Gated communities as club goods: segregation or social cohesion?

Tony Manzi
Bill Smith Bowers
School of Architecture and the Built Environment

Gated Communities as Club Goods:

Segregation or Social Cohesion?

Tony Manzi & Bill Smith Bowers

with the assistance of Jordan Trimby

London Research Focus Group

University of Westminster

School of Architecture and the Built Environment

35 Marylebone Road

London NW1 5LS

Tel: ++44 20 7911 5000

Fax : ++44 20 7911 5171

manzit@wmin.ac.uk

w.j.smithbowers@wmin.ac.uk

Gated Communities as Club Goods:

Segregation or Social Cohesion?

Abstract

Gated communities are normally presented in highly negative terms, based on the common assumption that they contribute to social segregation. In contrast to received wisdom this paper argues that the theory of club goods can be used to understand gating as a response to both real and perceived issues of crime, vandalism and anti-social behaviour. We suggest that gating can help to foster social cohesion by involving a wide spectrum of communities and income groups to: reduce crime, protect parked vehicles, increase safety and enhance the local environment by preventing unsolicited entry. The paper explores through two case studies, how communities struggling with neighbourhood problems including crime are using gating as a way of improving their environment rather than abandoning poorer areas of the city to find a safer home in more residentially segregated better off neighbourhoods. If housing and planning policy makers are to take seriously a commitment to resident democracy and local participation, such concerns should not be dismissed out of hand as examples of 'isolationism' or 'particularistic consumerist interests'.

Key words

Gated communities, residential segregation, club goods.

Introduction

The issue of gated communities raises important questions about the future form of urban development. In much of the academic literature the proliferation of gating is treated as an indicator of increasing levels of social division; creating new barriers between rich and poor, and introducing 'cities of walls' (Caldeira, 2000; Scott, 2002; Sandercock, 2002). The standard perception of gated communities is that design and technological innovations serve to increase privatism and destroy traditional community ties of neighbourliness, community and cohesion. This view is encapsulated in a recent American textbook (Gottdiener and Hutchison, 2000)

> The real issue is not about the actual gates and walls, but why so many feel that they need them. What is the measure of nationhood when the divisions between neighbourhoods require guards and fences to keep out other citizens? (p. 332)

The notion that gating benefits exclusively an elitist minority is a deep-rooted belief. Joseph Rykwert (2002) describes some of the recent additions to the Manhattan skyline (Trump World Tower and others) as 'vertical gated communities' offering 'a commanding residence for the privileged few' (p.218).

What is a gated community? A recent definition of gated communities can be offers the following definition:

residential areas with restricted access in which normally public spaces are privatized. They are security developments with designated perimeters, usually walls or fences, and controlled entrances that are intended to prevent penetration by nonresidents (Blakely and Snyder, 1997, p.2).

The stereotypical view of gated communities is that they embody a form of dystopian living, behind which community ties are nonexistent and neighbