999 en 2005 the city of Emmen and the housing association Wooncom planned to demolish 444 houses, which would be replaced by 461 new houses of which 213 were reserved for social housing with the other 248 to be sold to residents in the so-called middle and higher segments of the housing market. At the same time, an unspecified number of houses and apartments needed to remain in the affordable range for elderly people and residents in need of special care. The spatial plans were, however, only one side of the integral approach; the importance of a complementary social programme was recognised from the start but proved much harder to develop.
7.5 Developing the Social Dimension

Since 1998 the partnership of Emmen Revisited experimented, in co-operation with local care and welfare organization, schools, police officers, residents and local businesses, with new administrative forms and programmes, which combined physical, social and economic interventions in the urban renewal of the three neighbourhoods Angelslo, Emmerhout and Bargeres. Working out integrated targets proved to be difficult in practice. The development of Emmen Revisited, therefore, can be seen as a journey to combine physical ‘restructuring’ with economic and social interventions.

Although from the start of Emmen Revisited special attention was devoted to the social dimension of urban renewal, it was not quite clear to everybody involved what this meant in practice. The struggle to develop the social dimension of urban renewal was quickly criticised by outsiders as being too physically orientated. The partners themselves added to the confusion by stating different goals. The City Council of Emmen wrote in its policy planning for the year 2015 (Strategienota Emmen 2015) that the main aim of improving the quality of life in the neighbourhoods was to attract new businesses and residents to the area; urban renewal as a condition for economical development. The main purpose of the new (more affluent) residents was to spend more money in the neighbourhood, making the facilities in the neighbourhood more viable. The housing association Woomcom, on the other hand, opted for a physical conditioning; the problems in the neighbourhoods were, in the eyes of the housing association, caused by a segregated deprived population which needed to become more heterogeneous by differentiating the housing stock. In other words, mixed housing stock as a condition for more socially mixed neighbourhoods.

The different visions, and especially the general lack of vision on the social dimension of urban renewal, were recognised within the partnership. As a solution and to developing a more coherent frame for the social dimension, the partnership decided in 1998 to participate in a national programme, commissioned by the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, department of Social Policy to develop a Community Based Approach (wijkgericht werken) for urban renewal in the Netherlands. This programme, titled “Heel de Buurt” (The Whole Neighbourhood)
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was piloted in 10 Dutch neighbourhoods from 1998 until 2001. The main aim of the programme was:

_TO develop a social infrastructure at the neighbourhood level which facilitated the participation of citizens, increased social cohesion, contributed to the lifting of individual and collective deprivation, in relationship with the physical and economical infrastructure._ (Eindrapportage Heel de Buurt Emmen, 2002).

For Emmen, participating in the programme meant a shift in attention from resident participation to organising contacts between residents. The national programme “Heel de Buurt” provided an opportunity to expand the social component of the integral approach. Resident participation no longer consisted solely of voicing residents’ opinion but from that moment aimed to improve the informal contacts between residents and their involvement with the neighbourhood.

7.5.1 From Resident Participation to Social Cohesion

In the first year of Emmen Revisited the social activities were mainly focused on resident participation and creating coherence in the already existing projects, with special attention on young residents. By organising a wide range of sport activities Emmen Revisited tried to appeal to this group and to involve them in the partnership, i.e. the project “Free and Sports”, a co-operation between welfare organisation Opmaat and the department of Sport of the city of Emmen. Together they organised indoor football tournaments. Emmen Revisited provided additional resources and the infrastructure to increase youth participation; in Angelslo a multifunctional sport and meeting ground was built to allow all year round activities. The ground included different playing fields for football, basketball, table tennis and a skeeler track (which doubled as an ice rink in the winter). The facility proved immensely popular with the local youth, drawing young people from adjacent neighbourhoods and beyond. The success of the playing field led to the development of two additional playing fields in Bargeres and Emmerhout. All three playing fields were maintained by local residents’ boards.
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Other young residents were reached with a specially renovated bus, which set up camp at different places in the neighbourhoods at set times. Youth workers used the bus as a base for developing contacts with local youth and to provide them with information, i.e. on the dangers of fire works around New Year’s Eve. A spin off version of the bus, the sport bus, allowed young people to borrow sport equipment to organise their own sport activities. Although not stated explicitly, involving young people also meant fighting vandalism and nuisance, caused by lingering youth; a goal that was achieved, according to local residents.

Meeting with residents and meetings between residents became a central element of the regeneration programme in Emmen. Getting young and older residents involved in Emmen Revisited was no longer only for the sake of residents’ formal participation, but was specifically aimed at increasing the social cohesion between residents, while increasing their visibility for social work organisation.

7.5.2 Linking Social to Physical Interventions

Some ‘meeting’ activities were linked to physical interventions, like the porch conversations in the high-rise apartment flats called ‘Haar en Het Weeld’ in Emmerhout. After the renovation of the apartments was completed, residents who shared the same entry (porch) were invited to join a discussion on new communal rules for their building. Where residents came to an agreement, a plate was installed above the front door of the shared entry to symbolise the communal rules. This initiative demonstrates the effort of the coalition members of Emmen Revisited to not only redesign the homes residents live in but also to redesign the ways residents live together in their apartment block.

Another clear example of this effort, albeit on a more personal level, was the project ‘Hulp en Activering’ (Social Support and Activation) in the same neighbourhood. This project combined physical regeneration with social engineering by focussing on the social mobility of residents. After the failure of a project commissioned by the department of Social Affairs in Emmen, in which unemployed residents were offered education and job training to help them find a job, the partners in Emmen Revisited decided to link similar efforts more explicitly to the relocation of residents in urban renewal areas. The assumption behind this link was that residents, whose lives are already uprooted by a changing
environment and the relocation to a new or temporary home, would be more willing to consider changing other areas of their lives and would, therefore, be more motivated to join and complete social mobility programmes. Residents, who needed to be relocated because their homes were to be demolished, were offered additional support in acquiring educational and job qualifications. 400 residents on welfare benefits in the north of Emmerhout were offered this additional support package and almost all residents accepted the offer. Since the start of the project, 103 of them have been successful in getting a job, while a further 244 residents have been accepted at educational institutions. Additional research (Lammerts and Van der Graaf, 2005) on 70 residents who received support confirms the assumption of the coalition partners; residents who combined their relocation with a social support and activation package showed more progress than residents who did not need to move. Progress was particularly visible in the way they planned their time, the social contacts they developed and the way they felt about themselves and the place where they lived: the participating residents reported stronger feelings of belonging and independence. However, they were less positive on the changes in their neighbourhood and showed less improvement in their self-confidence.

Tabel 7.1 Differences in outcomes between residents who have and have not been relocated, in % (N = 70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Improved Relocated residents</th>
<th>Non-relocated residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>56,0%</td>
<td>43,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contacts</td>
<td>52,0%</td>
<td>43,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>28,0%</td>
<td>38,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of belonging</td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>27,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>32,0%</td>
<td>43,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independency</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
<td>13,6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although limited in scope and size, the research demonstrated the importance of the connection between social and physical mobility; some residents who are forced to change where they live are more prone to face and change problems of social deprivation in their personal lives. Moving homes became a moving to opportunity, while remaining in (or at least returning to) the same neighbourhood.
7.5.3 Emotional Ties to the Neighbourhood

The above mentioned projects demonstrate an awareness of the important social and emotional consequences that physical interventions have for residents in renewed neighbourhoods. Rebuilding a neighbourhood means also rebuilding the social network of residents and their emotional ties to the neighbourhood, especially for long-term residents. Aware of this uprooting, Emmen Revisited organised a day of memories when 300 flats were about to be demolished in Emmerhout. Prior to the demolition, residents who lived and had lived in the apartments were invited to write their memories on the walls of the apartments. At the same time a film of interviews with former residents was shown to tell the history of the buildings and aid residents in their trips down memory lane. Immediately after the day of memories, a demolition party was organised. Residents were invited to view the memories written on the wall with the motto “If the walls could speak ...” and a demolition song that was especially composed for the occasion was performed by children from a local school as the first demolition activity took place; the demolishing of a window frame. While this happened balloons went up in the air with messages attached by the children. At the end of the ceremony, residents were invited to join the demolition lunch in the community centre, where the tables were decorated with freshly demolished parts of the apartments, such as building rubble and toilet pots.

This effort demonstrates important ways in which place identity and sense of place can be utilised in aiding inhabitants to make a less uprooting transition to a new place of residence. Addressing the attachment people feel to the place they have lived in for so long when this place is about to be demolished, recognizes the symbolic value of the built environment. The housing association and other local parties can utilise this value, not only to ease the pain of moving and emotional uprooting for residents, but also to aid residents in their attachment to a new environment by organising similar events for residents who return to their renewed neighbourhood.

Another initiative which dealt with the attachment of residents to their neighbourhood is a project developed by local residents of the neighbourhood platforms. They came across the idea at an exchange meeting with other residents of urban renewal areas in the Netherlands, organised by the ‘Landelijke
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Samenwerking Aandachtswijken’ (National Co-operation of Deprived Areas), a national platform for active residents, supported by the Department of Internal Affairs. The idea they borrowed was called neighbourhood stage: a play organised by and for residents on life in their neighbourhood and the effect of urban renewal on the lives of residents. Together with the local music school and social workers, the residents prepared to stage a show on the work of Emmen Revisited. The show was to serve as an outlet for emotions in addition to “the more rational stage” of formal residents’ meetings. Unfortunately, due to a lack of funding and the bankruptcy of the local social work organisation, the show has never been performed.

This is illustrative of the social programme in Emmen Revisited. Many projects were set up under the umbrella of the social renewal, but a considerable number of projects never reached the finish line or simply ceased to exist once the project time and money ran out. The day of memories, for instance, has never been repeated and the specially designed activities bus has been in the garage for a while. This is not so much due to a lack of care on behalf of the coalition partners but has more to do with a faulty social diagnosis; the content of the social programme has never been properly defined and its link to the physical and economical programmes has never been specified. The development of interlinkages between the different programmes remained implicit and has been confined to incidental experiments in the daily urban practice, with no elucidation of the logic behind these experiments or translation of the project goals into overall programme targets. How do social projects fit into the integral framework of Emmen Revisited and to which overall goals should they contribute? In short, the social programme is poorly defined, resulting in a social programme which is lacking in direction and continuity.

The development of Emmen Revisited demonstrates an ongoing search for combining physical urban renewal with economical and social interventions. This search has resulted in innovative projects, which have widened the scope of the social programme considerably from purely resident participation to include social cohesion and connections to the economical programme through social activation. Furthermore, it has included initiatives which recognise the importance of
neighbourhood attachment and which have sought to actively increase the attachment of residents to their neighbourhood.

In 2006 after eight years of Emmen Revisited, the coalition partners evaluated the fruits of their labour by independent research and tried to define the content of their social programmes and its connections to the physical and economical urban programmes more clearly. In the working programme for 2005 to 2009 the social climate in the neighbourhoods of Emmen Revisited takes centre stage. Social climate is defined in the bigger sense of the word; it includes social security, contacts between residents and also feeling at home in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, physical and economical projects related to this overarching social goal: i.e. projects aimed at increasing the access of residents to the labour market intended not only to improve to financial position of residents, but also their self-esteem. This should ultimately improve the reputation and appeal of the neighbourhood, because in-active residents would no longer dominate the area. In spite of these statements, efforts to influence neighbourhood attachment mainly take place under the banner of project designed for improving the social bonds between residents. The view of the coalition appears to be that when residents get to know each other better, neighbourhood attachment will benefit automatically. Although social contacts are important for feeling at home in the neighbourhood, attachment to place is lost in this view as a goal in its own right in urban renewal.

7.6 Discussion

The development of Emmen Revisited demonstrates an ongoing search for combining physical urban renewal with economic and social interventions, which has widened the scope of the social programme considerably and has included initiatives which recognise the importance of neighbourhood attachment. However, the content of the social programme has never been properly defined and the link to the physical and economic programmes has never been specified, reducing the social programme to incidental experiments in the daily urban practice and fragmentising the integral approach. The development of an integral approach
requires a more structural approach, allowing projects aimed at increasing the place attachments of residents to develop and to become an integral part of the social programme.

However, valuable instigators are available like the day of memories organised in Emmerhout, where explicit attention was given to the emotional ties that residents had developed with a place which is about to be demolished; recognizing the symbolic value of the built environment and providing an outlet for these emotions. This effort demonstrates important ways in which place identity and sense of place can be utilised in helping residents to feel less uprooted in the transition to a new place of residence. The housing association and other local parties can utilise this value to ease the emotional pain of moving and also to aid residents in their attachment to a new environment by organising similar events for returning residents.

Emmen Revisited also demonstrates how bridges can be built between physical and social projects. In the project ‘Hulp en Activering’ (Social Support and Activation) in the same neighbourhood an explicit connection was made between socio-economic and physical interventions. The relocation of residents in urban renewal areas was used to increase the social mobility of unemployed residents by offering them education and job training. This connection was based on the assumption that residents, whose lives were already uprooted by a changing environment and the relocation to a new or temporary home, would be more willing to consider changing other areas of their lives. They would, therefore, be more willing to participate in the social mobility programmes on offer. This assumption proved right and similar initiatives could be helpful in reducing the emotional stress caused to residents by relocation; it recognises the emotional uprooting involved and turns this emotion into a positive experience.

Next to the examples set by Emmen Revisited, the case study demonstrates the importance of an integral approach and organisation. Few cities have a detailed urban renewal programme at their disposal for the whole city that includes different public and private parties and consults them on a regular basis. Emmen Revisited is the exception to the case, where a thorough preparation resulted in a diverse and widely supported programme, in which the social dimension takes a prominent place.
8. Case Study: Hoogvliet, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

8.1 Introducing Hoogvliet

In the Urban audit (ECOTEC, 2007) Rotterdam is typecasted as a Gateway city: a larger city with dedicated (port) infrastructure, handling large flows of international goods and passengers. These cities are the platforms for freight transport, distribution and related industries and services. In addition, a wide variety of trade-related activities have been developed - Rotterdam has been successful in building (financial) services, particularly in the insurance industry. Despite all the achievements, this strong specialisation gives rise to a number of specific challenges. Port activities are becoming increasingly capital-intensive and automated, providing an ever narrower employment base. Unlike Transformation Poles (see chapter 8 on Manchester), Gateways are still firmly locked into their traditional port functions - and this can hamper the pursuit of new opportunities and diversification initiatives. Due to their physical appearance Gateway cities are often less attractive to tourists, investors and residents alike.

The Rotterdam city borough of Hoogvliet was built after World War Two to house the increasing demand for workers in the harbour and the nearby petro-chemical industry in the Botlek-area. Starting as a small dike town, it quickly developed into the first Dutch satellite town with more than 35,000 inhabitants. Employment was surging and many new workers were attracted to the newly built maisonette houses, set amidst an abundance of green public space. The fortune of Hoogvliet changed in the seventies and eighties with the large scale automation and computerisation of the industry and an economic crisis, followed by reorganisation and an explosion at the site of the oil manufacturer Shell, which dramatically
reduced the number of jobs in the area. Unemployment soared and the close proximity to the industry was no longer perceived as an asset but a threat; air and light pollution by the industry earned the area a bad reputation.

Moreover, Hoogvliet lost the battle for the middle classes to the neighbouring boroughs of Spijkenisse and Hellevoetsluis, who preferred the family homes in these booming urban areas over the large number of apartments in Hoogvliet. This further reduced the number of inhabitants and left behind the residents who could not afford to move. Between 1976 and 1985 almost 6,000 inhabitants left Hoogvliet, and particularly the north of Hoogvliet turned into a peripheral spill over area for the city of Rotterdam; the borough became known as ‘the sewer (waste pipe) of the regional housing market’. The area was characterised by a large number of void properties and an accumulation of social deprivation problems. Young people where hit hardest and were reported to be trapped in a culture of unemployment, expressing themselves in vandalism and juvenile behaviour (Heeger & Van der Zon, 1988).

The tide turned in the nineties after a television documentary branded Hoogvliet as a ‘terminal station’ for its residents with no hope for the future. However, the documentary achieved the opposite by catalysing the cries for renewal. Under the command of the residents’ party IBP and in coalition with the city council, local residents joined together to address the issues of degeneration and deprivation in Hoogvliet. In 1998 the city council and two local housing associations devised plans for large scale demolition and renewal of the housing stock. Almost 5,000 homes (nearly half of the cheap stock and a third of all the housing in Hoogvliet) were to be demolished and replaced by a larger number of new and more attractive homes. Part of the new build was reserved for social housing although the size of social housing in Hoogvliet was to be reduced from 62% to 45%. They would be replaced by building more expensive owner-occupied housing, and by selling parts (1,500 homes) of the social housing stock. Ultimately, the plan’s aim was for 60% of the residents should to own their own house in 2010, compared to the small minority of 20% owner-occupiers in 1998.

These plans made Hoogvliet one of the largest regeneration sites in the Netherlands. The city council and the two housing associations put their vision for Hoogvliet on paper in the urban renewal programme titled ‘Hoogvliet, Self-Willed
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(wilful) City’, in which they set out the guidelines and main areas to focus on in the urban renewal of Hoogvliet for the next ten years. The plan demonstrates clear ambitions to achieve more than improved housing by stressing social and economic goals. This becomes evident by the five themes that are laid out in the plans:

1. Desired Living
2. Living Together
3. Education and Employment
4. Care and Social Security
5. Establishment for Businesses

Although these themes are fairly general, they show a strong focus on the socio-economic mobility of its residents. In a revised version of the plan (2000) more detail is added by stressing three renewal principals:

- Maintaining social cohesion throughout the urban renewal process;
- Every resident who wants to stay in Hoogvliet, should be able to do so;
- Not only the borough of Hoogvliet should improve, but every resident in Hoogvliet should reap the rewards.

This is clearly a very ambitious strategy and relatively unique in the Netherlands. Social mobility is not often quoted as a motive for urban renewal; most programmes focus exclusively on spatial mobility and/or social cohesion and when attention is given to social mobility this is usually at the aggregated level of the neighbourhood. Is the neighbourhood improved by mixed tenure, increased education and employment qualifications for residents and less deprivation? Hoogvliet turn this around by starting with individual residents: are residents who already lived in the neighbourhood at the start of the urban renewal programme in 1998 more socially mobile in 2006 and where do these changes occur in individuals’ lives? The changes in people’s lives should bring out a change in the whole neighbourhood; if residents’ lives are improved, life in the neighbourhood should improve with less vandalism and crime, and more safety and neighbouring. Therefore, it is deemed important to maintain the social bonds between residents during the urban renewal process; neighbourhood life should proceed as normal as possible. Moreover, the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood are
taken into account; residents who would like to stay in the neighbourhood should be able to return to their renewed house or else be relocated elsewhere in their neighbourhood to maintain neighbourhood affection and connections. Residents who have left the area were invited to return.

The three guiding principles in Hoogvliet echo the three distinct social goals of urban renewal, social cohesion, social-emotional ties and social mobility, and are connected to each other in the urban renewal programme. Those that feel at home in Hoogvliet will maintain stronger bonds with other residents and need to stay in the neighbourhood to help the weaker. Place attachment to the area is also directly stimulated; the building plans were based on images, constructed with a wide variety of participants, which projected the present and future identity of the municipality. In the execution of these plans innovative projects were designed to record and influence people’s place identity. For example and in a similar way to the day of memories organised in Emmen, special days were organised in which residents’ memories of the neighbourhood were visualised in plays written and performed by the locals, to help residents part with the area that they were forced to leave due to the demolition of their homes.

8.2 Designing Place Identity

Place identity has been actively stimulated in Hoogvliet. Hoogvliet was one of four experimental zones for an innovation programme, called “Identiteit en Branding” (Neighbourhood Identity and Branding), set up by two large housing associations in the Southwest of the Netherlands, Woonbron en Staedon, and supported by the Dutch department of Housing. Concerned with what they defined as “a degrading quality of neighbourhoods, a lack of recognisability of the living environment, and a concentration of deprivation” both housing associations sought new ways to regenerate these neighbourhoods by profiling them according to well-defined user groups with specific characteristics and demands. To achieve a better match between people and places, they choose the identity of an area as the guiding principle for their developmental plans. The ‘emotional logic’ of four carefully selected neighbourhoods needed to be located and used as an inspiration for the
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physical regeneration and urban renewal of these areas in so-called ‘conscientious’
neighbourhood plans. Four pilot projects were set up: two in The Hague
(Mariahoeve en Schipperskwartier) and two in Rotterdam (Hoogvliet en Nieuwe
Westen). In Hoogvliet the project consisted of three research phases:

- Historical research;
- Branding sessions with local professionals and residents; and
- Life style sessions.

In the first part of the project The History Story conducted delved into the
historical roots of Hoogvliet. The results are described in the report “Hoogvliet:
Bloem zonder Wortels” (Van den Brink 2003). The report was not
overenthusiastically received by its commissioners, as it painted a rather gloomy. I
described the borough as a physically, economically, socially and politically
defragmentated place with a strong dividing line between a mixed but socially and
economically weak dense south on the one side, and a more homogeneous richer
northern part of Hoogvliet on the other side where space and green was more
abundant and costly.

Next up was Real Time Branding, whose task it was to come up with a new
brand for Hoogvliet that would put the neighbourhood back on the map and in the
market of popular places to live. To speed up this difficult task the company
applied a so-called pressure cooker-method; 50 representatives of the
neighbourhood, ranging from residents and social workers to housing association
staff, police officers and council employees were put together for three days in a
big conference room on the south coast of Holland. Here they debated on
numerous hot issues, such as the most favourite places in the neighbourhood and
the wishes, values and associations people attached to the ideal neighbourhood
environment with the ideal neighbour. The representatives were supported by two
advisers and a creative team of drawers/ designers, whose task it was to translate
the outcomes into visual images. The result was a metallic ‘brand’ book, which
depicted five key values for Hoogvliet: base camp, self esteem, community, strong
minded and adventure.

To test whether these key values resonated with the residents back in
Hoogvliet, the SmartAgent Company organised a number of sessions with local
residents in which they were presented with different images of possible social climates in Hoogvliet according to street layout and type of housing. The key values were used to locate the new Hoogvlieter whose lifestyle would make him or her strongly focussed on the neighbourhood where he lives and the people that live there. The sessions resulted in six living arrangements, which suited the different value orientations in Hoogvliet. The first one, called the private neighbourhood, was designed for people who did not like to constantly run into their neighbour, while the second one, labelled the living square, consisted of houses located round a cozy communal space while each home could enjoy their privacy in their secluded backyards. In contrast, residents who opted for ‘the freedom street’ could pretty much do as they pleased without disturbing their neighbours. Three arrangements were specifically designed for the new Hoogvlieter: in ‘the protected collective’ children were able to play together, while neighbours could exchange the nitty gritty of daily lives over the fence, whereas in ‘the home in the city’-design all sorts of people could mingle in an urban designed environment. The different designs were to be used as dream images that could inspire the physical and social regeneration of Hoogvliet.

In spite of all the efforts and colourful design books, strikingly little of the results of the project have found their way into project plans and urban renewal activities in Hoogvliet. The results of the four different pilot projects were presented at a conference in The Hague in the summer of 2006, where it became clear that this translation would not happen anywhere soon. The only visible result is a marketing campaign by the city council with the motto “Helemaal Hoogvliet” (Totally Hoogvliet), which uses the key values and living arrangements as a inspiration for the promotion of new build housing in the borough.

A programme that has materialised more visibly in the urban renewal of Hoogvliet is the work of a group of architectural historians who started in 2001 after the International Architecture Exhibition held in Hoogvliet. The exhibition carried the motto “Welcome In My Backyard!” (WIMBY!), playing on the well known defensive response of residents when unpopular facilities, such as homeless shelters and rehab centres are added to their neighbourhood; “Not In My Back Yard”. What was meant to be only a virtual city architect, enabling a large scale
vision for the transformation of Hoogvliet, developed over the years into a small-scale and hybrid network of public and private actors, who in joint ventures developed artistic projects to change the outlook and appearance of the physical structure of the city. For instance, for the project “Inside Out”, homes that were nominated for the sledgehammer were wrapped up in real size computer animations of local residents in their home environment. The banners were supposed to make private lives part of the public city life, although not all residents were able to recognise themselves on the banners. More recently, the groups designed and built a ‘recreational villa’ in the middle of the area to “revamp the empty and quiet live in the streets by providing residents a place to meet and gather” (www.wimby.nl). Most of their work is strongly symbolic and aesthetic, used for visual communication. Architecture is used to visualise and highlight the physical and social diversity of the city.

The group also developed plans that tried to change the physical infrastructure of Hoogvliet. WIMBY! redesigned four maisonette flats in the neighbourhood of Oudeland. Their design aimed to create new housing collectives which “redefine the borders between public and private space by creating opportunities to meet and interact with different ethnic groups”. The balcony areas were designed as living space and the communal spaces were to be fitted with glass walls to enable social control of these spaces. So called ‘cluster zones’ should allow residents to interact with each other or separate themselves from others (privacy management) by shifting walls around. Potential tenants were to be recruited from different walks of life and to be assigned to different parts of the flats. Young people would be located above elderly residents, while single parents (mostly from the Dutch Antilles) would be living next to ‘free spirits’, ‘pre-Yuppen’ (young, urban but not yet professional residents) and ‘short stayers’ who work on a temporary contract for a local company. The execution of the plan experienced considerable delays due to ‘capacity problems’ at the involved housing association. The plans were further undermined by a city council decision in 2006 to reserve part of the flats for the housing of former prostitutes from the now closed tipping zone on the Keilerweg in Rotterdam. The society responsible for the care of these ladies preferred separated floors for their clients instead of the mixed and shifting borders design intended by the WIMBY! architects.
Unfortunately, and in spite of all the efforts to incorporate place identity into the urban renewal of Hoogvliet, little remains of all the research and designs. Evidence of a changed area reputation for Hoogvliet, particularly in the eyes of people living outside the borough, is lacking so far. Although the city council conducted a survey on the image of Hoogvliet among residents and outsiders (people living and working elsewhere in the Greater Rotterdam area) at the start of the urban renewal in 1999, this research has not been repeated to establish changes in the reputation on the area. What the research conducted for the Strategisch Communicatieplan Herpositionering (Strategic Communication plan for Repositioning, 1999) did show was a striking difference in the perception of Hoogvliet between insiders and outsiders; the image of residents living in Hoogvliet differed considerably from the image of the area held by other Rotterdam inhabitants and commuters, in that residents are far more positive about the reputation of the area, with 90% claiming they do not want to leave the area and two thirds stating they will live in Hoogvliet until the day they die. Outsiders are much less familiar with the area: three quarters of these respondents could not think of any (positive or negative) association with the name Hoogvliet.

Other evidence on the lack of progress in area reputation comes from the Leefbaarheidsmonitor (Liveability Survey) regularly repeated under a representative sample of Rotterdam residents. When residents in Hoogvliet were asked in 2001 to rate their own neighbourhood and the borough of Hoogvliet on a scale from 1 to 10, the borough received an average rating of 6.8 with a similar score for the neighbourhood. When repeated in 2005 the scores almost remained the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Neighbourhood</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogvliet</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leefbaarheidsmonitor Rotterdam 2001, 2005

In sum, there is no proof of an effective redesigning of place identity in Hoogvliet has in urban renewal. However, the possibility remains that other more indirect attempts have been more successful. Next to direct attempts to change the place
attachments of residents, the urban renewal programme in Hoogvliet has tried to increase the social mobility of residents. Is it possible that this attempt has been more successful and in doing so has influenced the place attachment of residents? Is there an indirect effect of social mobility on place attachment? This is not an unlikely connection as the experiences in Emmen in the previous chapter have shown: by combining relocation with social activation residents demonstrated more progress. Does improved social mobility in urban renewal increase the emotional ties to the neighbourhood; do more mobile residents feel more at home in their neighbourhood? In short, are human capital investments more effective in (indirectly) stimulating the place attachments of the original residents?

8.3 Social Mobility in Hoogvliet

The rest of this case study is concerned with evaluating the results of the urban renewal programme in Hoogvliet, with a particular focus on the socio-economical mobility of individual residents. To do this, the changes in socio-economical status for residents still living in the area were assessed between 1998 and 2006 on five dimensions: employment, education, income, housing, and independence and health.

1. **Employment**: changes in the amount (hours per week) and type (qualification level) of employment and job career, as well as changes in volunteer work, job training and entrepreneurship
2. **Education**: changes in school attendance and qualifications (including exam scores)
3. **Income**: changes in amount (increases and decreases) of earned and spendable annual household income, and saving money
4. **Housing**: change in type (tenant or owner-occupier), price and size of property, with respect to changes in household composition
5. **Independence and health**: changes in dependency on care and benefits and changes in perceived amount of control over ones own life and that of any children. Are residents living more independent and healthy?
These five dimensions were chosen to define social mobility and map onto the five urban themes selected by the Hoogvliet council and the housing associations. With these dimensions, it was possible to distinguish between different patterns of mobility for residents still living in the area. Is social mobility more likely on certain dimensions and what are common combinations? Does not only the quality of housing improve for individual residents, but also their employment or educational qualifications? Do they feel more in control of their lives and what are their expectations for the future? Furthermore, are there differences in social mobility between different residents’ groups and different neighbourhoods in Hoogvliet? And if so, does this lead to different mobility patterns? Does improved housing provide stimuli to improve one’s income or does a hefty mortgage make it more difficult for residents to make ends meet? Is job training the best way to improve employment or is it more about who you know in the neighbourhood for job referrals?

In the relatively short time span of the research (1998-2006), it is unlikely that large improvements will have occurred in the social mobility of residents on all dimensions. To increase the time span of the research and to make (more modest) behavioural changes visible, the research also focuses on changes in the ambitions of residents. Do residents assess their chances for social mobility differently after eight years of urban renewal? Is there a change in work ethics visible from a culture of poverty to culture of achievement? Are they more ambitious for the future, both for themselves and for their children? After establishing changes in social mobility and ambitions for the future, the next question is what causes these changes? Is urban renewal responsible for these changes and which projects contribute the most?

Since controlling data for similar areas where no urban renewal has taken place is lacking, strong causal connections are hard to establish. However, by comparing between different residents’ groups and neighbourhoods in Hoogvliet plausible connections between urban renewal and social mobility can be explored.

**Methodology**

Based on an extensive literature review indicators were selected and developed on each dimension, resulting in a comprehensive questionnaire. This questionnaire was
subsequently used in 24 open interviews with residents who have lived in Hoogvliet since the start of the urban renewal in 1998, to record their changes in socio-economic status and to investigate the sources of their reported changes. Residents were selected on three criteria: 1) residency since 1999 in one of four areas, where the majority of the urban renewal projects took place, 2) ethnicity and 3) age.

The three criteria allowed for comparisons between the different target groups of the urban renewal policy in Hoogvliet; original white Dutch residents versus ethnic newcomers, particularly residents from the Dutch Antilles, on the one hand, and young people growing up in the neighbourhood versus elderly residents on the other hand, who liked to remain in the neighbourhood, in spite of their growing care needs. All selected candidates were characterized by a low education and low income, as it was anticipated that the effects of the urban renewal projects would be largest among this group of residents. Residents were approached by local community workers. Out of 32 potential interview candidates 24 were interviewed. Interviews lasted on average 1.5 hours and were conducted face to face in the respondents’ homes. The interviews focused on different routes of social mobility: which dimensions of social mobility are affected by urban renewal?

8.3.1 Employment, Income and Education
Since respondents were selected on low socio-economic status-scores, most residents that were interviewed had little money to spend. The majority was without a job and received social benefits. Those who were employed often worked in a so-called ID-job or as paid volunteer staff for the local community (OK-bank). The average income ranged from 1350 to 2050 euro net a month. Some households had to make ends meet with less than 1000 euro a month. The interviewed residents complained about a loss of income over the period 1998-2006 with increasing housing costs (rent, bills and insurance) reducing their spending power. The introduction of the (expensive) Euro in 2001 was partly blamed for the increased costs of living. None of the respondents had increased their income since 1998, with some residents even experiencing a reduced income by losing their job in the last eight years. In particular, residents in Nieuw Engeland and Meeuwenplaat complained of loss of income. Several residents experienced the
poverty trap; by acquiring a job they lost access to benefits and grants, which made them worse off in the end and forced them to quit their jobs.

There was a time when I needed to make ends meet with 80 guilders per week and a son. If I succeeded, I was very proud. I was doing fairly well then. I had access to many facilities and received for instance housing benefits. My son’s sport tuitions were partly paid by the government and I was able to take up courses that were offered to me. […] I enjoy more income now, but my costs of living have increased and I am not entitled any more to the same benefits” (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

In general residents found it more difficult in 2006 to make ends meet. Few residents have improved their income by finding a job or a partner who contributed to the household budget.

Educational qualifications were equally low for the interviewed residents; most residents had no further qualifications after MBO (GCSE equivalent). However, they were satisfied with their education level and, therefore, felt no incentive to improve their qualifications. What residents did notice was an increase in the ethnic mixing of schools in Hoogvliet, although this trend was not noticeable in every neighbourhood. According to the residents, the primary schools in Meeuwenplaat attracted more pupils from the ethnic population than schools in Zalmplaat where the majority of pupils was still white. Official statistics, however, showed that more ethically mixed schools were a minority case: 3 out of 11 primary schools have increased their ethnic student population, while 3 schools have witnessed a decrease in their number of ethnic students, and 5 schools report no change at all. Ethnic mixing of the schools in Hoogvliet is, therefore, more pronounced in the experience of the Hoogvliet residents than in the official statistics.

8.3.2 Housing
Residents who were forced to move due to the demolition of their home were more satisfied afterwards with their new house. More space and facilities, both inside (larger bathroom, lift) and outside (balcony, garden), are appreciated by the new
tenants. An increase in the rental price was taken for granted, since residents receive more space and facilities in return. However, a considerable number of these residents admitted they would have preferred to stay in their demolished house. They felt at home in their house and with the people living around them, and did not share the same urgency as the housing association for demolition. They dreaded the move to the new place, but in hindsight are happy with the result; their new home.

Until 1999 I lived in Meeuwenplaat. I just had to leave there: it was small, damp and ridden with fungi and the flat had only stairways. I deliberately choose a new house in a mixed neighbourhood. My house is a real palace, honest. You won’t find a similar sized house anywhere else. I never want to leave from here (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

Not feeling safe and a bad area reputation were most often quoted as reasons for moving20. One respondent moved into the Waaierflats in 1968, where different ethnic groups were packed together. This led to tensions and ultimately gun violence between ethnic groups. Therefore, the respondent decided to move out of the flats to the adjacent neighbourhood of Johannapolder. After her marriage she moved back to Nieuw Engeland, because “the biggest problems had been solved”.

I wanted a bigger house, but did not really want to move to Nieuw Engeland. This has always been a neighbourhood with a bad reputation, lots of nuisance and junkies. They shoot cats on the streets from their balconies, and I have cats!” In the end she decided to remain in the neighbourhood: “With the demolition of the flats the neighbourhood has improved. The quality and size of the house and the low rent made me decide to stay. It is just a beautiful house with a large garden! (Resident from Nieuw Engeland)

Residents who did not experience the demolition of their homes are usually long term inhabitants of the area; they feel strongly connected to the neighbourhood

20 At the same time, improvements on the issues are a reason to return to the neighbourhood.
and would prefer to stay in Hoogvliet for the rest of their lives. Financial reasons are part of this decision:

_We feel very fortunate. The house in which we live is built with urban renewal funds and the rent is set accordingly. Therefore, it not appealing to move_ (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

_I never even considered moving out of Hoogvliet. Hoogvliet is familiar; there is lots of green space, great for the children, who enjoy playing in it_ (Resident from Meeuwenplaat).

Living in Hoogvliet was for most respondents a conscious decision; the accessibility to work and family or friends were important advantages of living in this part of Rotterdam, especially for immigrants from the Dutch Antilles who travelled to the Netherlands to build a new life for themselves and their children. One respondent lived from 1975 to 1986 in Amsterdam, while working on a shipyard. When the shipyard hit rocky waters, he applied for a similar job at Shell in Rotterdam and moved to Hoogvliet.

_It’s very quiet here. There is a good underground connection with the centre and the south of Rotterdam. Job opportunities are also good: Shell, the Botlek area. At least you don’t have to sit in traffic jams to get to work_ (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

Another respondent moved in 1998 from Curaçao to the Netherlands. Her daughter was already living in the neighbourhood of Zalmplaat and, therefore, she moved in with her daughter and grandchildren until she acquired an apartment of her own in 2000. She moved to the Netherlands to provide her two sons with a better future and to support them when they were studying.

While the new neighbourhood was a marked improvement for these residents compared to the one they left behind, their arrival was met with less enthusiasm by their neighbours. The residents who where already living there experienced a negative change in their living environment and complained about increased levels
of noise pollution, nuisance and lingering. As the new residents were often former immigrants, they introduced a different way of life to the neighbourhood, which collided with the norms and values upheld by the original residents. In Oudeland and Meeuwenplaat particularly, residents complained about their new neighbours from the Dutch Antilles. Much less is known and visible to the original residents were the new arrivals of middle class families, attracted by the new and often more expensive rental opportunities and housing for sale. Existing residents’ attention (and complaints) focused primarily on the lower income groups that caused noise pollution and nuisance; contact between the different income groups was predominantly absent.

When Shell expanded in the past, people from Drenthe moved up here. When they moved up the societal ladder, they moved to a bigger house, freeing up their old houses. The new people who moved into these so-called “Shell houses” turned them into a ghetto. Who could afford to leave, moved out of the neighbourhood. People with a low social status, but also criminals and drugs addicts moved in (Resident from Oudeland).

This process of new arrivals and rising tensions between old and new residents’ groups was repeated several times during the urban renewal of Hoogvliet. Demolition of housing in adjacent neighbourhoods caused a flow in of residents who could afford a home in a better off neighbourhood, which was perceived by the existing residents as a decline of ‘their’ neighbourhood, causing them to consider moving to another neighbourhood where “life was better”. This sat a chain of movements in motions with perceived loss of reputation and house prices in its track, which became a self-fulfilling prophesy for urban renewal and demolition. When urban renewal plans were presented turnover rates increased, changing the neighbourhood composition and causing nuisance and loss of reputation for the residents who lived there. If possible they moved out of the neighbourhood, leaving behind, in increasing frustration, those who could not afford to move. This chain started in the early nineties in Nieuw Engeland and was followed by a moving flow to the other three neighbourhoods in Hoogvliet. When urban renewal started in
Meeuwenplaat at end of the millennium, similar complaints and concerns were raised from the white population in the neighbourhood.

*An increasing number of immigrants from the Dutch Antilles moved into the neighbourhood, older Dutch residents moved out; they were afraid of the immigrants. These people have another way of life; they talk much louder. Some people get frightened by that* (Resident from Meeuwenplaat).

Later on it was Zalmplaat’s turn to be concerned when residents from Meeuwenplaat whose houses were demolished moved to this adjacent neighbourhood. According the residents, the neighbourhood was declining rapidly.

*Zalmplaat had a name for being the best neighbourhood of Hoogvliet. [...] Zalmplaat used to be white and Meeuwenplaat predominantly black; the other side of the underground station was out of bounds. [...] The neighbourhood reputation has deteriorated slightly in more recent years. Many residents left the neighbourhood out of precaution, leaving void properties behind in the flats. The flats have become more prone to vandalism* (Resident from Zalmplaat).

Next to new residents, the demolition brought noise, nuisance and often crime to the adjacent neighbourhoods.

*The waste skips are still there. They attract people from other neighbourhoods, who come to dump their waste here. Within a year’s time the neighbourhood visibly changed. Nieuw Engeland used to be the ghetto, now all these people moved over here [Meeuwenplaat]. All of a sudden a drugs dealer lived among the white elderly residents in this flat. 11 year olds came round to score drugs* (Resident from Meeuwenplaat).

However, not every resident judged the new arrivals a disaster for the neighbourhood:
The neighbourhood has become more amiable, the neighbourhood has opened up. You can witness this in schools and on the streets; they are more colourful (Resident from Zalmplaat).

It’s more fun in the summer; there are more people outside. Many activities are organised for children, there is more contact between residents (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

And for some it was a process of getting used to the new environment:

There used to be more fear among residents. Before 1999, foreign voices on the street were rare. Nowadays that is perfectly normal (Resident from Meeuwenplaat).

Time appears to be a healer; in Nieuw Engeland, where demolition started already in the early nineties, neighbourhood reputation is on the up again. Residents, who fled the neighbourhood at the first strokes of the demolition hammer, are slowly returning to their original neighbourhood and speak proudly of the improved area. For them Nieuw Engeland is no longer the ghetto of Hoogvliet.

The living environment has improved; it’s safer, because residents act differently and the green spaces are prettier. The police patrols more often and the housing association keeps in touch with residents” (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

When family used to visited, they used to be frightened by the neighbourhood in which I lived. This is no longer the case: the visitors are pleasantly surprised (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

Although, scepticism remained and the old image of Hoogvliet held by outsiders was more resistant to change and likely to changed more slowly.
Many residents moved out of the neighbourhood. It’s not clean and safe. [...] There are green spaces in the neighbourhood, but they are used by foreigners who play baseball, or occupy the space by the hundred and just sit there and moan. They also sell beer from the houses. [...] The neighbourhood, in which we live now, has recently been renamed into “The Turning Point”. I find this an apt name: you should turn around here and get out as quickly as you can (Family from Nieuw Engeland).

The area reputation has improved; it is now a nice quiet street. I recently spoke to someone, who said she never ever wanted to live in Nieuw Engeland. I explained to her that the neighbourhood is doing much better now, but the bad image of the Waaier-flats remains in the heads of people outside the neighbourhood (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

In spite of the promise made by the borough council and the involved housing associations, the interviewed residents did not expect every resident to return to the neighbourhood when the urban renewal was completed. Some residents were believed to be either better off elsewhere or to be unable to return. Also, respondents were sceptical about the promised affordable rent prices of 500 euro a month and less.

Many residents, who lived in the demolished houses, do not return to the neighbourhood. They were offered a spacious flat in Zalmplaat and do not wish to leave anymore. Although, there are so-called “shoppers”, people who move from one demolition house to the next to collect the moving premium (Resident from Meeuwenplaat).

8.3.3 Independence and Health

The residents that were interviewed were asked about their independence and their ability to manage their own affairs. Are they able to stand up for themselves and able to get access to the right people to help them solve they problems the meet in their daily affairs? One of the major ways residents improved their independence was by participating in volunteer work; it provided volunteers with
problem solving knowledge and useful connections for support and access to public agencies. The process of demolition and moving caused stress for many residents and being active in volunteer work and resident participation helped them to cope with the stress and anxiety.

*It was a tumultuous time, which was not good for your body and soul. I built up self-confidence by cooperating with social work in the neighbourhood. Through this work other Hoogvliet residence got to know me and they recognised and appreciated my contribution. Residents and organisations involved with the demolition are much more accessible now; I know where to go when there is trouble* (Resident from Meeuwenplaat).

Other residents went through a similar process due to more personal problems like over exhaustion, work fatigue and extreme anxiety, which forced them to take control back over their life and taught them to stand up for themselves. Urban renewal acted as trigger for their personal problems, but also as a stimulant to find help. Some of these residents received support from a social worker, although most of them said they preferred to do it alone and did not like to admit they needed or received help. When residents failed to enlist help and support, they reported feeling less independent and able to manage their lives.

*In the streets four to five year old children called me a whore. I couldn’t handle that and looked for help. The police referred me to Victim Aid, but they asked me: “Why are you here?” and I left instantly. Now I find it even more difficult to ask for help* (Resident from Nieuw Engeland).

Finally, older residents were worried that they would be less able to look after themselves and the house (maintaining the garden) in the future. They worried about having to move again to more supported housing and feared that no affordable housing alternative would be available to them at that time.
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8.4 Discussion

The interviews conducted for this research were part of a larger research project conducted for the borough of Hoogvliet, in collaboration with the University of Amsterdam and the OTB research institute in Delft (Veldboer et. al., 2007). The research project consisted of three parts: an extensive literature review to explore topics for half-structured interviews with a sample of residents, which were consequently developed into questions for a large scale survey among all residents in Hoogvliet who have lived in the area since the start of the urban renewal programme. The results of the interviews were, therefore, used as input for a larger survey among all original residents in Hoogvliet. The results of the survey largely confirmed the findings of the interviews and elaborated a number of issues raised in the interviews. For a more detailed discussion of the survey residents see the report written by Veldboer, Kleinhans and Duyvendak (2007).

Both the interviews and the survey indicated that success was present but limited to certain aspects of mobility. Most residents benefited from improved housing quality, but little direct progress was visible on the other dimensions of socio-economical status. Work, income and education of residents were not improved for the majority of residents. Some did find a job or start an education with the help of the programme, however, for most residents their disposable income was not increased and more often they found it harder to make ends meet. Residents who already enjoyed a working life noticed little improvement and, by and large, residents were already satisfied with their education in 1999 and had little aspiration to pursue additional qualifications.

Ethnic groups, in particular immigrants from the Dutch Antilles, fared better: they improved their socio-economic status more often by participating in on-the-job training programmes, although some times enforced by social services. Also, more progress was made by volunteer work. Although varying considerably in degree, almost all respondents participated in some kind of volunteer work. Particularly for residents with limited opportunities on the labour market due to disabilities, volunteer work proved an alternative career; in stead of being a stepping stone for better job prospects, volunteer work boosted their self
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confidence and strengthened their feelings of independence. By participating in the programme, residents increased their contact with other residents and made even more their contact with local professionals from social work, housing associations and the city council. In some occasions, volunteer work developed into something more, allowing residents access to subsidised jobs (ID-banen) and special job training programmes. However, it proved difficult to uphold this newly acquired status in the long run when grants and training programmes came to an end. There appeared to be an inverse relationship between volunteer work and job prospects; without a job residents had ample time to participate in volunteer work, however, once in a job their ability to participate diminished quickly.

Another dimension which showed considerable change was neighbourhood reputation with, on one side, the existing residents who complained about loss of reputation and problems of deprivation caused by in flow in of residents from adjacent neighbourhood who houses were being demolished and, one the other hand, residents who returned after a number of years to their renewed neighbourhood and speak proudly again of the improved area. This is one of the most profound changes quoted by residents; a new sense of achievement in the area.

Where residents before showed signs of fatalism (no on cares, nothing matters), there are now few who reside in their deprivation. The general consensus among residents is that achievement is possible and that society is willing to listen and help. There is no longer a culture of underachievement, in which residents loose faith because there are no opportunities (Veldboer et. al., 2007:43).

Many residents appreciated the efforts of the borough council and the housing association to improve their quality of live, even if this had far-reaching consequences for them, such as being forced to leave their home due to demolition. The research showed that changes in the neighbourhood and the personal lives of residents were connected; neighbourhood mobility generated individual mobility (Veldboer et. Al, 2007:44). It is no coincidence that the two groups of residents who demonstrated the most progress were also the most mobile.
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residents: ‘upscalers’ (who go upmarket) and former immigrants from the Dutch Antilles. Interestingly, residents who went upmarket attributed their improvements primarily to their own efforts and less to the urban renewal efforts of the city borough. Few residents linked their achievements to changes in their wider environment, such as improved retail options in the area or the availability of more motivated volunteers at the local leisure centre, while these conditions are often vital for residents to improve themselves. Immigrants from the Dutch Antilles, on the other hand, are more aware of the wider changes around them and contribute their achievements more often to the urban renewal programme. The specifically designed projects for this group are not only effective in this respect, but are also recognised as such by these residents.

This points to a crucial factor in the urban renewal programme of Hoogvliet: mobilising residents was not sufficient; they also had to be made aware of other potential changes in their lives. This is one of the key findings of the research:

When residents were forced to move, they became more aware of other opportunities for change in their lives. Moving house became a moving to opportunities, while remaining (when possible) in the same neighbourhood (Veldboer et. al., 2007:44).

However, according to the research, this is not sufficient in itself. Social professionals who work in these neighbourhoods have the important task of making residents aware of these potential changes and to support them in achieving these opportunities by tailor-made socio-economical projects. Next to mobilising residents, social professional have to direct them to other opportunities (Veldboer, et. al., 2007: 44). When residents are forced to move due to demolition, they can support them with additional social investments aimed at improving their educational and job qualifications and, most importantly, their self-esteem to discover and act upon new opportunities in their lives.

The urban renewal programme in Hoogvliet has brought about a process of improved self-esteem for a considerable amount of the residents by combining new housing opportunities with assertive social policy (Veldboer, et. al., 2007: 43). This does not lead (yet) to many objective improvements in the quality of their lives.
when measured in terms of education, income and jobs, but “does make a substantial number of the Hoogvlieters feel they can achieve more in their lives and feel more proud of the neighbourhood they live in” (Veldboer, et. al., 2007: 43). Both feelings appear to be connected; a more viable and safer living environment (to be proud of) is important for residents to feel able to change their lives and face long-term standing problems of deprivation. Neighbourhood improvement becomes an important condition for social mobility.

Starting with bricks and mortar is not a bad approach, although the opportunities (and threats) created by the housing programme need to be ceased (and counteracted) by socio-economical and social-emotional programmes. The link between social mobility and neighbourhood attachment perceived by the borough council and the housing associations is in fact turned upside down: instead of improving individual lives as a precondition for improving area reputation, improved area reputation improves individual’s self-esteem and their willingness to become socially mobile. For the more ‘arrived’ resident groups urban renewal offers an opportunity to return to their ‘old’ neighbourhood.

8.5 Place Attachments in Emmen and Hoogvliet

Both Hoogvliet and Emmen illustrate that there is a complex relationship between the different goals of urban renewal in the Netherlands. Urban renewal is more than bricks and mortar, but what to do with the residents? Is it more important to increase neighbourhood cohesion, as Emmen Revisited decided to do, or does it matter to them more when their social mobility is increased as Hoogvliet argues? High expectations in both cases were disappointed: residents got more housing for their money in Emmen, but experienced limited improvements to their social wellbeing. The social cohesion in Emmen improved only a little, while other indicators like neighbourhood tidiness, nuisance and safety showed deterioration. In a similar way, the residents in Hoogvliet showed few signs of improved social mobility; their job prospects, income and educational qualifications were not significantly improved.
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Reviewing more subjective indicators, demonstrated more progress in both case studies: in Hoogvliet residents became more aware of the possibilities offered by the urban renewal programme to improve their neighbourhood and also their personal lives and as a result felt that they could achieve more in their lives. In Emmen, particularly Bargeres, residents did no longer want to leave their neighbourhood in spite of the social problems they still experienced. A considerable group of residents even decided buying their house from the housing association; since 1991 Woomcom has sold more than 3,200 of their properties to tenants. Buying your home as a tenant is an important indicator for physical attachment and illustrates that residents feel more at home in their neighbourhood. The subjective results in Emmen and Hoogvliet indicate that urban renewal can have a positive effect on the emotional ties of residents, making residents more proud of and attached to the place where they live. However, clear evidence of this is still lacking in both case studies.

More evidence on the effects of urban renewal in Emmen en Hoogvliet on the emotional ties of residents is available from the Housing Needs Survey used in chapter 4. Both areas are sufficiently represented in the data to allow for additional analyses on the neighbourhood level. Which changes are visible in the place attachments of residents living in both areas between 1998 and 2006 and what does this tell us about the likely effectiveness of the different approaches to the social dimension chosen in Emmen and Hoogvliet?

When the physical attachment of residents is considered first, it becomes clear that Emmen is more similar to the non-priority areas in the largest 30 cities, while Hoogvliet closer resembles the more deprived areas. Residents in Emmen are more physically attached to their neighbourhood and these ties increased further between 1998 and 2006. However, the physical ties of residents became weaker after 2002, while they were still on the up in the non-priority areas.
The largest growth in attachments to the neighbourhood, however, can be witnessed in the borough of Hoogvliet; after a loss of physical affection between 1999 and 2000, the residents increased their physical ties considerably, up to the point of closing in on the amount of physical affection displayed by the residents in Emmen.

The same holds true for social attachment; residents in the borough of Hoogvliet demonstrated the largest increase in bondings to their neighbourhood, particularly after 2000, while in the same period residents in Emmen lost social affection for the area where they live. This loss of affection in Emmen took place after a sharp increase of social attachment in the years before, between 1999 and 2000, when residents in Hoogvliet were experiencing a loss of social affection for their neighbourhood. The trends in both areas are opposite to each other: when Emmen is improving the social emotional ties of its residents, the people living in Hoogvliet become less socially attached; and when these ties are on the up again in Hoogvliet, they decline in Emmen. However, the net result is an increase of social and physical attachment to the neighbourhood in both case studies. Emmen shows earlier sign of improvement, although Hoogvliet boast the biggest growth in neighbourhood attachment.
The different trends in neighbourhood attachment are even more pronounced when patterns of attachment are considered. Although the patterns fluctuate considerably over time, on average feelings of alienation are reduced in both case studies. Again opposite trends can be witnessed; while in 2000 Hoogvliet residents became more alienated from their neighbourhood, a large number of the residents in Emmen reduced their feelings of alienation. An interesting difference between both areas is the percentage of residents who established relative ties to their neighbourhood: in Emmen this group increased considerably over the years (from 6 to 37%), while in Hoogvliet a reduction of relative ties was visible, particularly after 2000. Apparently, the residents in Emmen became more satisfied with the place where they live and felt more at home over the years, without developing any specific affection for their neighbourhood, while in Hoogvliet feeling of placelessness developed more strongly. The Hoogvliet residents were less negative about the place where they live and felt more neutral towards their neighbourhood; it did not play an important role for their emotional wellbeing.
In spite of the larger increases in residents’ attachment, both physically and socially, to their neighbourhood in Hoogvliet, Emmen Revisited appears more successful in increasing the strength of the emotional ties to the area where residents live. While Hoogvliet becomes a less negative and more neutral place to live for residents, Emmen is able to transform feelings of detachment and alienation into more affectionate feelings for the area, although not specifically tied to the neighbourhood. The residents in Emmen are happier with where they live and feel more at home.
9. Case Study: Sale, Manchester, United Kingdom

9.1 Booming Manchester?

Manchester paved the way for the Industrial Revolution more than 150 years ago and expanded rapidly over the next century. However, the city was hit hard in the second half of the last century by the outsourcing of labour to third world countries. Manchester lost a large share of its population and with it its economic support. Unemployment and social problems increased dramatically, forcing Manchester to join the ranks of Glasgow and Liverpool as one of the worst places to live in the United Kingdom. Peck and Ward (2006), in their review of 10 years of restructuring in Manchester, sum up the decline in no uncertain terms:

The first industrial city was the first to experience large-scale de-industrialisation, which from the 1960s onwards started to pull the guts out of the place. Industry had not only been a source of jobs but also of cultural identity for a city that had long prided itself on the tradition of no-nonsense graft and money-making. [...] In 1959 well over half of the Greater Manchester workforce was employed by manufacturing. Today, less than one in five of the conurbation’s workforce is employed in factories. (Peck & Ward, 2006:1)

For the last ten years the tide has turned for Manchester: new businesses have been secured and the once desolated city centre and deteriorated harbour areas have been restored and repopulated and new stadiums and culture venues have been established. These developments changed the outlook of Manchester considerably and the city has enjoyed rising employment rates along with processes

---

of gentrification. Like many other cities, Manchester turns to the creative class as the driving force behind the urban renaissance (Florida). Manchester competes with other areas for the favour of young students and highly educated starters in the housing market as well as well to do families (Hall). Other residents’ groups such social professionals are less recognised and favoured as relevant urban middle class (Watt, 2005).

In the urban audit (ECOTEC, 2007) Manchester is described as a transformation pole: larger cities with a rich industrial past that have been forced into change by great economic shifts which impacted heavily on their traditional economic base. The visible change in transformation poles is often impressive. For example new city centres have been built, districts upgraded and state of the art transportation systems put in place. Cities such as Turin, Birmingham and Glasgow are the prime examples here. Typically large-scale projects are implemented. According to the urban audit, Manchester is now emerging as a well-connected and fashionable city in the UK, well-positioned to be a viable alternative to London in areas of services, culture and arts. Key to this transformation has been the renovation and improved connectedness of its city centre (2007: 85). Compared to other transformation poles, Manchester scores low on security, but high on employment and housing: finding a job and a home is relatively easy in Manchester, which is quite rare in this category of cities: more often when jobs are abundant, housing is scarce and vice versa.

9.2 Urban policy and renewal in Manchester

The change in policy focus and agency described in chapter 6, from a preoccupation with housing by central government to a supporting role for housing towards prime social and economic targets in deprived areas and steered by local councils instead of national governments, can also be witnessed in the city of Manchester. After years of taking a back seat, the local government was brought back into the regeneration process in the 1990s, as part of a partnership with other government agencies and the private sector. In the 1980s regeneration policies were largely focused on property-led initiatives and by-passed local government through the establishment of Urban Development Corporations (UDC’s), which took over planning powers from the local authorities within their area. This change in
power was exemplified by the establishment of the Central Manchester Development Corporation (CMDC). The CMDC enabled the Manchester City Council to become more effective in bidding for regeneration money and in implementing projects. Furthermore, CMDC helped to establish a strategy for regeneration, which included bringing a residential population back into the city centre; diversifying the economic base of the city centre to include visitor attractions; and building on the financial services sector. CMDC’s initial strategy was to focus on the functional and geographical extension of the city centre (Williams, 1996). The city centre was not a residential area; there were a mere 250 residents, the result of a long-standing policy of moving people out of the city centre in slum clearance programmes. Thus, the focus was on economic rather than social regeneration; the low numbers of people living here supported this focus.

Manchester made bids for both the 1996 and the 2000 Olympic Games. Although unsuccessful, the process exerted a strong influence, acting as a unifying force and giving a sense of purpose to the wider regeneration efforts of the city. The bids were quite audacious, but they proved an essential part of learning to think big and of believing that Manchester had real potential. The Eastland area of east Manchester was identified as a site for a stadium (Sport City) that would support the 2000 bid - and this eventually housed the 2002 Commonwealth Games.

The 2000 Olympic bid galvanised an emergent network of public and private sector elites, which for a short period shared a common goal: to achieve regeneration through the bidding process (Peck and Ward, 2006: 13).

The emerging networks of public and private sector elites redesigned the political landscape for urban renewal in Manchester and were, as Peck and Ward point out (2006:7), quick to adopt the post-1997 discourse of ‘tackling social exclusion, and can even be seen to have engineered a proto-Blairite policy stance by the early 1990s: “The focus was on opportunities of growth, investment and development, rather than licking the wounds of employment decline and public-sector budget

---

22 A less conscious decision was the failure to develop good public transport links, as well as the general state of decay in the city centre, both of which led to the suburbanisation of many businesses (Mellor, 2002).
cuts” (Peck and Ward, 2006: 14). However, Peck and Ward are equally quick to point out that this positive outlook of the new urban policy merely acts as a façade, behind which the real problems of deprivation are not tackled and even ignored: “If there is a feeling in Manchester that the city is winning the regeneration game, more often than not this is framed in terms of winning funds rather than actually turning around entrenched social problems, let alone long-standing economic problems” (Peck & Ward, 2006: 7). Although criticised for its carefully staged performance, it is generally agreed that the private-public partnerships, less affectively know as the Mancunian Mafia, have been to some extent successful in transforming the city centre:

There are few more vivid illustrations of the capacity of the city’s new governance structures than the rapid and comprehensive response to the IRA bomb of June 1996. Couched again in terms of the language of opportunity, the bomb (re)galvanised partnerships and networks that may have otherwise begun to show signs of post-Olympic fatigue or even sclerosis. The vigorous response to the bomb invoked a strong sense of pride: our city would not be beaten. [...] The Mancunian Mafia’ stepped into the breach. [...] Institutional innovations went hand in hand with physical redevelopment (Peck and Ward, 2006: 14).

Williams et al. (2003) reach a similar conclusion in their comparative research on urban regeneration in Leipzig and Manchester. They conclude that key to the success of the Manchester approach was not the development of statutory plans, but the creation of informal networks of public-private partnerships, “creating the right environment to generate rapid change” (Williams, 2003).

After the successful transformation of the city centre, the CMDC started devoting its attention to east Manchester: the residential areas around the city centre, especially the deprived areas in the large ring between the new centre and the affluent suburban areas. CMDC hoped for a spin-wheel effect, in which the centre’s renaissance would set off a regeneration of the deprived areas around the city centre. Unlike the city centre this is in fact a whole series of communities rather than one defined locality. At the end of the 1990s, east Manchester was in a
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parlous state, with 13% population loss in the 1990s, a collapse of the housing market, resulting in 20% vacant properties and the creation of negative equity. The remaining population was characterised by low skills, high crime and poor health: 52% of households received benefit, while 12% were unemployed. The neighbourhoods were left with poor community and retail facilities and a fragile economic base.

Therefore, a key difference between the regeneration of the city centre and east Manchester was the sheer range of social interventions in east Manchester. The strong economic focus in the renaissance of the city centre changed into social entrepreneurship when faced with the persistent problems of deprivation in the estates of east Manchester. Concern with the low skills base of residents, high crime rates, poor health and poor community facilities has resulted in an extensive network of initiatives seeking to address these matters.

Manchester had high hopes for a trickle down effect by which the urban renaissance and the continuous arrival of the middle class benefits the poor residents outside the city centre. They should be able to share in the success with new opportunities for employment, schooling, housing and local facilities in an area with an improved reputation.

Poor residents of the peripheral council estates will not feel the effects immediately, but they will reap the long-term rewards of a restructured economy and a concretely pro-business climate (Peck and Ward, 2006:7).

To this end the city has invested greatly in the well-being of residents living in the ring between the city centre and the more affluent suburbs. Most noticeable is the reduction in anti-social behaviour; however changes in other socio-economic statistics are less visible: indicators for life expectancy, alcohol consumption, employment, and poverty ‘tell a depressingly consistent story’ (Peck & Ward, 2002). The desired trickle down effect appears to be lacking, at least for the moment.
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While the centre of the city has been comprehensively reconstructed, both physically and culturally, in ways that would have been hardly imaginable 15 or 20 years ago, many of the city’s underlying social and economic problems have been displaced rather than solved. [...] Stare as hard as you like at indicators of poverty, social exclusion and dislocation, political alienation, ‘real’ unemployment and wages and the striking thing is that the lines during the 1990s hardly bent at all, and most continued to track steadily in the wrong direction. (Peck & Ward, 2006: 5-6).

Many of the economic and social efforts are necessary, however not sufficient to provide less well off residents in deprived neighbourhoods with a new perspective. Few of the desired middle class consider living in one of these no-go areas. Only when area reputation is improved, small processes of state-led gentrification are visible. Single households or young couples are most easily persuaded, while families tend to look for more suitable places elsewhere to raise their children, and ‘upscalers’ are struggling to meet the financial demands of living in the regenerated area (Fenton, 2006).

Critics point to an increasingly ‘Americanised’ city, with rapidly growing economic and social polarisation, aided by a set of policies which effectively legitimate the transfer of funds from social safety-net programmes into subsidisation of speculative accumulation, zero sum competition and middle class consumption, with can be classified as a form of regressive social redistribution ((Peck & Ward, 2006: 7-8). Steve Quilly argues that the city council’s embrace of municipal entrepreneurialism during the 1980s must be seen in part as a tactical response to the loss of local-government power and centralising neo-liberalism of the Conservatives nationally.

9.3 Gold Service in Sale, Manchester

A good example of the cities entrepreneurialism is the tenant reward scheme, called Gold Service, developed by a local housing association in Sale to aid the regeneration of deprived areas into more pleasant places to live. Instead of
focusing on the housing stock, Irwell Valley Housing Association (IVHA) starts by defining residents as local customers and puts their needs first on the regeneration agenda. They experimented with the concept of Gold Service: a reward scheme that rewards ‘good behaving residents’ with additional services and amenities. By providing these extra services the associations try to increase the involvement and independency of residents (mostly on welfare benefits) and, in doing so, their attachment to the housing association and the neighbourhood. An explicit distinction is made between good and bad tenants, forcing local governments to rethink their equality-based housing policies.

The assumption behind the scheme is learning by moral example: seeing the benefits neighbours receive triggers residents to comply with the behaviour rules set by the housing association in order to become eligible for the same rewards. The rewards should not only trigger improved behaviour of residents, but also improve the reputation of the area to outsiders, attracting new, and especially more affluent, residents to the area. Increased social ties are a means to improve the reputation of an area. For this purpose not only social ties are stimulated, but also emotional ties of residents are actively triggered to improve the reputation of an area. Deprived neighbourhoods are to be transformed into fantastic places to live, and not only for the present residents. Pride in their home and neighbourhood is stimulated through projects like House Pride, a competition for local residents for the best garden and by enlisting renowned architects to design new social housing in order to create a sense of pride in the housing from the start.

**Methodology**

In May 2007 a study visit was made to Sale in Manchester. Interviews were conducted with staff members of Irwell Valley Housing Association and resident representatives, social workers and members of the evaluation panel. Furthermore, visits were made to areas where Irwell Valley has implemented Gold Service. On-site observations were made and existing documents on the urban renewal of the
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area were reviewed, including neighbourhood plans, policy documents and scientific studies on the regeneration of (east) Manchester. Specific data was gathered on proposed goals and interventions, the implementation and usage of these interventions, and the ways residents are involved in restructuring programmes. Based on this data the implementation of the tenant reward scheme in Manchester, as part of the urban renewal programme, was reconstructed and reflected upon with key players.

9.4 Resident Behaviour and Neighbourhood Reputation

The emphasis on the regeneration of Sales is on changing area reputation and behaviour of residents. One of the five mission statements of the IVHA boasts to “create fantastic places to live and enjoy life” (IVHA brochure). The focus on opportunities and social efforts instead of physical regeneration in the urban policies of the city council are repeated by the CEO of IVHA, Tom Manion. Residents of deprived areas should not be spoiled, but challenged and provided with opportunities. His motto is telling: tough rights and tough responsibilities. According to Manion, the main means to achieve this is to change the culture in neighbourhoods. Relocating money to the neighbourhood is a complete waste if it is not followed by residents taking responsibility for themselves and their neighbourhood. Manion is a strong believer in (moral) management by housing associations: “Take away people’s excuses [to be passive and marginalised]”. This is, according to Manion, not to blame the victims, but to firmly place them in the driving seat of their own social mobility. People will always resist change until they reap the benefits of it. Therefore, professionals have to recognise the raw talents of residents and turn them into good uses. As an example, he tells the story of a boy who dazzled him with his mathematics skill when calculating the odds of the cards when gambling while skiving from school. These skills should, according to Manion, be put to use in his education by challenging him to use his skills in the classroom.
Our aim is to break down the barriers and misconceptions in order to inspire our residents to achieve. This is through a partnership approach and recognising that creating sustainable communities is not just about physical regeneration, it requires a variety of community economic activities that reflect the needs of the local community and one size does not fit all (website IVHA).

For Tom Manion, this entails a new role for (housing) professionals: they have to motivate people and lead by example, and thus become teachers instead of social helpers. He is critical about the gap between professional skills and the needs of residents in deprived areas. Professionals do not generally live in the area where they work and, therefore, can not relate to the problems faced and potentials shared by these people.

The vision Manion is trying to sell, points to some interesting differences with the Dutch approach of regenerating deprived areas. Contrary to the Netherlands, the poorest residents are the key agents for change. While in Dutch urban policy, change is brought about by mixing deprived areas with the more affluent middle class; in Manchester and the UK at large, the middle class enters the scene much later. Under the assumption that middle class groups will only feel at home in deprived neighbourhoods when the behaviour of the anti-social residents has changed, much energy and resources are devoted to changing the behaviour of the residents already living in the area, before any time is spent on building homes for the middle class. Changing the attitude of the existing residents is believed to be crucial for changing the reputation of an area, which is necessary for higher income groups to even consider living in these areas. First the original residents need to feel at home in a neighbourhood for it to become attractive for outside middle class groups. Therefore, before any attention is given to the role of higher income groups, activities in urban renewal programmes focus on changing the identity and reputation of an area by changing the behaviour of the poorest residents. Gold Service is instrumental in changing the behaviour of residents and reducing deprivation.

When this has been achieved, mixing becomes an option for the housing association. This can be witnessed in Sale, Manchester by the recent completion of
new build housing at the fringes of the neighbourhood, specifically designed and priced for the middle class after eight years of urban renewal and Gold Service. Members of the creative class are the most desirable new residents for the IVHA. Next to young intellectuals and families, employees of the city council and the social services are given priority when the new houses are released. Present housing is sold under the Right to Buy act to further attract this group to the neighbourhood. IVHA prefers teachers over lawyers in order to raise the quality of life for other residents, not so much by bringing more money to the neighbourhood, but by attracting creative capital, teachers who can function as role models for the present population. They need to “raise the level of existing community to the level of the new entering community”.

According to the association, both groups are dependant on each other: if residents in social housing behave badly, this will be reflected in the housing prices and, therefore, it is in the interest of the middle class home owners to invest in their poorer neighbours. Likewise, it is in the interest of the original residents to keep the new affluent residents in their neighbourhood, because failure to do so will damage the reputation of the area with undesirable consequences such as red lining (when banks refuse this give mortgages or charge more interest to residents from certain areas), increased segregation and even cultures of poverty. The dream of win-win gentrification is supported by local residents: “We are working on a integrated community in Sale, by creating a seam between old and new residents and to raise the capacities and expectations of the old existing community” (Sale resident and Board Member of IVHA).

IVHA acknowledges that not every resident is a winner and that some residents are forced out of the neighbourhood due to increased housing prices and demolition of undesirable homes to make room for the new housing, but this is perceived necessary to stop further deterioration; a price to pay for success. However, the housing association agrees it is important to keep hold of the successful tenants who are able to climb the societal ladder as an example for other residents. This does not require separate institutions or any form of self-organisation: providing enough housing opportunities (mixed tenure) to remain in the neighbourhood is deemed sufficient. The arrival and continued stay of the middle class will (further) improve the reputation of the area.
Therefore, reputation and culture are crucial to the regeneration of Sale: as a means to civilise the original residents and an end to attract creative middle classes. Physical regeneration is supportive towards this overarching goal\(^{23}\). When IVHA bought the Sale West Estate from the city council in March 2000, improving the quality of life of residents and changing more than bricks and mortar was their key selling point in the promotional plans for the estate. The general goal was to improve the estates’ dire reputation. The estates are in an area of extreme contrast and inequality, with areas of prosperity and areas suffering from decline laying side by side. The properties were in a poor state of repair, approximately 12% of the properties were void and around 80% of the properties on the estate were considered long term unlettable by Manchester city council. Rent arrears were in the region of £180,000 and over 70% of the residents were dependant on social benefits. Vandalism, youth congregating, empty and abandoned properties were the top three priorities highlighted in the local area consultation (source: Neighbourhood Plan 2007-2010, Sale West, Heatherway & Surround, IVHA, 2007:4). At that time, buses and taxis did not dare to venture into the estate, further segregating the residents from the world outside their neighbourhood.

It was never a lack of internal social cohesion that troubled the housing association, but a deficiency of external cohesion which caused the housing association the greatest concerns. The area was a so-called overspill estate and owned by a bordering borough council who bought the estate when they ran out of land and property in their own borough while expanding their business. This resulted in an early detachment of residents towards the borough in which they lived since they officially belonged to another borough. The borough they were part of, however, didn’t make any effort to improve their detachment. A new housing association which actively sought communication with residents was therefore warmly received by the residents, though equally met by suspicion.

Following Irwell Valley’s success in securing the stock transfer of the Sale West Estate (formerly the Racecourse Estate) from Manchester council, a redevelopment master plan for the estate was drafted. This included improvements

\(^{23}\) For the regeneration of one of their neighbourhoods IVHA hired a renowned architect to design the social housing in order to dramatically polish up the look and hopefully the reputation of the area.
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to the existing stock, selected demolition of so-called ‘hard to let properties’ to enable the redevelopment of these areas and the various vacant land sites dotted around the estate. Part of the master plan was to provide new build housing for sale on some of these sites, both for outright sale and shared ownership, allowing existing residents to purchase a minimum share in a property, for example a 50% share, and pay rent on the remainder. Further shares can be obtained after a qualifying period and the rent is then reduced proportionately. In the redevelopment of Sale, the existing residents took priority, not only concerning housing, but also and especially concerning their health and care. IVHA reinstalled communication lines with the existing residents by conducting a resident survey, auditing the health, care and housing needs of their new customers.

The communication lines with the neighbourhood are maintained by a specially appointed neighbourhood manager. This person upholds strong relationships with all the parties involved in the regeneration of the area and their job is comparable to a neighbourhood coordinator or social worker in the Netherlands. One of their main responsibilities is to draw up a neighbourhood plan, which sets out a shared vision for the area to guide its future developments in great detail for the next five years, including yearly targets for the housing association. These so-called key performance indicators (KPI’s)\(^\text{24}\) are reviewed every six months. All the parties involved in the regeneration of the estate, including local residents, are consulted at length to ensure community wide support for the plans and are kept in the loop by a six monthly progress review.

The plan is organised into seven different themes\(^\text{25}\) representing the wider local and national political agenda and run concurrently with the Audit Commission’s Key Lines of Enquiry and the Respect Standard\(^\text{26}\). Each theme is coordinated by a partnership of professionals and residents. For instance, the

\(^{24}\) The Key Performance Indicators are: customer satisfaction, turnover, available homes, average re-let time, average re-let costs, rent collection, arrears, ASB Category A, B, and C.

\(^{25}\) The seven themes are: resident consultation, children & young people, safer community, quality of life, employment and training opportunities, economy and viability of the area and environment.

\(^{26}\) For more information visit [http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/kloe/](http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/kloe/). The ‘Respect Agenda’ Action Plan published in January 2006, states that landlords, like Irwell Valley, need to be committed to: ‘reward responsibility by providing incentives for those who respect their neighbourhoods and community’.
partnership for theme two, children and young people, joins the forces of police officers, patrollers, community support officers, youth workers, and children and young people on the estate. The themes, and the goals set within each theme, echo the importance of increasing the desirability of the area, not only for the benefit of local residents, but also for the KPI’s of the housing association:

*Creating A Safer Community (theme 3) improves the desirability of the estate and this in turn will impact on the organisation’s corporate KPI’s. Both housing and environmental improvements are complementary to each other and residents will feel that they are not only benefiting from an improved home, but also an improved community* (Neighbourhood Plan 2007-2010, 2007:13).

All the themes, which strikingly do no include any reference to housing, are supportive to this overarching goal. To achieve these goals a diverse range of projects and activities were developed (partly) under the umbrella of Gold Service. This is the focus of the next paragraph.

9.5 Rewards

Irwell Valley Housing Association (Irwell Valley) owns over 7,000 homes and just under 400 supported housing units concentrated within five boroughs in Greater Manchester. The group was set up in 1975 and grew considerably in March 2000 with the transfer of approximately 1,600 properties in Sale from Manchester City Council. In April 2005 Irwell Valley expanded again, with the transfer of 1,000 properties in Haughton Green from Manchester City Council. It also provides homes for shared ownership and outright purchase. Since 1998, the Irwell Valley Housing Association in Manchester has been experimenting with a new service system in which customer relations are at the centre stage. The new element of this system is the distinction that is made between good and bad tenants. Good tenants are entitled to extra services, such as quicker repairs, discounts, saving points that can be used to improve their home or neighbourhood, and even funds in areas such as
education and employment counselling. Bad tenants must settle for basic service and maintenance.

In order to become a member of this service, the good tenant has to fulfil a number of conditions. Rent has to be paid on time (in case of overdue rent, payment arrangements have to be made), the maintenance of the house must be good, and neighbours must have no complaints about the tenant. The emphasis of the system is on good tenants, and not, as is very often the case, on bad tenants. Tenants must be responsible and loyal, and in return they receive good service.

Table 9.1 Overview of service facilities in Manchester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold Bonus cash rewards</td>
<td>Gold Service members receive £1 for every week they are members. This reward is paid out three times a year in the form of Bonus Bonds, which can be spent in 25,000 shops all over Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Gold</td>
<td>Residents can opt to use their bonus points collectively and allocate them to the neighbourhood. In this case (Community Gold), IVHA doubles the amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold repairs service</td>
<td>Emergency Gold Service helps members in case of urgent repairs within three hours, less urgent repairs within three days. Non-members are served within a day in case of emergencies, other repairs can take up to five days (urgent repairs) or 20 days (standard repairs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold home contents (insurance package)</td>
<td>IVHA and its insurance company have agreed on an inexpensive package of fire and theft insurances for members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold discounts</td>
<td>The Bonus Bonds can be spent by means of a Countdown card, offering a 5 to 20 per cent discount in a large number of stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold health care</td>
<td>This service is part of the Gold discounts and enables members to join the Hospital Saturday Fund which entitles them to a variety of refunds in case of illnesses, both long and short term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold magazine</td>
<td>Promotion magazine for Gold Service with discount tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold access (hotline to Chief Executive)</td>
<td>On the pretext of ‘Talk to Tom’, members can call the chief executive 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Outside opening hours they are answered by a voicemail system. Members are guaranteed to get an answer or visit from Tom within 48 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold house pride</td>
<td>Following on from popular British television shows, members can win a makeover for their garden or one of their rooms. IVHA provides the work force and a budget of £500. A design agency helps with the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold education</td>
<td>IVHA provides funds (£10,000) for schooling. Children of non-members may also apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold employment and training</td>
<td>IVHA hires local workers, but also demands from its subcontractors that they use the local work force. Furthermore, IVHA manages the Phoenix Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold credit (loan facility)</td>
<td>Funds or loans for members in financial distress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, specific services were developed for the Sale West Estate in order to tackle a number of persistent social issues in the area. By co-operating with the Employment and Regeneration Partnership, the IVHA managed to obtain a subsidy from the European Social Fund for setting up an employment and training advice centre called the Phoenix Centre. This job centre is based in Sale and offers educational funds, assistance in filling in and writing job application letters, training in interview techniques, appropriate clothing for a job interview and a reimbursement of travel expenses for the interview. IVHA also stimulated employment directly by deploying local workers for large-scale renovation projects and for small jobs such as building fences and setting up shuttle services in the neighbourhood. Up to October 2005 over 1200 clients have accessed training courses, advice and guidance and over half have achieved employment and training. The project started in 2001 and was extended after the European grant in 2004, allowing IVHA to run the centre directly. More recently the focus of the centre has extended to other areas, like Haughton Green.

This project is similar to the project ‘Hulp en activering’ developed in Emmen (chapter 7) and the projects initiated in Hoogvliet to increase the social mobility of residents. An important difference, however, is the accessibility of the service offered to residents: while Dutch residents, both in Emmen and Hoogvliet, are able to participate unconditionally, the residents in Sale are only allowed to join the project when they have fulfilled their membership criteria for Gold Service. This difference is illustrative for the approach favoured in Manchester: not just offering help and support, but support based on reciprocity: residents have to prove their commitment to the neighbourhood.

A number of services specifically aimed at improving the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood. Take, for example, the garden makeovers that IVHA offers its residents. By entering a competition residents can win professional help and a budget of £500 to redesign their garden or a room of choice in their home. The competition is extremely popular among local residents (especially since gardening is a national sport in Britain), and has the advantage for IVHA that it increases the attractiveness of the property, while residents are urged to take a stroll in the neighbourhood to review and discuss each others gardens. The project stimulates residents to keep their gardens and homes tidy and makes them aware
of their neighbours, which is one of the main contributors for increasing the place attachments of residents to their neighbourhood (see chapter 5).

Another contributor was spending time in and around the house, which IVHA stimulated by offering residents cheap toolboxes for DIY in and around the house. Although a large percentage of residents will be unlikely to actually use the toolbox, the group that does saves the housing association time and money on repairs and the time these residents spent on repairs increases their attachment to their neighbourhood. In a similar vein IVA encouraged people to stay in their homes longer by publishing articles in its tenant magazine on such things as decorating children’s bedrooms. By showing how to furnish a room for two children, the corporation hopes to prevent families with children from moving house due to lack of space in their current home. This reduces the corporation’s high transfer costs and increases the attachment of residents to their neighbourhood by decreasing their likeliness to move. A final concept IVHA is working on is equity stakes, where loyal customers get shares in their rented houses for every year they live there. Each year a percentage of the profit is paid out to the tenants. The idea behind this is that it stimulates customers to stay in their homes longer, which makes them more inclined to invest in their homes themselves. This may even offer tenants a ‘leg up’ to buying their rented house.

9.6 What Does Gold Service Achieve?

Irwell Valley Housing Association (IVHA) has commissioned a considerable amount of research into the functioning and results of Gold Service. Prior to the introduction of Gold Service in Manchester, a one-year research project was carried out among tenants into the current state of affairs and the desirability of the new system. A considerable percentage of all tenants were interviewed. In addition to these interviews, an independent market research agency has conducted two surveys among tenants of IVHA on questions concerning the implementation of Gold Service and the way defaulters and troublemakers should be addressed. 95% of all tenants were positive about the new system and supported a discriminating approach toward defaulters and anti-social families.
In addition to the above-mentioned research, the Housing Corporation funded independent consultants to monitor the process and assigned an independent panel of experts to evaluate the project. This panel consisted of prominent members (chief executives of other housing associations and senior government officials from various cities and included a researcher from Glasgow University) and met six times during the year to discuss the monitoring data from the RDHS Ltd (independent housing consultants) and to make recommendations towards the Housing Corporation and Irwell Valley Housing Association.

It is obvious that ample evaluation and monitoring has been carried out. There is no lack of reports and surveys that speak highly of the visions and results of Gold Service. For example, through an elaborate question-and-answer session, the Irwell Valley briefing kit on Gold Service takes away any doubt that may exist on the success and intentions of the method. People who are still not convinced will be persuaded after reading the sound bites in which many of the chief executives pronounce their appreciation of and support for the concept. It can be argued that Manchester has learned a lot from the PR-qualities of its overseas American neighbours. However, picking through the sales talk, the accumulated evidence is impossible to deny. An important piece of evidence is the report from the previously mentioned experts of the Independent Evaluation and Development Panel that was published in March 2001. In this report, the panel presents the results of four years of monitoring, comparing the results to control groups, based on similar data from regional housing associations.

The results after three years are impressive indeed: more than two thirds of all tenants are free of debt, all rent is being paid, costs for security and prevention of vandalism have decreased by 25% and the transfer rate has decreased significantly. Before implementation, 60% of all tenants did not pay their rent on time, leading to 40% having rental debts. The costs for the new service (£400,000) are more than covered by the income (decreased negative capital due to rent arrears) of £700,000. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, Gold Service did not only serve as a considerable economy measure for IVHA, but also led to better relations with and more satisfaction among tenants, causing a decrease in transfers and vacancies. This, in turn, diminished the maintenance costs for the residences. Furthermore, the spirit of the staff members at IVHA improved considerably, which
undoubtedly had an effect on customer satisfaction. In 2005 around 90% of the residents were a member of Gold Service.

The big question is whether it has also affected the quality of life in, and attachment to, the neighbourhoods. The report does not go very far into this subject matter and merely states that there are “improved neighbourhoods and community spirit”, but fails to give specific evidence for this statement. IVHA, however, claims success in the redevelopment of Sale: the neighbourhood has become a more desirable place to live. Proof is for IVHA the rising value of the housing stock, although with the unintentional (but accepted) side-effect that not every resident is able to afford the new housing and rental prices and, therefore, is not able to return to the neighbourhood.

The reinstatement of the old community centre appears to be a major contributing factor to the claim of improved neighbourhoods and community spirit. The centre quickly became a focal point for community life and established links between the different services. For instance, when residents were offered training towards an qualification as day care staff, they were also offered a job at the new day care centre, which was located in the same building, to put their newly acquired qualification into practise and, more importantly, to earn money with it. The Phoenix Centre closed in 2005: not only did the funding stop after the project term was completed, but apparently interest for the centre was declining in the neighbourhood. Is it not clear whether this is due to such a successful application rate, making unemployed residents hard to find, or whether it proved difficult to activate an increasingly difficult and remaining core of unemployed residents who showed more resistance and were faced with a multitude of social and economic problems. The community centre, however, remains extremely popular with 30,000 visitors a year for projects like the Sunshine Café and the IT Centre.

The popularity of the centre, unfortunately does not tell us much about improvements in the social ties with and between residents, let alone their emotional attachments to the estate. One could argue that the greatly increased satisfaction of residents and the dramatically reduced turnover rate should account for something. Interviews with local professionals and residents furthermore indicate that some residents developed more contacts in their neighbourhood, although the resident panels that are set up within the Gold Service scheme consist
of the usual residents’ elite that is all too similar to Dutch resident participation in urban renewal: white, female and over forty years old.

Perhaps the most persuasive evidence for the limitations of social effectiveness is the popularity rate of Community Gold. This part of Gold Service aims explicitly at collective action of neighbourhood residents. When individual residents pool their saved bonus points together to finance a neighbourhood project the housing association doubles the budget. However, few neighbourhoods were willing to do this and those who did belonged usually to one of two groups: young families who raise money for a playground for their children or the elderly who look for joint activities. These groups already have a strong focus on the neighbourhood and are easily mobilised. The less neighbourhood-orientated groups, who are a likely target for housing associations to mobilise, were more difficult to persuade into collective action by Community Gold. It is probably safe to say that Gold Service does not particularly excel in mobilising passive residents or connecting different resident groups.

IVHA (and other housing associations which developed similar schemes\textsuperscript{27}) maintain the potential of tenant reward schemes for improving social cohesion and social-emotional ties to the neighbourhood. They argue that residents increase their commitment to their neighbourhood and their neighbours, by improving the relationship between landlord and tenant. The trust Gold Service generates towards the housing association can act as a catalyst for trusting other residents. This line of reasoning has its flaws: why should a resident invest time and effort into his neighbourhood when fellow residents are already doing it for him or her? In the social sciences this problem is known as the free riders-paradigm. A solution to this problem is group pressure: if there is a majority of residents who participate they can sanction the free rider by social exclusion. If you don’t co-operate you won’t be part of this neighbourhood. The Dutch Housing associations, therefore, aim at involving a majority of the neighbourhood residents in Gold Service and hope this

will create enough shared involvement in the neighbourhood to generate mutually enforced social relationships between residents.

Some evidence for this claim comes from a survey held among 11 Dutch and 7 English housing associations, which developed their own tenant reward scheme (Van der Graaf, 2007). Asked about their achievements, most housing associations in both countries (although some associations were not able to see any particular results yet) claimed an improved image (80% in the NL; 83% in the UK) and improved customer relations. The Dutch housing associations defined the latter in terms of increased commitment from tenants (60%), while the British housing associations witnessed improved communication with tenants (83%). In both cases trust between tenants and landlords has increased considerably, with beneficial effects for housing associations in both countries: the UK associations reported more financial gains (50%), mainly in terms of less rent arrears, while the Dutch housing associations reported increased liveability in neighbourhoods (40%). It remains debatable whether social cohesion can always become strong enough to exercise social control over all the residents in an area, neither is it arguable that this should be the case for every neighbourhood. Not every resident wants to participate on the same level in their neighbourhood and is equally committed to it.

More direct evidence toward changes in the emotional ties of residents can be found in the BHPS-data used in chapter 5, although this data does not allow for the specifying of the results for the residents in Sale, because data is only available at the local authority level and therefore only the emotional ties of Manchester residents can be analysed. However, this does allow for an assessment of the general approach towards urban renewal in Manchester: is the Mancunian mafia not only able to improve the image and outlook of the city, but also to change the place attachment of its residents to their neighbourhood?

The table below illustrates that compared to other local authorities the physical and social attachments of residents in Manchester have increased more; even compared to the general positive trend in New Deal for Community-areas, the city show a larger increase in attachments than the other NDC authorities: Mancunians feel more attached to the place where they live and the people they live with.
Table 9.2 Changes in Place Identity and Attachments in Manchester, 1998-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manchester (N=77)</th>
<th>Other NDC Areas (N=719)</th>
<th>Other 86 Most Deprived Areas (N=910)</th>
<th>Other Areas (N=3,908)</th>
<th>Total (N=5,614)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>+ 15.4%</td>
<td>+ 16.7%</td>
<td>+ 18.3%</td>
<td>+ 16.1%</td>
<td>+ 16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Attachment</td>
<td>+ 16.9%</td>
<td>+ 14.9%</td>
<td>+ 12.7%</td>
<td>+ 12.3%</td>
<td>+ 12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attachment</td>
<td>+ 19.5%</td>
<td>+ 13.5%</td>
<td>+ 12.4%</td>
<td>+ 13.2%</td>
<td>+ 13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest improvement takes place for residents who reported a low affection for their neighbourhood and neighbours in 1998: five years later they feel more at home, either with their neighbours or with the place where they live. That residents with the smallest affection are affected most is further confirmed when patterns of attachment are reviewed. In spite of a substantial group of Mancunians (23%) for whom no change in attachment is visible, residents who felt displaced and alienated from their neighbourhood are uplifted the most: not only do they feel less detached and display a more neutral stance towards their neighbourhood; a considerable group of these residents report more relative ties (30%) and even feelings of community rootedness (50%).

These results are remarkable; it appears the Mancunian mafia has been successful in reaching the group of residents they had in mind when they turned their eyes to east Manchester: the ones least involved with their neighbourhood and the least accessible for social professionals. However, considering the small number of respondents, the results have to be reviewed with care. To establish the effect of Gold Service in Sale more precise information is needed on the emotional ties of Sale’s residents in future research.

9.7 Discussion

Although Gold Service has been successful in creating a better landlord-tenant relationship, the evidence on improved community cohesion and emotional ties to the neighbourhood is limited. In spite of this Irwell Valley Housing Association raises a valuable point: Tenant Reward Schemes might not be the panacea for neighbourhood deprivation and social issues, but they do provide an opportunity for
housing associations to become normative mediators in a space where a normative consensus about how to live together in a neighbourhood has long broken down.

However, the ambitions have to be modest: Gold Service cannot enforce norms or commitment on residents. A shared norm can only be created by residents themselves. The creation of norms and values is, in the words of Thaddeus Muller, a process of image shaping, weighing, negotiating and reciprocity. But institutions, such as housing associations, can, even from a perspective of self-interest, facilitate this process. In these post-modern times this process has become more complex: the public space we share with others is not only more dynamic but also far more extensive than it used to be. This means that residents have to, much more than they were used to, search for common norms and values to act collectively upon. In some cases that means they have to invent them from scratch in ongoing interaction with each other. Housing associations can create a safe framework for these interactions by tempting residents into involvement with their own housing property and environment, which they partly share with other residents.

The starting point is not an increased social cohesion between residents or improved neighbourhood attachments, but a shared trust in the housing association that facilitates the negotiation process between resident about common norms and values that make life in the neighbourhood more satisfactionary. Ongoing interaction requires trust, which can be based on trust in institutions that are involved in the everyday life of residents. Gold Service and Community Gold can therefore be seen as an institutional condition for the development of trust between residents.

An important aspect of this institutional condition is closeness: for trust to develop, the housing association needs to be visible in the housing environment of residents. Key to the implementation of Gold Service in Manchester was a reorganisation of the organisational structure that emphasised the execution level. Employees from housing associations were urged to spend time on the street and talk to residents on a daily basis. Before the introduction of Gold Service in Manchester the housing officers were so occupied with rule enforcement, maintenance, housing contracts and projects in social housing, redevelopment and special needs that there wasn’t any time left to have a chat with local residents.
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To reduce their workload a call centre was set up to take care of the rule enforcement and maintenance. The time gained was invested in community work: in every neighbourhood the housing officers drew up a community plan with the residents followed by a service plan in which a course of action was stated for providing the Gold Service amenities the residents required. IVHA described this reorganisation as a transformation from housing officers to community officers. For the organisation it meant a bigger front office and a smaller back office: a move that proved crucial for building up a good relationship with and between tenants and ultimately for contributing to an improved reputation for the area.

The improved landlord-tenant relationship creates a safe environment to become more active in their neighbourhood. The trust created in the interactions with the housing associations can makes residents feel safer in addressing the behaviour of their neighbours. This is likely to affect the emotional ties of residents: increased interactions between residents in a safe environment will increase their attachment to the neighbourhood and allows new meanings to become attached to the environment. The next chapter reviews a more collective strategy by the borough councils of Newcastle and Gateshead to alter the reputation of a deprived area and the place attachments of its residents. In the regeneration of the quaysides of the river Tyne both councils opted for a macro-level cultural strategy of urban renewal. Does a collective approach, instead of an individual strategy as favoured in Manchester, lead to better and more visible results?
10. Case Study: Newcastle-Gateshead, United Kingdom

10.1 Introduction

Newcastle-Gateshead is often portrayed as an exemplar of the revitalising benefits of culture-led regeneration: urban renewal in which cultural facilities take centre stage in the redressing of an area’s deprived reputation. By designing eye-catching museums and theatres filled with important works of arts and artists, the area should acquire a new purpose and identity. Several English cities (Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Cardiff) have sought to incorporate production and consumption of culture as part of their efforts to sustain a new industrial future in the post-industrial world, where cultural investment provides an alternative to the de-industrialised past.

One of the main contributors to this idea is Richard Florida’s thesis that the creative ethos is increasingly dominant in developed societies (2002): creative cities are thriving because creative people want to live there. This points to the potential of culture as a powerful means of attracting creative people into the city. Commentators, however, are eager to point out that cultural strategies simply reflect the utter absence of new industrial strategies for growth (Zukin, 1995:274) and will only increase social exclusion because these investments articulate the interests and tastes of the post-modern professional and managerial class without solving the problems of a diminishing production base, growing disparities of wealth and opportunity, and the multiple forms of social exclusion (McGuigan, 1996: 99). Is Newcastle-Gateshead an exception to the case or a new victim?
Newcastle and Gateshead are two city councils on the bank of the river Tyne in the north east of England. Both cities were hit hard by de-industrialisation and the closure of the coal mines in the second half of the last century. Many people left the area and social problems increased rapidly for those who were left behind. In the nineties both city councils decided to put aside their mutual competitiveness and established a partnership to bring people back to the city centre and tackle the persisting social problems. At the time Gateshead was one the 35 most deprived areas in England.

10.2 Culture-led Gentrification in Newcastle-Gateshead

Newcastle-Gateshead Quayside has in recent years undergone a remarkable transformation. Millions of pounds of public and private investment have revitalised the Quayside both in the eyes of its people and, perhaps even more so, in the eyes of the outside world. This revitalisation centres around three iconic pieces of architecture: the BALTIC Contemporary Art Gallery built for £46 million; the Sage Gateshead Music Centre designed by Foster and Partners at a cost of £70 million and the Gateshead Millennium Bridge built at a cost of £22 million which in combination have served to redefine an area of industrial decline.

The BALTIC is a new contemporary arts centre that overlooks the River Tyne. The Arts Council National Lottery funded project saw the conversion, by Gateshead Borough Council, of a 1940s grain warehouse into the largest gallery for contemporary art in the UK which aimed to attract 400,000 visitors annually. Originally conceived as an art factory, a place for artists from all over the world to work, the BALTIC has no permanent collection and boasts five generous spaces for contemporary exhibitions.
Opened to the public in December 2004, the Sage Gateshead is not envisaged purely as a music venue. It is also the home of the Northern Sinfonia and Folkworks, as well as a music education centre. The reinvention of Gateshead Quay, which also includes residential developments and two international hotels, is linked to the Newcastle side of the Tyne by the Millennium Bridge, the world’s first tilting bridge which was opened in September 2001 and won the RIBA Stirling Prize for architecture in 2002. More important for local residents was the fact that the Millennium Bridge in Newcastle, contrary to the one in London, did not wobble!

In combination, these developments have given new life to Newcastle-Gateshead Quayside, providing the region with a renewed public focal point. In almost every writing or documentary on the north east of England at least one of these buildings is mentioned or depicted. It is, however, important to remember that the development of the Quayside has not been without its political tensions. The history of the relationship between Newcastle city council and Gateshead council has not always been an easy one. What united both city councils was a shared belief in the importance of public art for the regeneration of the area.

10.3 The Role of Public Art

Gateshead council first became involved with public art in the early 1980s when they decided to take art to the public with a series of outdoor installations because it did not have its own contemporary art gallery. The early works were so successful that in 1986 the formal public art programme was launched. This programme was given a tremendous boost during the 1990 Garden Festival at Dunston, Gateshead, which had more than 70 temporary artworks on display. The programme is directly connected to urban renewal. Art should not only be taken to the public but also be used as a means to help residents relate to their environment:

_The primary motivation for the creation of public art is to provide a ‘sense of place’ through unique works of art visible daily to the public, which help to create a quality environment_ (Gateshead Council 2006: 6).
Public art should contribute to ‘attractive, functional and flexible’ streets, buildings and public spaces. Artworks and the role of the artist in this context, enhance the fabric of the urban framework, involving the public through the creative process, adding value and creating a sense of ownership. Through the commissioning process, the work of artists should positively impact on social exclusion issues, create civic pride and improve the general quality of design.

Artworks can be found in the streets, at Metro stations and on the riverside amongst other locations. Each work has been individually designed for its specific site and many incorporate references to local history. Residents have been actively involved in developing the programme of art, and thousands, from children to pensioners, participated directly by making their own art at the Shipley Art Gallery and the annual sculpture day in Saltwell Park, which attracted over 200,000 visitors. Moreover, the art programme visited a large number of neighbourhoods to organise local art activities for different residents groups, which were attended again by thousands of residents. The programme has attracted artists of national and international renown and Gateshead now boasts an outstanding and accessible collection of contemporary art, particularly sculpture.

Twenty years after the public art programme started, Gateshead has a legacy of more than 30 major works by leading artists such as Richard Deacon, Andy Goldsworthy and Antony Gormley, most paid for with cash won from sources such as the Urban Programme, Arts Council, Northern Arts, Henry Moore Foundation and local sponsors. The public art programme has now gained national recognition and won a succession of prestigious awards for a dynamic and imaginative approach to commissioning art for public sites.

One of the most famous pieces of public art in Gateshead is the Angel of the North, designed by Antony Gormley. Measuring 20 metres in height and 54 metres across, the statue stands on a site that was once occupied by a colliery at the A1/A167 road interchange. This is the main southern approach to the borough and the Tyneside conurbation. Due to its location and size the statue is viewed everyday by 90,000 people in passing from the road and railway nearby and receives 8,000 visitors per week. Research (One NorthEast, 2002) shows that the sculpture is one of the most recognised symbols in the north east of England and people have used it as a celebratory location/gathering point for events such as the
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eclipses, pre-wedding ceremonies and New Year's Eve. In 2002 the Angel was voted one of the ‘Wonders of Britain’ in a national survey carried out by Yellow Pages.

Interest in The Angel has not always been this kindly. During the planning and building stage the statue was heavily criticised the local and national media, comparing it to Nazi symbolism and questioning the "large waste of tax payers' money". Local residents openly disputed the £800,000 price tag, which in their eyes could have been better spent on social projects such as housing or hospitals. In response Gateshead Council launched a ‘concerted press campaign’, which challenged the negative views on the sculpture and deliberately promoted the case for public art. The watershed moment came when one of Angel creator Gormley’s best-known works, Field For The British Isles, was exhibited at Greensenfield BR Works in Gateshead from March-May 1996. The display of 40,000 miniature terracotta figures pulled in 25,000 visitors in 10 weeks, and attracted widespread public acclaim and support, paving the way for the Angel of the North. A turning point for local residents was a daring dawn raid on April 30, 1998 by Newcastle United fans, who hoisted a giant-sized replica of a local football hero’s shirt on to the 65ft statue and draped it across its chest. Ever since, public opinion has changed about the sculpture and the Angel became a source of local pride.

The claim to success extends to Gateshead borough council, which argues that the sculpture has had a huge impact on Gateshead in terms of inward investment and arts related funding. The Angel of the North promoted the image of Gateshead as adventurous and forward-looking and symbolised what Gateshead Borough Council could achieve in urban renewal through public art. This gave investors the confidence to invest in the renewal of the Gateshead Quayside and allowed the council to secure £48 million for the refurbishment of the Baltic Flour Mill into a public museum for Modern Arts. According to the Council, Public Art has helped reclaim derelict areas, creating new social spaces and providing links between Gateshead Town Centre and the cultural facilities located on the Gateshead Quays.
10.4 New Feelings of Home in Gateshead and Newcastle?

While the transformation of the Newcastle and Gateshead Quayside is undeniable, it remains to be seen if the public art programme has had the huge impact claimed by Gateshead borough council. Did the public art programme not only generate much media attention and access to large funds, but also change the reputation of the area and the social-emotional ties of its residents? In spite of several research and evaluation reports, the only claim made is that there simply has to be a link between the remarkable transformation of both cities (in space and minds) and the public art programme initiated by Gateshead borough council, without the need for further evidence. The Council is content to note:

*Few people would question that the Angel has had an immense impact. Literally immense - we do not believe we can sensibly measure the full economic and social impact that it has had. We could theoretically measure every column inch of publicity that the Angel continues to attract [and place an economic value on it]. But we think that DCMS needs to discuss with partners how we might develop a methodology for moving beyond concrete measurement to recognise that some work has a value that can be accepted without the usual evidence* (Gateshead Council, 2004 cited in CATHOR, 2006).

However, not everybody is happy to agree with this statement. Christopher Bailey from the University of Northumbria argues that a mere correlation is not sufficient evidence for cause and effect: "*There are so many contingent factors that the hunt for causation is doomed*" (Bailey, 2006, cited in CATHOR, 2006). Steven Miles (2005) is equally critical and points out that ‘these sorts of developments’, actually articulate the interests and tastes of the post-modern professional and managerial class without solving the problems of a diminishing production base, growing disparities of wealth and opportunity, and the multiple forms of social exclusion (Miles citing McGuigan, 1996: 99). Flagship cultural institutions, frequently financed as public sector investments to attract private-sector renovation of the
surrounding area, tend to be, according to Miles, engines not of democratisation of
culture but of gentrification. While, in the eyes of Miles, not all is bad, it is hardly
beneficial to the original residents: run-down areas can be transformed, but it may
displace a residual population. (Miles and Miles, 2004: 53).

Miles goes on to argue that city councils and urban professionals often make
a crucial mistake in their eagerness to transform an area’s reputation: their ready-
made identities often reduce several different visions of local culture into a single
vision that reflects the aspirations of a powerful elite and the values, lifestyles,
and expectations of potential investors and tourists. These practices are thus highly
elitist and exclusionary, and often signify to more disadvantaged segments of the
population that they have no place in this revitalised and gentrified urban
spectacle (Miles citing Broudehoux, 2004, p. 26). This critique echoes the
comments in the Dutch debate on neighbourhood identity and branding (see
chapter 6), which stress the impossibility of ready-made identities. A difference
with the Dutch experiences is the focus of neighbourhood identity: while in the
Netherlands efforts are concerned with the design of a new brand for deprived
neighbourhood, which will appeal to old but particularly new residents, the English
focus on the design of iconic building and cultural venues, which symbolise the new
identity and reputation of the area. Both approaches try to enforce a new identity
onto a place and this common element enrages critics in both countries alike.

As an alternative Miles suggests, that the success of culture-led regeneration
is dependent upon the degree to which the reinvention of the urban landscape fits
in with, rather than being foisted upon, the identity of the place concerned.

*It is suggested that the success of investment in iconic cultural projects depends above all upon people’s sense of belonging in a place and the degree to which culture-led regeneration can engage with that sense of belonging, whilst balancing achievements of the past with ambitions for the future (Miles, 2005).*

According to Miles this is exactly what happened in Newcastle and Gateshead. By
using public art as a participatory tool in urban renewal, both councils have been
able to link the regeneration of the area to the local culture and identity, and in
doing so strengthened the local identity. The redevelopment of the Newcastle-Gateshead Quayside has successfully tapped into and reconfigured the place identity of the area by giving the people of the region something tangible with which they could reassert their collective identities. The need to reassert their collective identities is, according to Miles, linked to the history and position of the north of England. Citing Keith Wrightson, Steven Miles describes this identity as proud and truculent:

*A northern upbringing frequently involves the inculcation of an unusually powerful set of attachments to place; a deep rooting in a particular physical, social and cultural environment. At the same time, however, those loyalties are strongly inflected, almost from the outset, by awareness of a questionable place within the larger social and political geography of England.* (Wrightson, 1995:29, cited in Bailey et al. 2005:62)

A strong sense of place, combined with a second rate position, breeds an aggressive form of pride with which northerners try to re-establish themselves in relation to a dominant south and a foregone industrialised past. The need for regeneration was a much economic as cultural and for Miles this is key for culture-led regeneration to succeed. In an article with Christopher Bailey and Peter Stark (2006) Miles argues that redevelopment of the Newcastle and Gateshead Quaysides was underpinned not by economic imperatives, but by a will and determination on the part of local arts activists and politicians to provide the area with more and better cultural facilities. Not only because of a lack of cultural facilities or because of a lack of cultural awareness among local residents, but also because the local authorities sought to use large public works of art as a means of signalling the intention to regenerate the locality.

The need for cultural facilities was clear: in all arts attendance areas, the north had the lowest levels of usage in England, broadly one-third below the national average and one-half of London levels. The region enjoyed an ‘availability index’ for the large-scale repertoire in the performing arts at one-quarter of the national average. The use of public art for regeneration was new. By using public art in urban regeneration the councils of Newcastle and Gateshead not only
improved the cultural facilities, but also improved the local identity. The regeneration succeeded, Bailey, Miles and Stark argue, precisely because the local people took ownership of them, not as exclusive symbols of wealth but as sources of local pride that regenerated a local source of identity as much as they did the local economy. As such, they suggest that the regeneration of the Newcastle and Gateshead Quayside “might well be interpreted as representing the radical reassertion of a rooted identity in new ways and therefore represent something far more significant than the inevitable end-product of cultural commodification”.

The authors are keen to point out that a combination of a people’s identification with places, and pride in and of that place and its heritage, may potentially represent a powerful cultural force for urban renewal. The Newcastle-Gateshead regeneration illustrates the way in which existing (and, in some senses, declining) sources of identity can be strengthened.

By raising this claim, Bailey, Miles and Stark take issue with Zukin’s (1995) suggestion that culture-led regeneration actively undermines urban distinctiveness. Zukin argues that despite the language of inclusion associated with culture, the reality is that culture is not the unifying force many urban renewers might like it to be. In many cases, cultural strategies reflect for Zukin simply the “utter absence” of new industrial strategies for growth. In turn, the potential economic benefits of cultural appropriation in urban renewal are counter-balanced by the erosion of local distinctiveness (1995, p. 274). Scott agrees: the clustering of culture “has deeply erosive or at least transformative effects on many local cultures” (2000:4). And even Richard Florida who is credited with raising the importance of culture for cities is unsure whether local culture will benefit in the end. The creative class seeks quasi-anonymity and prefers weak community ties to strong ones. Culture is for Florida an individual commodity which creative citizens pick and mix according to their desires and is therefore eroding to existing cultures based on strong ties. While Florida is sceptic and Zukin and Scott are critical, Bailey, Miles and Stark argue that culture-led regeneration can revitalise cultural identities in a way which represents a counter-balance to broader processes of cultural globalisation. Moreover, they point out that culture-led regeneration will be most successful when it, intentionally or unintentionally, teases out the local distinctiveness.
Case Study: Newcastle-Gateshead, United Kingdom

Culture-led regeneration perhaps provides a framework within which, given the right conditions, local people can re-establish ownership of their own sense of place and space and, perhaps more importantly, of their own sense of history. (Bailey, Miles & Stark, 2006)

For proof of this statement the authors turn to the first results of a 10-year longitudinal study into the social, cultural, economic and regenerative impact of the Quayside development: the Cultural Investment and Strategy Impact Research (CISIR). This project is co-ordinated by the Centre for Cultural Policy and Management at the University of Northumbria. The aim of the project is to make a thorough longitudinal study of the contribution which the arts and culture can make to the development process, seen socially, economically and culturally. The project seeks to establish not simply the facts about activity levels, attitudes and participation, but also to address the meanings of such developments as ascribed by those people whom these developments affect. What are the effects of urban renewal on the local culture and daily lives of local residents? Are the developments also beneficial to them? A large number of both quantitative (surveys, monitor data) and qualitative (interviews, document analyses and case studies) data sources are used to answer these questions.

The data emerging from this longitudinal research shows that cultural production and consumption is strongly on the increase in Newcastle and Gateshead. There is a significant increase in the percentages of people attending arts events in the North East: for instance 27% of Newcastle and Gateshead residents attended a play in 2002, thereby equalling the 2001 English average, but doing so from very low base of 15% in 1988. From a situation in which, in terms of cultural provision, the area lagged behind much of the rest of the country, it had now arrived at a position of relative strength. Not only art attendance has changed: the number of respondents who felt that the arts played a valuable role in their lives had jumped from 23% in the north east in 1998 to 49% in 2002. And following the 2008 bid for European Capital of Culture made by the councils of Newcastle and Gateshead, 75% of respondents in Newcastle and Gateshead said their pride in the area has been reinforced. And if Newcastle-Gateshead did go on to win, 67% of respondents felt the area would be a better place to live.
These figures illustrate that cultural attendance and attitudes have changed significantly during the public art programme, however, less clear is the contribution of the programme to the local culture and identity. Although the researchers claim that these figures illustrate “that cultural forms of consumption can actively enhance and enliven local communities” they do not show the evidence to back up their claim. A more valuable role of art in residents’ lives and more pride in the area people live in, says nothing about their involvement in and attachment to their community. Future research results might prove them right, but for the moment we have to believe their words.

10.5 Place Attachments in Newcastle-Gateshead

A better indication of improvements in place attachments is possible with the panel data obtained for chapter 5 on the place attachments of English residents. By separating the results for Newcastle and Gateshead, a comparison can be made between the changes in this area and other deprived and non-deprived areas in the United Kingdom. Does Newcastle-Gateshead fare better, and if so, in which way does it deviate from the national trend? A stronger increase in place attachments, particularly place identity would be expected. This expectation is supported by the data. The table below illustrates that in comparison with other English neighbourhood place identity and place attachments, both physical and social, have increased more in Newcastle-Gateshead. Even when compared to a positive trend in the New Deal for Community-areas, both cities show more improvement, particularly in Place Identity and Social Attachments of residents between 1998 and 2003: the people in Newcastle-Gateshead feel more at home and more connected to their neighbours.

Table 10.1 Changes in Place Identity and Attachment in Newcastle en Gateshead, 1998-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newcastle Gateshead (N=106)</th>
<th>Other NDC Areas (N=730)</th>
<th>Other 86 Most Deprived Areas (N=871)</th>
<th>Other Areas (N=3916)</th>
<th>Total (N=5622)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Place Identity</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Rootedness</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Bonding</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The increased affection of residents for their neighbourhood is particularly visible among residents who indicated in 1998 that they felt little affection for the place where they lived or the people that lived there. The former feel more at home with their neighbours, while the latter have predominantly increased the physical ties to the neighbourhood in 2003.

However, a considerably large group of residents (11%) feels less at home in the neighbourhood in 2003 than they did in 1988. Especially residents who only experienced a physical connection to where they lived, indicates that five years on they have lost their affection for the neighbourhood. Apparently, not every resident shares in the strengthened bonds and local identity. This becomes more clearly visible when patterns of Place Attachment are considered.

Although Newcastle-Gateshead shows the greatest change in patterns of attachment compared to other neighbourhood in England, this change is not all positive. In line with the positive trend in the other New Deal for Communities areas, feelings of alienations are strongly reduced among residents in Newcastle-Gateshead between 1998 and 2003. 43% of the residents who felt alienated from their community in 1998 feel more relatively attached to their neighbourhood in 2003, while 29% even claim to feel completely rooted in their community. However in the same period, and contrary to the national trend, feeling of relativity change for a considerable number of residents into feelings of placelessness: the neighbourhood becomes a more neutral place to live for these residents. This is in spite of the fact that relatively fewer residents changed homes between 1998 and 2003 compared to the rest of England, and that those who did move out, they more often did so between the city boundaries remaining in the city (they feel more or less attached to).
Figure 10.2 Changes in Patterns of Place Attachment for Newcastle-Gateshead residents compared to other area, 1998-2004 (N=5,624)

Apparently, the redevelopment of the Quayside and the popular public art programme has not increased the attachments to the city for every resident. Still, both cities have been successful to the extent that they have been able to increase the affection of residents who felt least at home in their neighbourhood. This partly confirms the claim of Bailey, Miles and Stark that Newcastle-Gateshead has been able to link culture-led regeneration to the local identity of residents and in doing so have strengthened their place identity and affection for their neighbourhood.
10.6 Discussion

The collective cultural strategy employed by the borough councils of Newcastle and Gateshead appears to be more successful than the individual approach favoured by Manchester. Contrary to other English cities, which experimented with culture-led regeneration and where urban renewal is dominated by culture with a capital ‘C’, Newcastle and Gateshead emphasised culture with a small ‘c’ in their approach to urban renewal.

By using public art as a participatory tool in urban renewal, the deprived living environment acquired new meaning for residents, resulting in more attachment and stronger feelings of ownership towards the environment. By emphasising the cultural heritage of places and by using this heritage in the redevelopment of the area, the councils were able to appeal to the identification of residents with the area and (re)instill a sense of pride in the places where they lived.

The experiences in Newcastle and Gateshead show that public art can be a valuable participatory tool for increasing the emotional ties of residents to an area, provided that the art connects to their local identity. This does not only strengthen local identity, but also increases the attractiveness of the area for external investors and visitors. The culture-led approach in Newcastle was particularly successful, because the redevelopment of the Quaysides was not underpinned by economic imperatives, but by a cultural demand for more and better facilities. By using public art in urban regeneration the councils of Newcastle and Gateshead improved the cultural facilities and also provided the urban renewal with a symbolic meaning, signalling the intention to regenerate both the locality and the local identity.
11. Summary and Discussion

11.1 Introduction

This research focused on the social-emotional ties of residents and explored how these ties were affected by different urban renewal programmes in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Using national survey data from the Netherlands (Housing Needs Survey) and the United Kingdom (British Household Panel Data), and comparing urban renewal programmes in four cities (Emmen, Rotterdam, Manchester and Newcastle-Gateshead), I explored the emotional ties of residents in deprived neighbourhoods in both countries based on the concept of place attachment, which defined the relationship between the social and the physical as an affective bond between people and places.

Place attachment defines places not just as a stage for social action and battle scenes for power and status, but as places linked to people by an affective bond, in which space is transformed into place by the meaning people attach to that space. Places are involved in the construction of personal and social identities, which are displayed as place identity and can be seen in their behaviour through their sense of home. In short, places are socially constructed. However, this does not imply that places are purely mental constructs that only exist in people’s minds. Places have a physical component, which cannot be ignored. Based on a literature review, different dimensions of place attachment were distinguished to be able to describe how, why and where Dutch and English residents feel at home in the neighbourhood:
Table 11.1 Dimensions of Place Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong></td>
<td>Do you feel at home here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Place</strong></td>
<td>Rootedness or Physical Attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(How do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Bonding or Social Attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Affiliations</strong></td>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Why do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Family-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling-related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Place Identity</strong></td>
<td>Dwelling-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Where do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinguished dimensions were used to analyse different patterns of place attachment among Dutch and English residents.

11.2 Place Attachments in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

11.2.1 Sense of Place: How do we feel at home?

The Dutch experienced their neighbourhood in a similar way to the English: the most common combination in both countries is high social and physical attachment: more than a third of the residents felt at home in the place where they lived and who they lived with. However, 1 in 5 residents in both countries did not show any attachment to their neighbourhood and neighbours. A further 17% were only socially attached, while 22-23% experienced only physical attachment to their neighbourhood.

Table 11.2 Sense of Place in the Netherlands and England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Place</th>
<th>The Netherlands, 2002</th>
<th>England, 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rootedness, Low Bonding</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-deprived</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rootedness, High Bonding</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Rootedness, Low Bonding</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-deprived</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rootedness, High Bonding</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-deprived</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Discussion

While in the Netherlands, residents in deprived areas felt less attached (socially and physically) to their neighbourhood, residents in the UK showed similar levels of attachment to the people and places in their neighbourhood, regardless of where they live. For the English, how they felt about their neighbourhood depended less on where they live, while for the Dutch, location mattered for their social-emotional ties. This does not imply that the English are more indifferent to where they live; on the contrary, they just valued the house in which they lived more than the neighbourhood where they lived.

11.2.2 Place Affiliations: Why do we feel at home?

This became clear when the satisfaction with the house was considered: compared to Dutch residents, differences in attachment were more exclusively related to satisfaction with housing: residents who were more satisfied with their home felt more socially and physically attached to their neighbourhood. However, the neighbourhood was an important consideration for English residents when the suitability of the area for raising children was taken into account, particularly the standard of local schools. In more child friendly neighbourhoods the English felt more at home, physically and socially. Perhaps the English school system, where access to a school is based on living in its catchment’s area, explains the importance of having good schools nearby. For the Dutch, satisfaction with their house mattered for their attachment to the neighbourhood, but they also took into consideration who lived in their neighbourhood. Dutch residents showed more attachment when there were happy with the people who lived in their neighbourhood.

Interestingly, social bonding in the Netherlands was related to public transport stops: residents who were more satisfied with the stops in their neighbourhood displayed high levels of bonding, while those with less social attachment were more dissatisfied with the possibilities of moving in and out of the neighbourhood. Did they feel trapped and felt there was no other alternative than to look for social support inside the neighbourhood?

I then looked at social-demographic characteristics (age, education, income and having children). Age proved to be the biggest contributor to the different senses of place for residents in the Netherlands and England: older residents felt
more socially and physically at home in their neighbourhood. However, this was not the same as how long they have lived in the neighbourhood. Although age correlated positively to duration, for instance, 18-24 year olds stay, on average, longer in a neighbourhood than 25-44 year olds, from 45 years and up, age becomes counteractive; social involvement dropped while physical attachment remained high. Next to age having children increased the rootedness of Dutch residents to their neighbourhood. Interestingly, for the English having children did not make the neighbourhood any more emotionally significant. Although the suitability of the neighbourhood for children mattered, it did not matter if they actually had children themselves to become more attached to the place where they lived.

A more striking difference between Dutch and English residents was the role of social participation in their attachment to their neighbourhood. While community involvement was the major contributor to the social-emotional ties of Dutch residents to their neighbourhood, this hardly mattered at all for English residents; the vast majority of English residents were not active or a member of any group. What did matter for the English instead was spending time in and around the house (working in the garden, doing DIY and car maintenance); this greatly increased their physical attachment to the neighbourhood. By spending time around the house, English residents claimed their space in the neighbourhood, made it their own place and developed an affection for it. This finding contradicted their strong place affiliation for the people in their neighbourhood reported earlier: while English resident said it mattered most who they live next door to, their time spent on their own in and around the house mattered more for their attachment to the neighbourhood.

11.2.3 Locus of Place Identity
The stronger focus among English residents on their house was also visible at the level at which residents identify with their neighbourhood. Although the majority of the English residents identified both with their dwelling and their community, if they had to choose, more residents found their identity at the dwelling level. This was especially so for residents in deprived areas who more often identified only with their dwelling or did not find their place identity at all within the neighbourhood. When English residents were faced with deprivation, they were
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more likely to retreat behind their front doors. The Dutch, on the other hand, valued their dwelling and the neighbourhood equally and showed no particular preference, regardless of where they lived. The most important differences between residents in the Netherlands and England on the different dimensions of place attachments, particularly for deprived neighbourhoods, are summed up in the table below.

Table 11.3 Differences in Place Attachments between the Netherlands and England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Place Attachment</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Identity</strong> (Do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Majority of residents feel at home</td>
<td>Majority of residents do not feel at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Place</strong> (How do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>More physical than social attachment to the neighbourhood</td>
<td>More social than physical attachment to the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Affiliations</strong> (Why do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>- Socially active in the community - Satisfied with dwelling - Satisfied with public transport - More aged - Children present in households</td>
<td>- Identification with house and neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Place Identity</strong> (Where do you feel at home?)</td>
<td>Identification with house and neighbourhood</td>
<td>Identification with house and neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement</strong></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.2.4 Patterns of Attachment

Neighbourhood satisfaction and social activity were added to the dimensions of place attachment to distinguish four different patterns of attachment: community rootedness, alienation, relativity and placelessness.
Table 11.4 Patterns of Place Attachment in the Netherlands (N=75,043) and England (N=10,548)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>Non-deprived</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Deprived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placelessness</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativity</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rootedness</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English residents were, compared to the Dutch, more community rooted; almost half of the population (compared to a third in the Netherlands) identified with and was physically and socially attached to the neighbourhood they lived in. A much smaller proportion (5%) of the English residents (compared to a quarter of the Dutch residents!) felt exactly the opposite: displaced, alienated and unhappy with their neighbourhood. A third of the English residents (compared to 22% in the Netherlands) had no special affection (labelled as placelessness); the neighbourhood was for them an indifferent place: they liked the people who lived there, but did not feel attached to or identified with the neighbourhood. Finally, 16% of the English and 21% of the Dutch residents showed affection for their neighbourhood, in that they identified with it and appreciated the neighbourhood and its neighbours but they were not especially attached to it by social-emotional ties.

Compared to the Dutch, English residents felt far less alienated from their neighbourhood, although the residents who were more indifferent (placelessness) to their neighbourhood displayed more negative affections for their area than their Dutch counterparts. Overall, the clusters in the English data showed lower levels of community satisfaction and social participation is generally lower.

Location mattered for the patterns of attachment that residents displayed in both countries: residents in deprived areas (for England especially in the New Deal for Communities-area) experienced alienation more often, while residents who lived in neighbourhoods with little or no deprivation were more often rooted in their community.
11.3 Place Attachment over Time

To research cause and effect (What causes changes in the emotional ties of residents?) Dutch and English neighbourhoods were compared through time (respectively 1998-2006 and 1998-2003). Did different patterns emerge in time and did urban renewal areas show different patterns compared to non-deprived areas?

The results indicated that both the attachment of Dutch residents to their neighbourhood and their neighbour had increased between 1998 and 2006, although the physical attachment of the Dutch started to declined again in most areas after 2002. In spite of the general trend towards more physical and social attachment, not all neighbourhoods profited to the same extent: although residents living outside the 30 largest cities profited the most in physical attachment, the steepest increase was visible in the priority areas of the G4 and G26. The progress made in the deprived areas became even clearer when the social bondings of residents were considered: between 1999 and 2006 they improved their attachment to their neighbours more than anywhere else in the Netherlands while, in the more rural areas, neighbours effectively lost social affection for one another in the same period. Residents in the strategic urban renewal areas of the Netherlands have felt more at home in their neighbourhood, and particularly to the people, since 1999 than any other place in the Netherlands.

Contrary to the Netherlands, English residents showed a declining trend in place attachments to their neighbourhood. Only in the New Deal areas do residents, on average, increased their affection for their neighbourhood or their neighbours, especially when they did not feel any affection before for the place where they lived or the people that lived there. Residents living in one of the 86 most deprived areas of the UK more often lost their affection for their neighbourhood, particularly when they were strongly bonded and rooted in their community. In the non-deprived areas most change occurred for English residents who only felt attached to their neighbours: more often they lost their affection for their neighbours rather than increasing it.

The declining trend in England is even more visible when changes in patterns of place attachment were reviewed: 85% of the UK resident altered the way they
felt about their neighbourhood between 1998 and 2003. Residents who felt rooted in their community changed most often, while residents who experienced alienation towards their community were the least inclined to change. The direction of change was mostly towards less attachment: a large number of the residents who felt indifferent towards their neighbourhood (placelessness) in 1998 admitted, five years later, to feeling displaced and alienated from their area. And a similar group of residents, who identified with their neighbourhood in 1998 without having a strong attachment to it (relativity), were indifferent to their community in 2003. A similar trend was visible for residents who felt strongly rooted in their community in 1998: five years later a considerable number of these residents took a more relative stand towards their community. The declining trend in patterns of identification and attachment was less severe in the most deprived areas in England. In particular, more residents in the New Deal for Community-areas lost their feelings of alienation to the neighbourhood and changed to placelessness than in the other deprived and non-deprived areas.

In the Netherlands, changes were more positive. Feelings of alienation were strongly reduced for residents between 1999 and 2006, particularly in the 30 largest cities, and feelings of placelessness, relativity and community rootedness increased almost everywhere in the Netherlands. Residents in the priority areas felt more neutral towards their neighbourhood (placelessness), while in the non-priority areas residents were more relatively connected to their neighbourhood. In sum, Dutch neighbourhoods, particularly in the 30 largest cities, were on the emotional up, while English residents displayed a loss of affection for their neighbourhood, with the exception of the New Deal for Community areas. The increased attachment did not mean that all was well in the Dutch neighbourhoods with more satisfied tenants and actively involved residents. The direction of change was towards less negative feelings for the neighbourhood and a more neutral stance towards the place where they lived, in which the neighbourhood was no longer a (negative) framework for the emotional well being and identity of its residents. For residents in the non-priority areas of the big cities the direction of change was towards more positive feelings for the neighbourhood: they felt more at home, although they did not feel particularly attached to the place where they lived (relativity).
11.4 Urban Renewal and Place Attachment

To explain what causes these changes, auto-regression analyses were performed on the changes in physical and social attachment of Dutch and English residents. The results for the English data showed that moving house was the best predictor for losing physical attachments to the neighbourhood. This confirmed earlier research indicating (Kleinhans, 2005) that a (forced) move due to urban renewal strongly affected residents’ social-emotional ties. Interestingly, this only affected residents’ physical ties to the neighbourhood. When the same models were tested for changes in social attachments between 1998 and 2003, moving had no effect on the social bonds of residents to their area. What mattered most for social bonds of English residents was identification with the area, especially at the level of the community: when residents started to identify more strongly with their neighbourhood, they felt more socially attached to it. Changes in social participation and community involvement were, surprisingly, not important for the bonding of residents to their neighbourhood, although social time spent around the house contributed significantly to the rootedness of residents. Furthermore, a long-standing connection to the area and improved feelings of safety in the neighbourhood (self-related place affiliations) strengthening the social bonds of residents to the area where they lived. Finally, the number of children and the amount of income proved significant for both physical and social attachments of residents: when family and income grew larger, they felt more socially and physically at home in the neighbourhood.

Similar results emerged from the Dutch data between 2002 and 2006, although less precise analyses were possible due to the aggregated nature of the data. Moving house explained best the changes in physical attachment of residents, while moving had much less effect on the social bonds of residents to their area. Far more important for the social bonding of Dutch residents (controlling for changes over time) was the importance residents attached to their social network: the more they valued their neighbours, the stronger they felt socially attached to their neighbourhood. While for English residents, changes in their social attachment were related to their identification with the area, the social bonding of
Summary and Discussion

Dutch residents depended more on how they perceived their neighbours. For English residents the neighbourhood was much more part of their personal identity, while Dutch residents valued the neighbourhood for their social contacts. When demographic and geographic details were entered into the third model, again the number of children and the amount of education and income were significant for the place attachment of residents.

The most contributing factors to the place attachments of English residents to their neighbourhood are summed up in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving House</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Satisfaction</th>
<th>Satisfaction with House /Affiliation with Community</th>
<th>Contacts in Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Place Identity/ Community-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure shows that urban renewal has an initial negative effect on the emotional ties of residents, particularly on their Physical Attachments. However, urban renewal contributes to the attachments of residents when urban professionals are able to help residents cope emotionally with moving house (even when they cause them to move in the first place). Furthermore, by setting up projects aimed at increasing the value residents put on their neighbours and the extent to which residents identify with their neighbourhood, urban renewal can improve the social bondings of residents.
Summary and Discussion

To investigate possible and successful interventions, four urban renewal programmes, two in each country, were investigated in great detail. For the Netherlands the neighbourhood Angelslo, Bargeres en Emmerhout in Emmen and the council of Hoogvliet in Rotterdam were studied. For the UK, qualitative data was gathered in Sale in Manchester and the Quaysides in Newcastle and Gateshead. In each case study the urban renewal programme was reconstructed with special attention to interventions that were developed to influence the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood. In order to compare the four case studies, social housing and urban renewal policy in both countries were discussed.

11.5 Urban Policy and Practice in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands

The 90’s saw a big change in urban policy in England and in the Netherlands, both by a change of government. In both countries, this signalled a change from predominantly physical regeneration to combined efforts in social, economic and physical renewal of deprived neighbourhoods, accompanied by a sharp increase in funding and new powers for local governments to tackle deprivation issues. While in the Netherlands local and national governments are struggling to combine social-spatial interventions, and more often resort to one or the other, in England the Labour government strongly advocated a leading role for social and economic regeneration.

In both countries large scale urban renewal programmes were created to tackle deprivation. Within these programmes the attention to social and emotional ties varies greatly. Urban social policy in the Netherlands has been primarily concerned with the social cohesion, and more recently with the social mobility, of poor residents. The two Dutch case studies are a case in point: in the urban renewal partnership of Emmen resident participation and social cohesion took centre stage, while the partners in Hoogvliet emphasised social mobility for residents in deprived neighbourhoods. In both programmes implicit references are made to the emotional ties of residents. Urban renewal programmes should protect and re-attract the original residents, who feel alienated from their neighbourhood by the arrival of large numbers of immigrants, whose integration, according to
policy makers, in turn depends to a large extent on making them feel at home and welcome in their new country. In practice however, the emphasis in Dutch urban renewal is on spatial redesigning, while social interventions are reduced to side-acts of the programme. The British welfare sector, on the other hand, is historically more closely linked to housing; the sale of social housing by Thatcher resulted in a strongly stigmatised housing sector for the very poor. The concentration and accumulation of social problems have led to a dominating presence of social services in social housing: while Dutch housing associations are cautiously starting to work alongside social services, English housing associations simply employ social workers.

Moreover, English policy makers seem to be more aware of the emotional ties of residents. This already becomes clear in the consistent references made in policy documents to housing as ‘homes’: dwellings are not merely places of bricks and mortar, but are places of home to the people who live in them. The greater attention to emotional ties is also visible in the efforts focussing on the identity and reputation of deprived areas. Making people proud of their home ground in order to discourage them from self-destructive behaviour is one of the elements of this community approach. The case study of Newcastle and Gateshead is a fine example: both councils have employed public art to link the regeneration of the area to the local culture and identity of its residents, strengthening their attachment to the area and redressing the reputation of the deprived area, not only by physical but also by symbolic improvements.

Contrary to the Netherlands, policy makers and urban planners take the poorest residents as the starting point for their policies and designs. Under the assumption that middle class groups will only feel at home in deprived neighbourhoods when the behaviour of the anti-social residents has changed, much energy and resources are devoted to changing their behaviour before any time is spent on building homes for the middle class. Changing the attitude of the original residents is believed to be crucial to change the reputation of an area, which is necessary for higher income groups to even consider living there (see the case study in Manchester).
11.6 Lessons from the Case Studies

**Emmen Revisited: in Search of the Social Programme**

The development of Emmen Revisited demonstrates an ongoing search for combining physical urban renewal with economic and social interventions, which has widened the scope of the social programme considerably and has included initiatives which recognise the importance of neighbourhood attachment. However, the content of the social programme has never been properly defined and the link to the physical and economic programmes has never been specified, reducing the social programme to incidental experiments in the daily urban practice and fragmenting the integral approach. The development of an integral programme requires a more structured approach, allowing projects aimed at increasing the place attachments of residents to develop and to become an integral part of the social programme.

However, valuable instigators are available like the Day of Memories organised in Emmerhout, where explicit attention was given to the emotional ties that residents have developed with a place which is about to be demolished; recognising the symbolic value of the built environment and providing an outlet for these emotions. This effort demonstrated important ways in which place identity and sense of place can be utilised helping residents to make a less uprooting transition to a new place of residence. The housing association and other local parties can utilize this value, not only to ease the pain of moving and social uprooting for residents, but also to aid resident in their attachment to a new environment by organising something similar for residents who return to their renewed neighbourhood.

Emmen Revisited also demonstrated how links can be made between physical and social projects. In the project ‘Hulp en Activering’ (Social Support and Activation), which operated in the same neighbourhood, an explicit linkage was made between socio-economic and physical interventions. The relocation of residents in urban renewal areas was used to increase the social mobility of unemployed residents by offering them education and job training, based on the assumption that residents, whose lives are already uprooted by a changing
environment and the relocation to a new or temporary home, will be more willing to consider changing other areas of their lives and are, therefore, more motivated to join and complete social mobility programmes. This assumption proved right and similar initiatives might prove especially helpful in reducing the emotional stress of residents caused by relocation, by not only recognising the emotional uprooting involved, but also by turning it into a positive experience and emotion. Finally, Emmen Revisited illustrated the importance of an integral approach and organisation. Few cities have a detailed urban renewal programme available on a city-wide scale that includes different public and private parties throughout the city and consults them on a regular basis. Emmen Revisited is the exception to the case, where thorough preparation resulted in a diverse and widely supported programme, in which the social dimension is prominent. The Housing Needs Survey demonstrated that Emmen Revisited is successful in increasing the strength of the emotional ties of residents to their neighbourhood. Feelings of detachment and alienation are transformed into more affectionate feelings for the area, although not specifically tied to the neighbourhood. The residents in Emmen are happier with where they live and feel more at home.

**Hoogvliet, Rotterdam: Place Identity or Social Mobility?**

In the urban renewal of Hoogvliet two strategies to increase the place attachments of residents have been explored: a direct path by designing a new neighbourhood identity for the borough, and an indirect path by improving the social mobility of residents. By providing residents not only with improved housing, but also with better opportunities on the labour and educational market, the whole borough was expected to profit with an improved area reputation and increased emotional ties to the area.

Place identity has been actively stimulated in Hoogvliet. Hoogvliet participated in a national innovation programme, called ‘Identiteit en Branding’ (Neighbourhood Identity and Branding), which sought to re-profile deprived areas for different user groups by using the identity of an area as the guiding principle for the developmental plans. The assumption behind this programme was that when residents are able to recognise themselves in the place where they live, they will be attracted to come and live there, helping the area to shed its negative
reputation. In Hoogvliet the project consisted of historical research, branding sessions with local professionals and residents, and so-called life style sessions. However, in spite of all the efforts and colourful design books, strikingly few of the project results have found their way into project plans and urban renewal activities in Hoogvliet. The experiences in Hoogvliet demonstrate that is impossible to dictate a new reputation for a deprived area and unite different residents groups instantly under a new banner or brand. As a social construct place identity needs to be reproduced in everyday life to have an effect on the behaviour of residents. Too often new values, lifestyles and identity are invented overnight, which are detached or too abstract from existing and daily (re)used constructs of place identity. In spite of the urban potential and good intentions, what often remains of all the efforts to incorporate place identity into urban renewal is a pile of glossy project plans and brochures. Direct evidence of a changed area reputation in Hoogvliet is unfortunately lacking.

More indirect results, however, indicated a remarkable change in the general culture of the area. Next to projects for redesigning the place identities of Hoogvliet’ residents, an important goal of the borough council and the two housing associations was to increase the social mobility of individual residents. For these purposes different projects were set up to increase the job and educational qualifications of Hoogvlieters, in particular for single parent homes of former immigrants from the Dutch Antilles and to increase, along with the quality of their housing, their independency and sense of achievement. The impact of the urban renewal programme was evaluated by the University of Amsterdam, the OTB research institute in Delft and the Verwey-Jonker Institute (Veldboer et. al., 2007).

The results of the research indicate that, although not many objective improvements were visible in the quality of most residents’ lives after eight years of urban renewal, the programme proved successful at changing the minds of many residents. One of the most profound changes quoted by residents was a new sense of achievement in the area. The general consensus among residents was that achievement was possible and that society was willing to listen and help. There was no longer a culture of underachievement, in which residents lose faith because there are no opportunities.
The case study shows that changes in the neighbourhood and the personal lives of residents are connected: physical mobility generates social mobility. It is no coincidence that the two groups of residents who demonstrate the most progress were also the most mobile residents; ‘upscalers’ (who go upmarket) and former immigrants from the Dutch Antilles. The specifically designed projects for the latter group were not only effective in this respect, but were also recognised as such by these residents. Another interesting result from this case study is the link between social mobility and neighbourhood attachment: increased self esteem led to stronger emotional ties. A substantial part of the Hoogvlieters felt not only that they could achieve more, but were also more proud of the place where they lived. Both feelings appear to be connected: because residents are more positive about their personal lives, they become more positive and attached to the place where they live. The was supported by the Housing Needs Survey, indicating that between 1998 and 2006 residents in Hoogvliet greatly improved their attachment, both physically and socially, to their neighbourhood.

**Sale, Manchester: Well behaved residents create good neighbourhoods?**

Manchester is, like Hoogvliet, concerned for the existing residents and aims to improve the reputation of a deprived area. Whereas Hoogvliet is looking to increase the social mobility of residents, the housing association in Manchester sets its sights lower and takes a more paternalistic stand: first the behaviour of the anti-social residents needs to be changed, before any change to the area’s reputation can take place and before other prospective residents will even consider living in the area. By rewarding tenant for good behaviour instead of evicting bad tenants, Irwell Valley Housing Association (IVHA) aimed to improve the neighbourhood reputation for old and new residents. Furthermore, by providing these extra services, the associations tried to increase the involvement and independency of residents (mostly on welfare benefits) and, in doing so, their attachment to the housing association and the neighbourhood. The assumption behind the tenant reward scheme developed by the housing association is that neighbours watch each other closely and do not want to miss out: “if my neighbour receives a new front door because he sticks to the rules, I will be more motivated to follow the same rules in order to get a new front door as well”.
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Emotional ties of residents were actively triggered in this process by rewarding activities that increase the attachment of residents to their neighbourhood, for instance, by organising local garden competitions and providing cheap toolboxes for DIY. Also, by offering advice on maximising room space within the house, the association tried to persuade expanding families to stay longer in their homes. In general, residents should become proud again of their neighbourhood and the world outside the neighbourhood needed to come and see this.

Although the financial rewards were impressive, the effects of the scheme on the social-emotional ties of residents were less clear. The greatly increased satisfaction of residents and the dramatically reduced turnover rate provide some indication of improved attachments, while interviews with local professionals and residents showed that some residents became more socially active in their neighbourhood and that the area reputation has improved. However, resident participation was selective and there was no evidence of increased emotional ties to the neighbourhood.

Nevertheless, tenant reward schemes appear to make a difference from a normative perspective: they provide an opportunity for housing associations to become normative mediators in a space where a normative consensus about how to live together in a neighbourhood has long broken down. Limited evidence seems to support the claim that there is improved trust between tenants and landlords. A shared trust in the housing association can facilitate the negotiation process between residents about common norms and values that will make life in the neighbourhood more satisfactory. Gold Service can therefore be seen as an institutional condition for the development of trust between residents. By developing trust between the association and individual residents, residents might feel safe enough to address their neighbours about their behaviour. The key innovation of Gold Service is the normative standpoint a housing association takes by making a distinction between good and bad behaviour and by rewarding that behaviour appropriately.

This increases not only residents’ satisfaction but is also likely to increase the social-emotional ties of residents. When positive interactions take place in the neighbourhood based on shared trust and values, the neighbourhood becomes charged with new meanings that enhance the place attachments of residents,
particularly their bonding to the neighbourhood. Additional research is necessary to establish this effect and to research the mechanisms by which place attachments are affected.

**Newcastle-Gateshead: Neighbourhood Attachment as Public Art?**

Newcastle-Gateshead is often portrayed as an exemplar of the revitalising benefits of culture-led regeneration: urban renewal in which cultural facilities take centre stage in the redressing of an area’s deprived reputation. By designing eye-catching museums and theatres filled with important works of art and artists, the area should acquire a new purpose and identity. Contrary to other English cities, which experimented with culture-led regeneration and where urban renewal is dominated by culture with a capital ‘C’, Newcastle and Gateshead emphasised culture with a small ‘c’ in their approach to urban renewal. Both councils have set up a joint public art programme and used this programme as a participatory tool in urban renewal. However, participation was not sufficient: by bringing residents in close contact with art and by enabling them to take part in the production of art, their living environment was supposed to acquire an additional emotional value which would results in a stronger attachment to and ownership of their environment. According to the councils, public art has helped significantly to improve the image of Gateshead and Newcastle and has paved the way for large corporate and national investments necessary for the facelift of the Quaysides. According to the Gateshead Council, public art has helped reclaim derelict areas, creating new social spaces and providing links between Gateshead Town Centre and the cultural facilities located on the Gateshead Quays.

Evidence for these claims are weak, however the panel data used in chapter five confirmed the increase of attachment to the neighbourhoods in the area. In comparison with other English neighbourhoods, place identity and place attachments, both physical and social, have increased more in Newcastle-Gateshead: the people in Newcastle-Gateshead feel more at home and more connected to their neighbours. However, not every resident shared in the strengthened bonds and local identity. Feelings of relativity changed for a considerable number of residents into feelings of placelessness: the neighbourhood became for them a more neutral to place to live.
Summary and Discussion

Apparently, the redevelopment of the Quayside and the popular Public Art Programme has not increased the attachments to the city for every resident. Still, both cities have been successful to the extent that they have been able to increase the affection of residents who felt least at home in their neighbourhood. This confirmed the claims of other researchers (Bailey et.al., 2002) who argued Newcastle-Gateshead has been able to link culture-led regeneration to the local identity of residents and in doing so have strengthened their place identity and affection for their neighbourhood. By using public art as a participatory tool in urban renewal, the deprived living environment acquired new meaning for residents, resulting in more attachment and stronger feelings of ownership towards the environment. By emphasising the cultural heritage of places and by using this heritage in the redevelopment of the area, the councils were able to appeal to the identification of residents with the area and (re)install a sense of pride in the places where they lived.

11.7 Implication for Urban Renewal Policy

My research demonstrates that the social-emotional ties of residents are a vital part of urban renewal programmes and policy. Not only do residents in deprived areas show less affection for the place where they live and the people they live with, their physical place attachments to the neighbourhood are further reduced by forced relocations in urban renewal. Instead of their neighbourhood being a well-known and welcome home, the new (and old) place feels alienated to residents, greatly reducing their willingness to contribute to the renewal effort or to tackle their own problems of deprivation and exclusion. Having said that, deprived areas in both the Netherlands and the United Kingdom demonstrate clear progress in increasing the physical and social ties of residents to their neighbourhood; although they lag behind, they are catching up.

28 For additional information on policy implications from this research, I refer to: Duyvendak, J.W. & P. van der Graaf (2008) Thuisvoelen in de buurt: een opgave voor stedelijke vernieuwing. Den Haag: NICIS/ Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. This publication is an adapted version of this dissertation, especially written for policy makers and urban professionals.
Summary and Discussion

Clearly something is taking place in these neighbourhoods that affects the emotional ties of their residents. Residents might not feel at home (yet), but they are happier to live in their neighbourhood and become more involved.

The case studies provide several examples of urban renewal projects that aim to alter the ways residents feel about their neighbourhood and provide some evidence towards the success and failures of these projects. In doing so they provide policy makers and urban professionals with vital clues on tools that will make residents feel more at home in their neighbourhood. Considering the impact of moving on the rootedness of residents to the neighbourhood, urban renewal should first of all help residents who are relocated cope with the emotional stress of moving. Special events, like the Day of Memories, organized in Emmen, can help residents in their transition to a new place, by recognising existing social-emotional ties and supporting the development of new place attachments to the new neighbourhood.

Furthermore by increasing the identification of residents to the neighbourhood and the value they put on their neighbours their social bonding will be improved. Tenant reward schemes such as those developed in Manchester can play a part in facilitating bonding between residents but other options are possible, as long as some key elements are taking into consideration: building trust between residents, the enduring presence of local professionals, and last but not least increasing community involvement by stimulating social interactions between residents.

The place attachments of residents are further enhanced if urban renewal programmes are able to change the personal circumstances of residents by improving their income and education. At the same time, Hoogvliet demonstrates how difficult it is to change the social mobility of residents. However, Hoogvliet proves it is possible to change the culture of an area, by making residents feel they can achieve more in their lives and feel more pride in the neighbourhood they live in. An important lesson from Hoogvliet is the interconnection of physical and social regeneration: a more viable and safer living environment (to be proud of) is important for residents to feel able to change their lives and face long-term standing problems of deprivation.
The question of how to combine social and spatial measures in urban renewal is central to the current political debate in the Netherlands and was one of the main causes for my research. Although the social-spatial question is a political issue, I argue that in order to research this question scientifically a redefinition is required. This concerns the framing of the social dimension of urban policy not exclusively in terms of social capital or social mobility, but as well in terms of emotional ties of residents to places. So far, attention for the emotional ties of residents to places has been almost non-existent in urban renewal or at the very least has not been framed as such. This might be one of the reasons why the debate on physical and social interventions is gridlocked.

In the emotional ties of residents to the places where they live, the physical and social dimensions or urban renewal come together. Although feelings related to a place are fluctual and even volatile, they always refer to a set geographical location, which is more fixed and resistant to change. The same place can evoke many different feelings for many different groups and individuals, accommodating for social differences, but also for social change. Social change does not necessarily have to result in a neighbourhood out of place with its new population, if the neighbourhood space allows different emotional ties to settle in and attach themselves to the environment. When the physical environment is successful in making different groups feel at home over time in the neighbourhood, this environment does not always need to change shape to accommodate social change. Therefore, spatial interventions need to take account of the emotional ties of existing and new residents, by creating both new environments and by sustaining existing ones, which allow a changing and diverse population to feel at home in their neighbourhood. By taking into account the social feelings of residents and there connection to physical places the gridlock debate on spatial and social interventions in urban renewal is opened up to new pathways for urban policy and practice.

Furthermore, this research shed a new light on the troublesome relationship between the social goals of urban renewal. In recent advice to the government the VROMraad (2006) argues that until now, the social mobility of residents has been neglected in favour of programmes on social cohesion and neighbouring. As a housing advice board to the government, it urges policymakers to create more
rungs for poorer and less educated residents on the societal ladder. I would argue, in a similar vein, that up till now the emotional ties of residents have been neglected in favour of programmes on social cohesion and, more recently, social mobility. However, instead of playing tug of war between the different goals of social urban renewal, this research demonstrates that social cohesion, social mobility and social-emotional ties are not independent goals in themselves, but closely connected to each other; the social attachments of residents to their neighbourhood are strongly influenced by their social participation, especially community involvement, which in turn is affected by the perceived social mobility of residents.

Therefore, for urban renewal programmes to make real progress, all three social goals need to be considered. To help residents climb the societal ladder, they need to feel able to achieve new goals in their lives. Feeling more at home in their neighbourhood, will give them the impetus to seize the opportunities presented to them in the urban renewal programmes. It is important for them to become more involved in the neighbourhood and with their neighbours and to increase their identification with the area in which they live to make them feel more at home in their neighbourhood. Before urban renewal can contribute towards this, it first needs to counteract the disturbing effect of relocation on the physical attachment of residents. For policymakers and urban professionals, the art is in making effective combinations between the three goals each and every time when they embark on urban renewal in a neighbourhood: can they make a neighbourhood in physical and social transitions a place to call home for old and new residents?

11.8 Implication for Urban Renewal Research

The research findings do not only take issue with one sided thinking of policy makers, but also with sociologists who argue against the value of social ties, especially in neighbourhoods, in modern day society. It has become common ground in Sociology to argue that in these individualistic and global times people prefer weaker ties between many more individuals and do not want to be held back
by an all inclusive community. Several scholars (Anderiessen & Reijndorp, 1989; Wellman, 1996; Friedrichs, 1997) have warned against putting too much emphasis and fate on the neighbourhood as a basis for identification and integration. They distance themselves from policy makers and landscape architects who paint a romantic picture of the harmonious community of the past, where life was well-organised and everybody knew and helped each other. They dismiss this line of thinking not only as a relic from the past but also as a ‘mythical netherworld’ that never existed.

As an alternative, some sociologists have argued for a community based on weak ties. Dyvendak and Hurenkamp (2005) argue for instance that ‘communities light’, with only weak ties among its members, are the preferred mode of organisation in modern society, due to the diverse and multilevel networks that people maintain. Others, like Talja Blokland, argue that social capital is not needed at all. According to Blokland, all that is needed for neighbours to get along is ‘public familiarity’. She uses the concept of public familiarity to emphasise the need for knowledge about neighbours instead of knowledge acquired in personal contact with neighbourhoods to develop social trust in neighbourhoods. According to Blokland the neighbourhood is not a basis for a shared identification, but merely a framework that can be used for identification. Repeated observations of people in the public space of the neighbourhood are sufficient to anticipate whether we can trust a neighbour or not. This knowledge does not need to be acquired in close personal contacts with neighbours.

However, this study shows that the neighbourhood is still an important frame of reference for many residents. Furthermore, to study the bonds between people and places we need to go beyond the knowledge that neighbours have of each other and beyond the concept of ‘public familiarity’. For (emotional) ties to develop between people and places, social interactions need to take place, in the literal sense of the word. Although I agree that the community is not or never has been the all-encompassing framework for the organisation of daily life and the identity of people, this research shows clearly that the neighbourhood is still an important framework for identification (albeit not the only one and not as important for everyone). For identification to take place within the framework of the neighbourhood, social interactions between people are required, in which
meanings are exchanged and the environment becomes ‘charged’ with meaning. Research on the bonds between people and places should, therefore, also carefully study the social bonds between people, although always in reference to the places where these interactions take place. Without these references the meanings that are exchanges in the social interactions can not be properly understood.

Researching emotional ties in urban renewal sheds a new light on this debate. In the international regeneration debate is it widely believed that urban renewal is a bad thing. Urban renewal does more harm than good, because residents are forced out of the neighbourhood by the new bourgeoisie pushing up house prices, uprooting their already distressed social networks and leaving the neighbourhood more segregated due to different time-space patterns between old and new residents (Wilson, 1987; Slater, 2006).

Zukin (1995) takes this argument a step further by claiming that urban renewal not only damages the social ties of residents, but also the cultural ties of residents to their place. She has argued that urban renewal destroys local urban culture: in the effort to unite different groups of residents under one new cultural banner, local distinctiveness is eroded (Zukin, 1995:274). In a similar vein, Miles (2005) argues that the ready-made identities offered by city councils and urban professionals in urban renewal often reduce several different visions of local culture into a single vision that reflects the aspirations of a powerful elite and the values, lifestyles, and expectations of potential investors and tourists. And even Richard Florida, who stresses the importance of culture for cities to attract the creative classes, is unsure whether local culture will benefit in the end. Culture is, for Florida, an individual commodity which creative citizens pick and mix according to their desires and is, therefore, eroding to existing cultures based on strong ties. In short, there is general agreement among urban sociologists that urban renewal is not only bad for social ties, but also bad news for local culture.

Contrary to the general consensus, Steve Miles (2005) argues that urban renewal can achieve the exact opposite: he believes that regeneration can revitalise cultural identities, if it is able to successfully tap into and reconfigure the place identity of residents living in the area. Instead of destroying local distinctiveness, he claims that urban renewal can strengthen local distinctiveness. Although the evidence base is limited for this claim, my research does show that
residents in Gateshead and Newcastle experience a more than average increase in place identity and social attachment: they feel more at home and more connected to their neighbours, compared with other New Deal for Community areas. By addressing the emotional ties through public art the councils in both cities were able to appeal to the identification of residents with the area and (re)instil a sense of pride in the places where they lived, instead of demolishing local confidence and culture in the physical transformation of the Quaysides.

For identification to take place within the framework of the neighbourhood, not only are social interactions required, but meaningful interactions, which charge (places in) the neighbourhood with new meanings and provide residents with new place identities. This will ultimately contribute to a new identity and reputation for the neighbourhood. Urban renewal can actively engage in meaningful exchanges between residents by providing symbolic references in the physical renewal of areas and by facilitating social interactions in which cultural meanings are exchanged (for example Memory Days). Research on the bonds between people and places should, therefore, not only focus on the social integration of people within the area they live in, but also on the meanings they attach to their environment and the ways by which these meanings are exchanged.

11.9 Implication for Urban Theory

In chapter two, I arrived at the concept of place attachment by a review of different areas in Sociology, starting with the concepts of social capital and social cohesion, arguing that in both concepts a reference to the spatial context of social interactions was missing. I even proposed a new concept for the study of social relations in urban environments, place capital, to describe the symbolic value of places. To define this concept more clearly I consulted the sociological literature on emotions and places. The literature on emotions left me disappointed with a very much individual explanation for emotional differences. Emotions in Sociology appear primarily as individual responses to external norms (dramaturgical theories) or an internal drive to confirm identities (symbolic interactionalists), whereas power and status decide on the scope and availability of emotional responses.
Summary and Discussion

(power and status theories). In all these theories emotions were narrowly defined and limited to the micro or at best the meso level. This is especially striking since most psychological theories on emotions agree that emotions are a thoroughly collective affair, leaving psychologists unable to define them at a simple individual level. Moreover, I was left none the wiser regarding the relationship between people and places: what role do places play in the emotional exchanges between individuals and how are power and status affected by different places?

More hopefully, I turned to the study of places in Sociology only to be put right back in place (or rather out of place) by Gieryn (2000), who explained to me that there appears to be no space for place in sociology. Luckily, some authors have since proved him wrong, but this does not change the marginal study of places in sociology. One step forward was the work of Keith and Pile, who argued that places act as neutralisers for conflicts and contradictions. Places hide power struggles and these need to be identified (politics of place) to understand the different meanings of place that are at stake. What a place represents at a given moment in time is, in the view of Keith and Pile, a particular political mobilization round a particular concept of space.

The meanings different groups attach to places are related to the identities they present in these places: “Spatialities represent both the spaces between multiple identities and the contradictions within identities” (225). This viewpoint is closely related to the symbolic interactionalist theories on emotions that I discussed, where individuals constantly try to confirm their self (identities) in interaction with others. The Politics of Identity provide a spatial dimension for the interactionalist theories by focussing on the places that represent these identities and allow groups and individuals to present different identities. Furthermore, by identifying ‘the politics of place’ described by Keith and Pile, the power struggles stressed by Power and Status theories on emotions in Sociology are uncovered and redefined as a struggle over the appropriate identity in a particular place. This connects sociological theories on emotions and place: whereas emotions are the outcome of power struggles, places tend to hide these struggles. (According to Keith and Pile spatialities of urban renewal are to be understood as an identity politics of space).
Summary and Discussion

To elaborate on the spatial dimension for Interactionalist theories I finally arrived at the concept of place attachment: how do places represent identities and allow groups and individuals to present different identities at the same place? As a transactionalist perspective it highlights important aspects of the study of emotions and place in sociology: people attach meanings to places and form affective bonds with these places when they present their identities in these spaces. By distinguishing different dimensions of place attachment, I have tried to show how places represent identities (place identity) and how people can develop different bonds to a place (physical and social attachment). By distinguishing different place affiliations and level of place identity, I have tried to show how residents can have multiple identities (for instance, friends-related and work-related) attached to different sorts of places (home or neighbourhood-based) in the neighbourhood.

Having used these dimensions in chapter four and five, and coming to the end of this dissertation, it is time to ask the question whether the concept of place attachment has done the job. Do the different dimensions I extracted give a clear picture of the emotional ties of residents, or are there any gaps left to be taken up in future research? I have demonstrated that it is possible and necessary to research the emotional ties of residents in urban renewal and that the concept of place attachment is a particular useful concept for the study of these ties.

By distinguishing different dimensions of place attachment I have contributed to a more encompassing concept of place attachment, which allows for theorising on emotional ties at different levels and to different places at the same time. There is not one way of feeling at home in the neighbourhood and these feeling changes over time and differ between groups and places. Moreover, people are likely to develop different attachments to more than one place. This makes place attachment a dynamic concept: meanings attached to places are constantly redefined in ongoing social interactions, allowing residents to adopt new meanings and places with which they can identify themselves. By combining these dimensions into four patterns of place attachment I was able to study the emotional ties of residents at different levels and places. The patterns will be useful for future research on emotional ties in urban renewal, allowing researchers to relate different programmes and interventions to different emotional needs and ties of residents.
Summary and Discussion

However, the concept of place attachment is not without its failures. For example, place attachment had been criticised as a theory that is only interested in the process by which people and places develop relationships and not so much by the structural differences and (cultural) contexts that allow people to form different relationship at different times and different places. The status and power differences stressed by sociological theories on emotions take a back seat. Although redefined as a struggle over the appropriate identity in a particular place, not much of this struggle is actually studied by place attachment-theory. This struggle is at the centre of the urban renewal debate: residents feel detached from their neighbourhood, because new groups arriving in the neighbourhood have challenged their identity in the place where they live or policy makers and urban professionals have designed a new place identity for them to make the neighbourhood more attractive for different groups which leave little place for their own identities. Furthermore, by defining the relationships between people and places as affective bonds, the theory has neglected the non-affective types of relationships concerning cognitive and instrumental processes (Moore, 2000:213).

Questions for Future Research

To make more space for place in sociology and in particular the study of emotional ties of people to places, more research is needed into these issues, building on the concept of place attachment. To guide future research, the following questions are relevant:

- How can emotions be defined at the macro level, based on interaction between different groups of people in society and interactions between groups of people and different places?
- In what ways are meanings exchanged between groups of people and in what ways do meanings become attached to the environment?
- What roles do places play in the emotional exchanges between people and how are group’s power and status affected by different places?
- What is the role of struggles and conflict in these exchanges?
- What role do cognitive and instrumental processes play in the affective bond between people and places?
Summary and Discussion

- How do different structures (government, welfare states, private and third sector) and cultural contexts (national and trans-national identities, local culture, multi-cultural) affect the emotional ties of people to places?
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Samenvatting
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In dit proefschrift ben ik op zoek gegaan naar de sociaal-emotionele bindingen van bewoners met hun buurt en de wijzen waarop herstructurering ingrijpt op deze bindingen: maken stedelijke vernieuwingsinspanningen verschil voor hoe bewoners zich thuisvoelen?

Voor het in kaart van de sociaal-emotionele bindingen van bewoners heb ik gebruikt gemaakt van het concept ‘place attachment’, dat de relatie tussen fysiek (plekken) en sociaal (personen) definieert als een affectieve band tussen personen en plekken. Mensen raken emotioneel betrokken bij hun omgeving wanneer ze op bepaalde plekken ervaringen opdoen: plaatsen krijgen betekenis door de persoonlijke, sociale en culturele uitwisselingen die zich er afspelen. In het onderzoek heb ik verschillende dimensies van place attachment of, zoals ik dat vertaald hebben, van buurthechting onderscheiden.

- Plaatsidentiteit: Voel ik mij thuis in de buurt?
- Hechting aan plekken: Voel ik mij fysiek en/of sociaal gehecht aande buurt?
- Hechtingsmotieven: Waarom voel ik mij thuis in de buurt?
- Niveau van identificatie: Waar voel ik mij thuis?

Op basis van de verschillende dimensies heb ik de buurthechting van Nederlandse en Engelse bewoners in kaart te gebracht.

Hoe voelen bewoners zich thuis in de buurt?

Ongeveer evenveel Nederlanders als Engelsen voelen zich helemaal thuis in hun buurt: meer dan een derde van de bevolking in beide landen voelt zich, zowel fysiek als sociaal, thuis in de buurt. Een vijfde van de Nederlandse bevolking voelt daarentegen nauwelijks een band met de buurt waarin ze wonen en de mensen die
daar wonen. 17% is alleen gehecht aan de mensen die in de buurt wonen, terwijl rond de 23% zich alleen fysiek verbonden voelt met de buurt. Verhoudingsgewijs wonen er meer mensen die zich nauwelijks verbonden voelen met hun buurt of alleen fysiek in de 56 aandachtswijken en met name in de vier grote steden. Bewoners die zich sterk verbonden voelen met hun buurt en buurtgenoten wonen daarentegen vaker in de kleinere steden en meer landelijke gebieden (buiten de G30) in Nederland.

In tegenstelling tot Nederland zijn er tussen Engelse buurten, met name achterstandsbuurten en meer gegoede wijken, weinig verschillen in buurthechting. Voor het thuisgevoel van Engelsen maakt het dus minder uit in welke buurt ze wonen. Daarmee is niet gezegd dat de Engelsen onverschillig zijn voor waar ze wonen; wat in Engeland echter zwaarder weegt is het huis waarin gewoond wordt.

**Waarom voelen bewoners zich thuis?**

Voor Engelsen is het belang van woonsatisfactie de belangrijke factor voor het gevoel van buurtbinding: sterker dan in Nederland hangen verschillen in fysieke en sociale hechting aan de buurt samen met de tevredenheid over het huis: hoe meer tevreden, des te groter is de buurthechting. Dat de buurt niet helemaal uit beeld verdwijnt, blijkt uit het feit dat naast tevredenheid met de woning, de geschiktheid van de buurt voor kinderen een grote rol speelt in de vorm en mate van buurthechting van Engelse bewoners: in kindvriendelijke buurten voelen Engelsen zich meer fysiek en sociaal thuis. Voor Nederlandse bewoners is tevredenheid met huisvesting eveneens van belang, maar daarnaast is het vooral belangrijk wie in de buurt wonen: als men tevreden is met de buren voelt men zich sneller fysiek en sociaal gehecht aan de buurt. Interessant is bovendien dat gehechtheid aan de mensen in de buurt samenhangt met tevredenheid over het openbaar vervoer in en naar de buurt: kennelijk geeft de mogelijkheid om de buurt te kunnen verlaten, vertrouwen om emotionele banden met andere bewoners aan te knopen, terwijl minder mobiele bewoners juist minder gehecht zijn aan hun buren: voelen zij zich opgesloten en ‘aangewezen’ op hun buren?
Als we kijken naar meer persoonlijke verklaringen voor verschillen in thuisgevoelens (geld, opleiding, leeftijd en kinderen) dan blijkt dat net als in Nederland, ook in Engeland leeftijd uit te maken voor hechting aan de buurt: oudere bewoners voelen zich zowel fysiek als sociaal meer thuis in de buurt. In tegenstelling tot Nederland maken kinderen echter geen verschil voor de buurthechting van Engelse bewoners. Alhoewel de geschiktheid van de buurt voor kinderen ertoe doet (zie hierboven) zorgt het daadwerkelijk hebben van kinderen er niet voor dat Engelsen zich meer verbonden voelen met hun buurt of buurtgenoten. Mogelijk speelt hier het belang van ‘catchment areas’ van scholen in Engeland een rol: toelating tot scholen is afhankelijk van postcode en een goede school in de buurt kan de huizenprijzen daarom aardig opjagen. Daarmee worden scholen en kinderen in de buurt een belangrijke graadmeter voor sociale status en aantrekkelijkheid van de buurt.

Een nog opvallender verschil met Nederland is het belang van sociale participatie voor buurthechting: terwijl dit voor Nederlandse buurtbewoners veruit het meeste gewicht in de schaal legt, maakt de mate van sociale participatie nauwelijks verschil voor de Engelse buurtbewoners. De meeste buurtbewoners zijn niet sociaal actief in de buurt, noch lid van een buurtclub of vereniging. Wat wel uitmaakt voor Engelsen is de tijd die ze doorbrengen in en om het huis; hoe meer ze klussen in huis, sleutelen aan de auto of graven in de tuin, des te meer voelen ze zich fysiek verbonden met hun buurt. Dit wijst er op dat het thuisgevoel van de Engelsen zich primair hecht aan en gevoed wordt door hun huis. Door tijd te spenden rondom het huis claimen Engelse bewoners als het ware hun plek in de buurt en ontwikkelen ze een emotionele band met de plek waar ze wonen. In Nederland speelt het eigen huis minder een rol voor de buurthechting van bewoners en is veel belangrijker wie er in de buurt woont. Dit laat zien dat er meerdere routes voor het ontwikkelen van thuisgevoelens zijn die per land kunnen verschillen. Nederlanders opteren voor de sociale participatie-route, terwijl Engels ‘in favour’ zijn voor een particulier traject. Deels liggen hieraan culturele verschillen ten grondslag: Kate Fox betoogt dat Engelsen sociaal onhandiger en schuchterder zijn en daarom liever met rust gelaten willen worden achter hun voordeur en schutting. Deels kan dit ook te maken hebben met verschillen in
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woonsegregatie en stigma: in Engeland is de sociale volkshuisvesting veel sterker een ‘opvanghuis voor de armen’, waardoor er door anderen, die beter af zijn, veel meer waarde aan het hebben van een eigen huis of ‘het eigen maken’ van een huis wordt gehecht.

_Waar voelen bewoners zich thuis?_


_Patronen van buurthechting_

Om meer variatie in thuisgevoelens te kunnen onderscheiden heb ik gezocht naar patronen van buurthechting door bewoners niet alleen in te delen op basis van hun affectieve band met de buurt, maar ook op basis van:
- hun tevredenheid met en
- hun sociale betrokkenheid bij huis en buurt.

Dit leverde vier verschillende patronen van buurthechting op:

1. Geaard in de buurt (Community Rootedness)
2. Onthecht en vervreemd (Alienation)
3. Relatieve gehecht (Relativity)
4. Ongebonden (Placelessness)

Engelsen voelen zich veel vaker geaard in hun buurt. Bijna de helft van de Engelse bewoners kans omschreven worden als geaard. Een veel kleinere groep dan in Nederland voelt zich onthecht, vervreemd en ontevreden met de buurt waar ze woont. Ze identificeren zich minder met de buurt en zijn sterk gericht op hun familie die in de omgeving woont. Maar Engelse bewoners, die minder belang hechten aan de buurt (neutrale plek om te wonen) neigen meer dan in Nederland naar een negatieve affectie voor hun omgeving. Dit geldt ook voor Engelsen in het algemeen: in vergelijking met Nederlanders zijn zij minder actief in en minder tevreden over hun buurt. De mate van hechting zegt dus blijkbaar nog weinig over de tevredenheid en inzet voor de buurt.

De verschillende patronen van buurthechting laten zien dat er geen één op één relatie is tussen affectie, tevredenheid en betrokkenheid bij de buurt. Bij twee patronen van buurthechting gaan de drie dimensies gelijk op: geaarde bewoners voelen zich thuis in de buurt, zijn tevreden over hun woonomgeving en vaak actief betrokken bij wat er in de buurt speelt, terwijl ontheemde bewoners nauwelijks affectie voelen, sterk ontevreden zijn en niet actief zijn in de buurt. Maar bewoners met een relatieve hechting voelen weliswaar minder hechting met hun buurt en zijn eerder geneigd tot ontevredenheid, maar identificeren zich wel met
de buurt en zijn er ook actief terwijl bewoners voor wie de buurt minder een rol speelt (neutrale opstelling), vaak wel tevreden zijn, maar noch affectie voelen noch inzet tonen voor hun buurt. In Engeland speelt dit onderscheid tussen buurthechting en buurttevredenheid nog sterker, omdat bewoners ondanks hun grotere hechting relatief vaker ontevreden zijn over hun buurt. Dit kan te maken hebben met de grotere achterstand waarin ze leven, maar ook met de (zeer matige) manier waarop Engelsenzich met hun buurt identificeren. Zoals eerder opgemerkt is vooral het eigen huis (ongeacht bezit, wat laag is in achterstandswijken) in Engeland belangrijk voor de buurthechting en klampen zij zich daaraan vast aan om problemen letterlijk buiten te sluiten.

Toch maakt ook in Engeland de buurt wel degelijk uit voor de mate van buurthechting. De verdeling van buurthechting in Nederland en Engeland is op een vergelijkbare manier ongelijk: bewoners in de prioriteitsbuurt en van de dertig grootste Nederlandse steden en in Engelse achterstandswijkenvoelen zich vaker ontheemd en verwreemd van hun buurt, in het bijzonder in de zogenaamde New Deal for Communities-gebieden. Terwijl bewoners in Engelse buurten met geen of weinig achterstand of in Nederlandse buurten waar niet geherstructuureerd wordt (non-prioritaire wijken) vaker geaard zijn in hun buurt.

**Stedelijke vernieuwing: bedreiging of potentie voor buurthechting?**

de voornaamste herstructureringswijken zijn zich dus in vergelijking met andere wijken in Nederland meer thuis gaan voelen bij de mensen met wie ze samenwonen in de buurt en hebben een inhaalslag gemaakt wat hun fysieke banden met de buurt betreft, al hebben meer landelijk wonende bewoners de meeste vooruitgang op deze terreinen geboekt.

In tegenstelling tot Nederland laat Engeland overwegend een neergaande trend in buurthechting zien. De enige, zij het lichte toename in buurthechting komt voornamelijk op het conto van de New Deal-wijken: bewoners in deze wijken die voorheen geen band met de buurt of hun buren hadden, hebben vaker op één of twee van beide fronten een affectieve band ontwikkeld. Bewoners in de andere Engelse achterstandswijken verliezen juist vaker hun affectie voor de buurt, terwijl ook in de meer welgestelde wijken bewoners vooral hun sociale hechting met de buurt aan het verliezen zijn.

De neergaande trend is nog sterker zichtbaar als naar patronen van buurthechting wordt gekeken. Tussen 1998 en 2003 verandert 85% van de Engelsen van mening over hun tevredenheid met de buurt waar ze wonen, hun sociale participatie in en buiten de buurt en/of de band die ze hebben met hun woonomgeving. Verandering betekent in de meeste gevallen minder buurthechting: een groot deel van de Engelse bewoners die zich neutraal opstelden ten opzichte van hun buurt in 1998, meldt 5 jaar later zich meer vervreemd van hun buurt te voelen, terwijl een vergelijkbare groep die zich in 1998 nog identificeerde met in de buurt (relatieve binding), in 2003 aangaf niet veel belang meer te hechten aan hun buurt. De grootste verandering doet zich voor bij de groep bewoners die zich voorheen sterk geaard voelden in hun buurt, terwijl bewoners die zich vervreemd voelen de minste verandering laten zien. Opnieuw is de negatieve lijn minder sterk in de grootste achterstandswijken van Engeland. Vooral in de New Deal-wijken voelen minder bewoners zich vervreemd en onthecht en stellen zich meer neutraal op (ongebonden) ten opzichte van hun buurt dan in de andere achterstands- en meer welgestelde wijken. Het lijkt het dus erop dat, juist in het perspectief van algemene achteruitgang in buurthechting in Engeland, in de New Deal-wijken enige vooruitgang wordt geboekt.

### Tabel S.1 Verschillen in thuisgevoelens tussen Nederland en Engeland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensies van buurthechting</th>
<th>Nederland</th>
<th>Engeland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plaatsidentiteit (Voel ik mij thuis in de buurt?)</td>
<td>Meerderheid voelt zich thuis</td>
<td>Meerderheid voelt zich thuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hechting aan plekken (Hoe voel ik mij thuis in de buurt?)</td>
<td>Meer fysieke dan sociale hechting aan de buurt</td>
<td>Meer sociale dan fysieke hechting aan de buurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hechtingsmotieven (Waarom voel ik mij thuis in de buurt?)</td>
<td>-Sociale betrokken in de buurt -Tevreden met woning -Tevreden met openbaar vervoer -Hogere leeftijd -Kinderen in huishouding</td>
<td>- Identificatie met huis en buurt -Tevreden met woning -Geschiktheid buurt voor kinderen -Klussen in en om het huis -Hogere leeftijd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niveau van identificatie (Waar voel ik mij thuis in de buurt?)</td>
<td>Zowel in huis als in de buurt</td>
<td>Zowel in huis als in de buurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tevredenheid met de buurt</td>
<td>Sterk tevreden met de buurt</td>
<td>Minder tevreden met de buurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrokkenheid bij de buurt</td>
<td>Sterk betrokken bij de buurt</td>
<td>Nauwelijks betrokken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wat veroorzaakt deze verschillen? Uit aanvullende analyses blijkt dat verhuizen het meest bepalend is voor veranderingen in buurthechting. Tussen 2002 en 2006 bijvoorbeeld verhuisd een derde van de Nederlandse bevolking. Het merendeel daarvan blijft in dezelfde gemeente wonen; slechts een klein deel verhuist buiten de gemeentegrenzen. Met name de fysieke buurthechting neemt, zoals te verwachten valt, sterk af als bewoners van woonadres veranderen. Deze uitkomst onderstreept het belang van aandacht voor het effect van (gedwongen) verhuizing in stedelijke vernieuwing. Tegelijkertijd is de invloed van verhuizing op de sociale buurthechting van bewoners een stuk minder: verhuizing onttrekt voornamelijk de band met de buurt en minder de band met bewoners. Dit bevestigt eerder onderzoek van Kleinhans (2006) die in zijn onderzoek aantoont dat sociale verbanden veel minder aangetast worden dan emotionele banden. Dit onderzoek verfijnt deze uitkomst: met name de fysieke-emotionele band met de buurt wordt negatief aangetast. Deze band is al relatief minder sterk dan de sociale band die bewoners in achterstandswijken met hun buurt ervaren en wordt door gedwongen verhuizing verder verkleind. Dit maakt het voor beleidsmakers en stedelijke professionals tot een weliswaar lastige maar dringende opgave om hier iets aan te doen: fysieke buurthechting is een schaars goed in achterstandswijken waar stedelijke vernieuwers zuinig op moeten zijn. Projecten die recht doen aan de emotionele betekenis van plekken (en de eventuele verhuizing) zijn daarom ook van grote betekenis.

Sociale buurthechting mag dan niet veel te lijden hebben onder (al dan niet gedwongen) verhuizing, wat wel van grote invloed is op de sociaal-emotionele band die bewoners met hun buurtgenoten ervaren, is het sociale netwerk dat ze in de buurt onderhouden en het belang dat ze aan deze contacten hechten. Hoe meer betrokken bewoners zijn bij het leven in hun buurt, des te meer voelen zij zich thuis. Deze uitkomst onderstreept het belang van van projecten gericht op sociale cohesie voor het vergroten van hechting aan de buurt en daarmee het behouden van bewoners voor de buurt. Ook in Engeland blijkt verhuizen de belangrijkste verklaring voor afgenomen fysieke hechting aan de buurt. Meer dan een derde van de Engelsen verruilt zijn huis in deze periode voor een ander; de meerderheid van de verhuizers blijft wel wonen in dezelfde gemeente (Local Authority District).
Degenen die in hetzelfde huis (en buurt) bleven wonen zijn in 2003 meer dan tweemaal zoveel gehecht aan hun buurt dan de verhuizers. Daarnaast draagt een gemeenschapgevoel ertoe bij dat Engelsen zich meer fysiek thuisvoelen in de buurt: wanneer bewoners het idee hebben in een vriendelijk en behulpzame omgeving te wonen (waar privacy gerespecteerd wordt!) dan versterkt dit hun fysieke buurthechting. Ook hier is de invloed van verhuizing op de sociale buurthechting van bewoners een stuk minder en in Engeland zelfs niet significant: verhuizing ontregelt voornamelijk de band met de buurt en minder de band met andere bewoners.

Waar in Nederland sociale netwerken van belang zijn voor meer sociale hechting aan de buurt, speelt in Engeland de vraag in welke mate bewoners zich identifieren met de woonomgeving een veel grotere rol, los van de contacten die ze in de buurt onderhouden. Alhoewel Engelse bewoners meer waarde hechten aan hun huis dan aan hun buurt, kan hun sociale hechting aan de buurt aanzienlijk vergroot worden wanneer bewoners zich sterker identifieren met hun buurt. De buurt is in Engeland niet zozeer van belang voor het onderhouden van contacten, maar voor het onderstrepen van de eigen identiteit. De buurthechting van Engelse bewoners is een meer persoonlijke beleving, terwijl voor Nederlanders de buurt een belangrijk sociaal platform is. Veranderingen in sociale participatie en buurtbetrokkenheid hebben dan ook nagenoeg geen effect op de buurthechting van Engelse bewoners. Wel vergroot het doorbrengen van meer tijd in en om het huis de fysieke buurtbinding in Engeland. Dit wijst wederom op het belang van eigen huis en tuin voor de buurthechting van Engelse bewoners. De verschillende factoren die zorgen voor meer of minder buurthechting in Nederland en Engeland zijn opgesomd in onderstaande figuur.
Deze figuur illustreert welke effecten stedelijke vernieuwing heeft op de buurthechting van bewoners en wat beleidsmakers en stedelijke professionals kunnen doen om de buurthechting van bewoners te versterken. Waar stedelijke vernieuwing door gedwongen verhuizing in eerste instantie afbreuk doet aan de fysieke buurthechting van bewoners, kunnen beleidsmakers en sociale professionals de sociale band met de buurt versterken door projecten op te zetten die zich speciek richten op het vergroten van burencontact van bewoners in Nederland en projecten gericht op identificatie met de buurt in Engeland.

Stedelijk vernieuwing in Nederland en Engeland

Maar wat behelen deze projecten precies en hoe kunnen ze het beste ingevuld worden? Om deze vraag te kunnen beantwoorden heb ik een kijkje in de keuken genomen van vier herstructureringsprogramma’s, waarin speciale projecten zijn ontwikkeld die zich richten op de sociaal-emotionele bindingen van bewoners met hun buurt; twee in Nederland en twee in Engeland. Wat leveren deze projecten op (en zijn ze eventueel overdraagbaar)? Voor Nederland worden de Emmense wijken Angelslo, Bargeres en Emmerhout en de Rotterdamse deelgemeente Hoogvliet besproken en in Engeland de wijk Sale in Manchester en het stedelijke
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vernieuwingsgebied Newcastle Gateshead. Elk gebied werkt op zijn eigen manier aan de binding van bewoners met hun buurt. Om een vergelijking tussen Nederlandse en Engelse praktijken te kunnen maken hebben we eerst een korte schets gegeven van het stedelijk beleid, en de aandacht daarbinnen voor buurthechting, in Engeland en Nederland.

In beide landen worden grootschalige herstructureringsprogramma’s opgezet om de gestelde doelen te realiseren. Binnen deze programma’s varieert de aandacht voor sociale en emotionele bindingen sterk. Sociaal stedelijk beleid in Nederland was tot voor kort sterk gericht op de vergroting van sociale cohesie en krijgt nu hoe langer hoe meer invulling vanuit de wens om de sociale mobiliteit van bewoners te verbeteren. We hebben hier in de casestudies verschillende voorbeelden van gezien: Emmen Revisited waar bewonersparticipatie en sociale cohesie een centrale plaats krijgt en Hoogvliet waar sociale mobiliteit de nadruk heeft. In beide type programma’s worden impliciete verwijzingen gemaakt naar emotionele bindingen: stedelijke vernieuwing dient de oorspronkelijk bewoners van een gebied als het ware bescherming te bieden als zij zich vervreemd voelen van hun buurt door de komst van immigranten. Beleidsmakers maken zich vervolgens druk over de integratie van deze nieuwkomers, die zich ook thuis moeten voelen in hun nieuwe land, zonder de thuisgevoelens van de oorspronkelijke bewoners aan te tasten. Meer expliciete referenties naar thuisgevoelens worden gemaakt in het debat over ‘fysiek-sociaal’: stedelijke vernieuwing moet meer zijn dan stenen stapelen, zo heet het, en de problemen en potenties van bewoners moeten centraal. De vraag hoe sociale projecten voor deze bewoners precies gecombineerd moeten worden met stedebouwkundige programma’s blijft echter de inzet van verhitte discussies in wetenschap en beleid.

In de Engelse volkhuisvesting gaan sociaal en fysiek vanoudsher meer samen, alleen wel in een context van gedwongen uitverkoop van sociale huurwoningen onder Tatcher waardoor een gestigmatiseerde sector voor de allerarmsten overbleef. De concentratie en cumulatie van maatschappelijke problemen in de Engelse sociale huursector heeft ertoe geleid dat de welzijnsector daar veel nadrukkelijker gekoppeld is aan huisvesting (en niet is weggesaneerd zoals in Amerika), terwijl in
Nederland welzijn lange tijd veel meer als een aparte sector wordt gezien. In Nederland zoeken corporaties daarom samenwerking met welzijnsinstellingen, terwijl Engelse housing associations zelf jongerenwerkers in dienst nemen. Engelse beleidsmakers lijken zich meer bewust van de emotionele bindingen van bewoners met hun buurt. Dit komt niet alleen tot uitdrukking in het consequente gebruik van de term ‘home’ voor huis in de Engelse volkshuisvesting (een huis is meer dan een bak stenen; het is een plaats waar bewoners zich thuis moeten voelen), maar ook in de dominantie van sociaal-economische en vooral -culturele projecten in stedelijke vernieuwing, waarbij een veel sterkere nadruk gelegd wordt op de identiteit en reputatie van gebieden. De casestudie in Newcastle en Gateshead vormt hier een voorbeeld van: beide stadbesturen proberen via een inclusief publieke kunst-programma de lokale identiteit van bewoners te versterken en daarmee de reputatie en aantrekkelijkheid van het gebied niet alleen fysiek, maar ook symbolisch te verbeteren.

In tegenstelling tot Nederland worden in Engeland vaak de achtergestelde bewoners als startpunt gekozen voor stedelijk vernieuwing, terwijl in Nederland een groot deel van de herstructuerings-inspanningen gericht is op het aantrekken van de middenklasse naar achtergestelde wijken om daarmee de economische en sociale menging in deze buurt te versterken. In Engeland komt de middenklasse vaak pas veel later om de hoek kijken: eerst dient het (anti-sociale) gedrag van de huidige bewoners aangepakt te worden om de buurt aantrekkelijk te maken voor nieuwe bewoners. Een mentaliteits- en gedragsverandering van de huidige bewoners wordt noodzakelijk geacht voor een betere reputatie van het gebied, anders zal de middenklasse de wijk geen blik waardig keuren. Eerst moeten de huidige bewoners zich gaan thuisvoelen in hun wijk, voordat de wijk aantrekkelijk wordt voor andere bewoners. Voordat daarom geld geïnvesteerd wordt in duurdere koopwoningen voor de middenklasse, wordt eerst veel tijd, geld en energie gestoken in sociaal-economische projecten voor de mensen die al in de wijk wonen. De casestudie in Manchester is hier een voorbeeld van, waar de corporatie bewoners een wortel voorhoudt om bewoners te verleiden tot goed huurdersgedrag en inzet voor de buurt.
Lessen uit de casestudies

Emmen Revisited: zoektocht naar sociaal
De ontwikkeling van Emmen Revisited laat een zoektocht zien naar het combineren van herstructurering met economische en sociale interventies waarbij de definitie van sociaal steeds verder is opgerekt en zelfs het belang van emotionele bindingen wordt erkend. Maar de afstemming van de sociale component met de fysische en economische pijlers blijft steken op projectniveau. Een enigszins onvolkomen sociale diagnose heeft er echter voor gezorgd dat de integrale aanpak nooit goed uit de verf is gekomen en het sociale programma versnipperd is geraakt. Het daadwerkelijk verknopen van fysische en sociale ingrepen is gebaat bij een bredere opvatting van de sociale component, waarbij ook de sociale-emotionele binding van bewoners aan hun buurt een plek heeft.

Aanzetten zijn er al wel: voor de sloop van flats in de Dilgt en Lemzijde zijn er speciale herinneringsdagen georganiseerd, waar expliciet aandacht is besteed aan de sociale band van huurders met de fysische ruimte waar ze gewoond hebben. Dit initiatief laat zien hoe buurthechting gebruikt kan worden om bewoners een minder ontworteld overgangsproces naar een (ver)nieuwd(e) plaats te laten maken. Het aanspreken van bewoners op hun emotionele binding met het gebied bij sloop erkent de symbolische waarde van de gebouwde ruimte. De corporatie en andere partijen kunnen deze waarde gebruiken, niet alleen om de emotionele pijn voor bewoners te verzachten, maar ook om bewoners te laten aarden in hun nieuwe woonomgeving: een soortelijke herinneringsdag kan georganiseerd worden voor bewoners die terugkeren naar hun vernieuwde buurt.

Emmen laat ook zien hoe een sociale koppeling met fysische projecten gemaakt kan worden. In het project Hulp en activering in Emmerhout werd het traject van herhuisvesting aangegrepen om bewoners in een sociaal zwakke positie extra hulp en activering te bieden, vanuit de gedachte dat mensen die al gedwongen van woonomstandigheden veranderen, eerder geneigd zullen zijn om ook andere delen van hun (dagelijks) leven aan te pakken. In dit project is dus een bewuste link gelegd tussen sociaal-economische en fysische ingrepen. De eerste resultaten wijzen erop dat
deze link succesvol is en dit soort initiatieven zou wel eens een belangrijke rol kunnen spelen in het verzachten van de emotionele stress veroorzaakt door gedwongen verhuizingen. Hier komen we later op terug bij de bespreking van de lessen in Hoogvliet.

Naast de voorbeelden die Emmen aandraagt, laat de ervaringen in deze case zien hoe belangrijk een integrale aanpak en organisatie is. Weinig steden beschikken over een uitgewerkte aanpak op stedelijk niveau waarbij meerdere partijen buiten het gemeentehuis en de corporatievestiging betrokken zijn. Emmen is daarop een uitzondering. Een gedegen voorbereiding leidde tot een breed uitgewerkt en breed gedragen programma, waarbinnen een belangrijke plaats was ingeruimd voor de sociale aanpak.

**Hoogvliet, Rotterdam: plaatsidentiteit of sociale mobiliteit?**

In de herstructurering van Hoogvliet is op twee manieren geprobeerd de buurthechting van bewoners te vergroten: direct door het ontwerpen van een nieuwe wijkidentiteit en indirect door het inzetten op sociale mobiliteit. Door bewoners niet alleen van een beter huis te voorzien, maar ook betere kansen op de opleidings- en arbeidsmarkt, diende de buurt een betere reputatie te krijgen en de hechting van bewoners aan hun buurt te verbeteren. Aan plaatsidentiteit is in Hoogvliet actief gesleuteld. Hoogvliet was één van de vier deelnemers aan het programma ‘Wijkidentiteit en Branding’, dat streefde naar sterkere profilering van achterstandsgebieden aan de hand van herkenbare woonmilieus gebaseerd op de identiteit van een gebied. Als bewoners zich beter kunnen herkennen in de plek waar ze wonen, zullen ze zich meer thuis voelen en dit zal de kwaliteit van het gebied en de bewoners ten goede komen.

Ondanks alle inspanningen is er zes jaar laten weinig van de beeldende resultaten terug te vinden in de stedelijke vernieuwing van Hoogvliet. Wat de ervaringen in Hoogvliet en ook in andere Nederlandse steden ons leren is dat identiteit en beleving van een wijk of ander gebied niet volgens een vooraf gemaakt ontwerp zijn te produceren. Zij worden gevormd in een dynamisch en onvoorspelbaar sociaal proces, waarin je voortdurend als participant betrokken moet zijn. De
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Via de indirecte weg lijkt Hoogvliet meer vooruitgang geboekt te hebben; door niet alleen te sleutelen aan de wijkidentiteit van Hoogvliet, maar ook aan de persoonlijke mobiliteit van de oorspronkelijke bewoners lijkt op de lange termijn ook de buurthechting vergroot te worden. Een grote waaier aan sociale projecten (Heel de Buurt, Lus dit Trafico) zijn opgezet met bijzondere aandacht voor Antiliaanse eenoudergezinnen, om hun arbeidsdeelname en opleidingskwalificaties te verbeteren en hun afhankelijkheid van uitkeringen en instanties te verminderen. Alhoewel op de objectieve indicatoren (inkomen, opleiding, werkgelegenheid) voorlopig niet veel verbeteringen zichtbaar zijn, boekt het programma betekenisvolle resultaten in de hoofden en harten van Hoogvlieters. Er heerst een nieuw zelfbewustzijn. Waar voorheen sommige groepen de indruk wekten van berusting, zijn er nu weinig sporen meer van berusting. Mensen denken bijna zonder uitzondering dat presteren zin heeft en dat de samenleving open voor hen staat. Van een ‘culture of underachievement’ - waarbij mensen hun motivatie verliezen omdat ‘er toch geen kansen zijn’- lijkt geen sprake (meer). De vernieuwing brengt een proces van zelfwaardering bij een deel van de betrokken bewoners op gang door een combinatie van een nieuw woning- en woonplaatsperspectief enerzijds en assertief sociaal beleid anderzijds. Een aanzienlijk deel van de oorspronkelijke Hoogvlieters vindt wel - subjectief dus - dat het beter met hen gaat en zijn weer trots op hun buurt. Beide gevoelens lijken met elkaar verbonden te zijn: trots zijn op een verbeterde wijk is voor bewoners belangrijk om zelf ook naar verbeteringen in het eigen leven te zoeken.

Dit onderzoek wijst uit dat dit ongevraagd beweging brengen in het leven van mensen een belangrijk punt is: fysische mobiliteit (je moet verhuizen) en sociale
mobiliteit kunnen met elkaar samenhangen. Niet voor niets springen uit ons empirisch onderzoek twee hoopvolle categorieën in het oog: doorstromers en Antillianen. De Antilliaanse groep is zich het meest bewuste van de link met stedelijke vernieuwing; hier lijkt de gerichte inzet van middelen op delen van deze groep niet alleen vruchten af te werpen maar ook als zodanig door betrokkenen herkend te worden. Verbeteringen in de wijk worden benoemd als individuele stijgingswinst, want een sociaal gedesorganiseerde wijk belemmert het maatschappelijk perspectief. Een goede reputatie van een gebied straalt ook op de bewoners af en draagt bij aan de investeringsbereidheid van nieuwe groepen bewoners en ondernemers. Daarmee is de doelstelling van de deelgemeente en de woningcorporaties in feite omgedraaid: niet individuele vooruitgang van bewoners zorgt voor een betere buurt: maar een betere buurt zorgt voor meer bereidheid onder bewoners om hun persoonlijke problemen van achterstand aan te pakken en vooruit te komen in de wijk. Geloof in persoonlijk kunnen leidt vervolgens tot meer thuisvoelen en hechting aan de buurt: bewoners zijn weer trots op de wijk waar ze wonen.

**Manchester: goed gedrag doet de wijk volgen?**
Manchester kiest ook de oorspronkelijke bewoners als uitgangspunt voor de stedelijke vernieuwing en streeft net als Hoogvliet een verbeterde reputatie van het gebied na. Maar waar Hoogvliet kiest voor het vooruit helpen van de oorspronkelijke bewoners, stelt Manchester, of in dit geval de woningcorporatie zich paternalistischer op: eerst dient het (anti-sociale) gedrag van de huidige bewoners aangepakt te worden om de buurt aantrekkelijk te maken voor nieuwe bewoners. Door het aanbieden van deze extra diensten en services probeert de corporatie huurders te verleiden tot meer betrokkenheid bij het werk van de corporatie en hun buurt. Het achterliggende idee is dat goed voorbeeld doet volgen. Als de buren een nieuwe voordeur krijgen omdat ze zich aan het huurcontract houden, zal dit bewoners aanzetten om zich ook aan de regels te houden om zo ook aanspraak te kunnen maken op extra diensten en keuze.

Emotionele banden met de buurt worden daarbij aangesproken door het belonen van activiteiten die de buurthechting ten goede komen: typisch Engelse
tuinwedstrijden (wie heeft de mooiste tuin) en klussen in en om het huis. Bewoners dienen weer trots te worden op hun wijk en dit moet de buitenwacht te weten komen. Het uiteindelijke doel is namelijk om de reputatie van het gebied te verbeteren, waardoor nieuwe bewoners en bedrijfjes zich in de buurt willen vestigen. IVHA kiest daarvoor een binnenweg: eerst dient het gedrag van de bestaande bewoners te veranderen, voordat mensen en bedrijven van buiten de wijk weer zien zitten en bereid zijn om er te komen wonen en te investeren. Via belonen in plaats van straffen probeert IVHA bewoners daarom te verleiden tot goed gedrag.

Dit lijkt zijn vruchten af te werpen in Manchester: De financiële resultaten zijn indrukwekkend en de tevredenheid van bewoners met hun buurt en het werk van de corporatie daarbinnen zijn fors toegenomen, terwijl de doorstroom van bewoners in de wijk navenant is afgenomen. Dit geeft enige indicatie van toegenomen buurthechting, maar vormt geen hard bewijs voor de effecten van Gold Service op de emotionele bindingen van bewoners. De bijdrage ligt wellicht subtieler: klantbeloningssysteem zijn misschien niet een wondermiddel voor achterstandsbestrijding, maar bieden corporaties wel de mogelijk om als normatieve bemiddelaars op te treden in een ruimte waar de normatieve consensus over wat gangbaar is in de samenleving en meer specifiek de buurt al lang niet meer bestaat of in ieder geval sterk uit de pas loopt met hun omgeving. Beperkt onderzoek ondersteunt de claim van corporaties. Klantbeloningssystemen leiden een sterk gegroeid vertrouwen tussen huurders en verhuurders, die ervoor zorgt dat Engelse corporaties minder huurachterstanden hebben en dat Nederlandse corporaties een verbetering in de leefbaarheid van hun buurten zien.

Gold Service biedt dus mogelijkheden tot het stimuleren van buurtbetrokkenheid en -binding, maar vormt daarvoor ‘slechts’ een institutionele randvoorwaarde, die een vertrouwde omgeving schept voor bewoners om zich actiever op te stellen. Door als corporatie een vertrouwensband te creëren met individuele huurders kan een bewoner zich veilig voelen om andere bewoners aan te spreken op hun gedrag. Dit zal ook zijn effecten hebben op de buurthechting van bewoners. Wanneer bewoners weer met elkaar in contact komen in de vertrouwde omgeving die de
corporatie gecreërd heeft, zal dit leiden tot nieuwe betekenisgevingen in de buurt. Daarmee kunnen de sociaal-emotionele banden van bewoners met hun buurt een nieuwe inhoud krijgen, die hun hechting met de buurt en in het bijzonder hun affectie voor buurtgenoten kan vergroten. Aanvullend onderzoek is nodig om dit effect daadwerkelijk vast te stellen en de mechanismen er achter bloot te leggen.

**Newcastle-Gateshead: buurthechting als publieke kunst?**

Het gebied Gateshead en Newcastle is een voorbeeld van ‘culture-led regeneration’: stedelijke vernieuwing waarbij culturele voorzieningen een grote rol krijgen toegedicht in het nieuw aanzien geven van een voorheen verpauperd centrum waar niemand wilde wonen en komen. Door het opzetten van in het oog springende culturele podia en het aantrekken van toonaangevende kunst en kunstenaars moet een gebied nieuw elan krijgen en nieuwe bewoners en bezoekers aantrekken. Anders dan in andere Engelse steden, waar met cultuur met de grote ‘C’ is gerenoveerd, hebben Newcastle en Gateshead nadrukkelijk gekozen voor cultuur met een kleine ‘c’. Via een publiek kunst-programma hebben beide stadsbesturen geprobeerd bewoners uitgebreid te betrekken in de stedelijke vernieuwing van het gebied. Maar betrekken was niet genoeg: door het publiek in aanraking te brengen met en zelf te laten deelnemen aan publieke kunst in de openbare ruimte, diende de vernieuwde omgeving een emotionele meerwaarde te krijgen die zich zou uitbetalen in een sterke verbondenheid met en toeëigening van de omgeving. Volgens het bestuur heeft publieke kunst een wezenlijke bijdrage geleverd aan de nieuwe reputatie van Gateshead en de weg geplaveit voor grootschalige investeringen in stedelijke vernieuwing, met name de opknapbeurt van de Newcastle en Gateshead Quayside. Volgens het gemeentebestuur heeft publieke kunst geholpen om sterk verloederde ruimten te herclaimen door nieuwe sociale ruimten te construeren en via kunstwerken verbindingen te leggen tussen verschillende plekken in de stad.

De bewijsvoering hiervoor blijft voorlopig dun, maar de claim voor meer emotionele toeëigening en buurthechting wordt deels bevestigd in de paneldata van hoofdstuk 5: identificatie met de buurt en sociale buurthechting zijn in het gebied sterker toegenomen dan in vergelijking met andere Engelse wijken,
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Inclusief de New Deal for Community-wijken. Toch is er een relatief grote groep bewoners die zich juist minder thuis zijn gaan voelen in de buurt. Dit wordt ook zichtbaar als naar verandering in patronen van buurthechting wordt gekeken. Gevoelens van vervreemding en onthechting (Alienation) nemen sterk af onder de bewoners, maar tegelijkertijd, maken bij een aanzienlijk deel van de bewoners relatieve buurthechtingen plaats voor gevoelens van neutraliteit. Kennelijk heeft de vernieuwing van de Quayside en het publiek kunst-programma niet voor iedereen geleid tot een sterkere binding met de stad. Wel lijkt de stad er in geslaagd te zijn om bij een groot deel van de bewoners de affectieve banden aan te halen, met name bij bewoners die zich er het minst thuisvoelden.

Dit bevestigt de opvattingen van Engelse onderzoekers, dat Newcastle en Gateshead er in geslaagd zijn om de cultuur gerichte aanpak te verbinding met de lokale identiteit en daarmee deze identiteit heeft versterkt. Door het centraal stellen van culturele voorzieningen voor de lokale bevolking en het benadrukken van het culturele erfgoed van iedere lokatie, werd de identificatie van bewoners met het gebied aangesproken en hun trots in de plek hersteld.

**Aangrijpingspunten voor stedelijk onderzoek en theorievorming**

Dit onderzoek toont aan dat verbetering van de buurthechting van bewoners in stedelijke vernieuwing geen sinecure is. Niet alleen zijn bewoners in achterstandswijken minder gehecht aan hun buurt en buurtgenoten dan bewoners in wijken waar niet geherstructureerd wordt, maar deze banden komen onder druk te staan door de gedwongen verhuizing die herstructurering vaak met zich meebrengt. In plaats van een welkom thuis is/wordt hun buurt een vreemde plek waar zich niet of minder bij betrokken voelen. Tegelijkertijd laten de prioritaire wijken wel sterke verbeteringen zien in de fysieke en sociale affectie van bewoners met hun buurt. Er gebeurt dus al het nodige, wat zijn effecten heeft op de buurthechting van bewoners.

De casestudies geven voorbeelden van effectieve projecten en dragen de nodige bewijslast aan voor projecten die van betekenis zijn geweest voor de buurthechting van bewoners. Aandacht voor de sociaal-emotionele rol van plekken ontbreekt
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opmerkelijk genoeg nog grotendeels in stedelijke vernieuwing. Dit is een van de redenen waarom de stagnatie in het debat over fysiek-sociaal zo moeilijk wordt overwonnen. In de sociaal-emotionele binding van bewoners aan plekken komen fysiek en sociaal samen: sociale gevoelens die verbonden zijn aan fysieke plekken.

Een voordurend dilemma van stedelijke vernieuwing is het up to date houden van fysieke plekken, waar zich in een veel sneller tempo sociale veranderingen voordoen. Een deel van het antwoord ligt mogelijk in het veel beter begrijpen en benutten van de sociaal-emotionele binding van bewoners met plekken; deze binding bepaalt hoe bewoners tegen een plek aankijken en deze gebruiken. Hoewel deze gevoelens voor een plek veranderlijk en soms zelfs vluchtig zijn, refereren ze altijd aan een concrete plek die zelf vaak veel minder veranderlijk is. Dezelfde plek kan uiteenlopende vormen van thuisgevoel oproepen en daarom hoeven sociale veranderingen niet altijd te leiden tot het gedateerd raken van de fysieke omgeving, tenminste wanneer mogelijk is om in de loop van de tijd verschillende emotionele betekenissen aan de fysieke omgeving te hechten. Wanneer de fysieke omgeving erin slaagt om verschillende groepen in de loop van de tijd zich ‘thuis’ te laten voelen, hoeft de fysieke omgeving zelf niet per se te worden veranderd.

Dit onderzoek laat zien dat de buurt nog steeds een belangrijk emotioneel referentiekader is voor bewoners. Sociale contacten spelen daarbij een belangrijke rol en dit onderstreept het belang van aandacht voor sociale en emotionele banden in stedelijk onderzoek, in weerswil van wetenschappers die ervan uit gaan dat in de huidige individualiserende en globaliserende samenleving de buurt en contacten in de buurt hebben afgedaan. Voor het aanknopen van emotionele banden dienen sociale contacten plaats te vinden, in de letterlijk zin van het woord.

Door de emotionele banden van bewoners te onderzoeken wordt een nieuw licht geworpen op deze ‘oude’ discussie. Stadssociologen zijn het er in het algemeen over eens dat stedelijke vernieuwing niet alleen slecht nieuws is voor sociale buurtnetwerken, maar ook funest is voor de lokale cultuur. Dit onderzoek laat echter zien dat het heel goed mogelijk is om met stedelijke vernieuwing de lokale identiteit te versterken door op specifieke plekken betekenisvolle interacties te organiseren tussen bewoners, waardoor zij zich meer thuis gaan voelen in de buurt. Sociale interacties in de buurt zijn op zich zelf niet genoeg; van belang zijn de
betekenissen die in deze interacties uitgewisseld worden en die verankerd raken in plekken. Stedelijke vernieuwing kan daar aan bij dragen door symbolische referenties aan te bieden in de fysieke ruimte en sociale interacties te organiseren waarin oude en nieuwe ruimtelijke betekenissen worden uitgewisseld, zoals de herinneringsdagen in Emmen.

Met het concept buurthechting is het mogelijk om de emotionele banden met de buurt te onderzoeken. Dit begrip heb ik verrijkt door verschillende dimensies van hechting te onderscheiden, waardoor het mogelijk is om de emotionele banden van bewoners op verschillende schaalniveaus en met verschillende plekken tegelijkertijd te onderzoeken. Er is niet een manier van thuisvoelen in the buurt; gevoelens voor plekken zijn veranderlijk en afhankelijk van wanneer we ons waar met wie bevinden. Het is veel aannemelijker dat mensen diverse emotionele banden onderhouden met verschillende plekken tegelijkertijd. Dit maakt het begrip buurthechting een dynamisch concept, waarbij gevoelens voor een plek contact geherdefinieerd worden in voortdurende sociale interacties, waardoor bewoners in staat zijn om nieuwe betekenissen aan veranderde plekken te hechten waarmee ze zich kunnen identificeren.

Maar ook het begrip buurthechting is niet zonder problemen. De theorie over ‘place attachment’ is bekritiseerd om haar eenzijdige aandacht voor proceskant en de wijzen waarop mensen en plekken affectieve banden aanknoopen en daarmee heeft de theorie het effect van structurele verschillen op deze relaties verwaarloosd. De status- en machtverschillen die zo sterk benadrukt worden in de sociologie van emoties zijn naar de achtergrond verdwenen. Alhoewel de theorie de machtstrijd herdefineerd als een strijd over de meest geeigende identiteit op een gegevens moment en plek, is weinig van deze strijd terug te vinden in studies naar ‘place attachment’. Deze strijd staat echter central in stedelijke vernieuwing: bewoners voelen zich vervreemd door de komst van nieuwe bewoners die de bestaande buurtidentiteit onder druk zetten. En beleidsmakers en stedelijke professionals hebben zo hun eigen ideeën over wat de identiteit van de buurt na de stedelijke vernieuwing moet worden, wat weer haaks kan staan op de beleving oude en nieuwe bewoners. Tenslotte heeft de theorie van ‘place attachment’ alleen
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aandacht voor affectieve relaties en blijven non-affectieve relaties gebaseerd op
cognitieve en instrumentele bindingen met de buurt buiten beeld. Er valt dus nog
het nodige te onderzoeken in de buurtbinding van bewoners en de effecten van
stedelijke vernieuwing op deze bindingen.
## Appendices

### Appendix A: Dimensions and Indicators of Sense of Attachment in Literature Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators from Literature Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rootedness or Physical Attachment** | R1. How many years have you personally lived in your present neighbourhood?  
R2. Do you own your home or do you rent it?  
R3. Do you expect to be living in this neighbourhood 2 years from now? |
| **Bonding or Social Attachment**   | B1. In general is it pretty easy or pretty difficult for you to tell a stranger in your neighbourhood from somebody who lives there?  
B2. Would you say that you really feel a part of your neighbourhood or do you think of it more as just a place to live?  
B3. How about kids in your immediate neighbourhood? How many of them do you know by name: all of them, some, hardly any, or none of them? |
| **Existence of Place Identity**    | PI. Do you feel at home here?                                                                                                                                       |
| **Place Affiliation Variables**    | PA1. Self-related (e.g., general psychological state happiness, “feeling comfortable”)  
PA2. Family-related (e.g., reared family here, nearness to family members)  
PA3. Friend-related (e.g., meeting people, friendly neighbours)  
PA4. Community-related (e.g., attractive town lifestyle, sense of community)  
PA5. Organization-related (e.g., participation in work, formal organization)  
PA6. Dwelling-related (e.g., home ownership, variety of personal possessions) |
| **Locus of Place Identity**        | PL1. Dwelling-based (Do you associate feeling at home with dwelling, community, and/or region?)  
PL2. Community-based  
PL3. Region-based |
# Appendix B: 56 Priority Areas in the Netherlands (2002-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alkmaar Overdie/ Schermerelnd</td>
<td>Leiden Leiden Noord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Almelo Almelo Zuidwest/ Ossenkoppelerhoek/ Kerkelanden</td>
<td>Leiden Zuid/West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amersfoort De Kruiskamp Koppel</td>
<td>Lelystad Zuiderzeewijk/Atol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Randenbroek Schuijlenburg</td>
<td>Maastricht Maastricht Noordwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amsterdam Westelijke tuinesteden: Osdorp Midden Noord/ Meer en Oever/ Geuzenveld Zuid/ Overtoomse Veld/ Delflandplein/ Staalmanpleinbuurt/ Kolenkitbuurt</td>
<td>Nijmegen Willemskwartier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zuidoost: Bijlmermeer: buurten K / G en F / D E en H</td>
<td>Rotterdam Crooswijk Noord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Noord: Nieuwendam Noord de Banne</td>
<td>Hoogvliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Arnhem Malburgen</td>
<td>Oud Zuid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Presikhaaf</td>
<td>Rotterdam West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Breda Breda Noord Oost: Hoge Vlucht/Doornbos Linie</td>
<td>Zuidelijke Tuinsteden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>De Heuvel</td>
<td>Schiedam Nieuwland/Groenoord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Den Bosch Boschveld</td>
<td>Tilburg Oud Zuid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bartjes/Eikendonk/Hofstad</td>
<td>Nieuw Noord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Den Haag Den Haag Zuidwest</td>
<td>Utrecht Hoograven/Tolsteeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Duindorp</td>
<td>Kanaleneiland/Transwijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Laakkwartier Spoorwijk</td>
<td>Overvecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Transvaal</td>
<td>Zullen/Ondiep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rustenburg/Oostbroek</td>
<td>Venlo Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Deventer Keizerslanden</td>
<td>Zaanstad Zaandam Zuidoost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rivierenwijk</td>
<td>Zwolle Holtenbroek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dordrecht Dordrecht West: Oud en Nieuw Krispijn/ Wielwijk/ Crabbenhof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eindhoven Woensel Zuid (Hemelrijken)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tongelre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Emmen Emmen Revisited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Enschede De Velve Lindenhof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wesselerbrink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Groningen Lewenburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vinkhuizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Haarlem Delftwijk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Europawijk Zuid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Heeren GHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Heeren Stadt Oost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Helmond Binnenstad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hengelo (Ov) Berflo Es</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Leeuwarden Achter de Hove Vegelin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Vrijheidswijk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix C: 86 Most deprived areas in the UK and New Deal for Communities areas (NDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hartlepool (NDC)</th>
<th>Sedgefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Allerdale</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>Hyndburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Barrow-in-Furness</td>
<td>Kerrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>Islington (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>Southwark (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Sefton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham (NDC)</td>
<td>Stockton-on-Tees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackburn with Darwin</td>
<td>Kirklees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td>Knowsley (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Luton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>Middlesbrough (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol (NDC)</td>
<td>Lewisham (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bradford (NDC)</td>
<td>Lambeth (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brent (NDC)</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton &amp; Hove (NDC)</td>
<td>Leicester (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>Liverpool (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Middlesbrough (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coventry (NDC)</td>
<td>Manchester (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>North Tyneside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doncaster (NDC)</td>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>North East Lincolnshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Oldham (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>Pendle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>Penwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haringey (NDC)</td>
<td>Rochdale (NDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional NDC areas*

* not part of the 86 most deprived
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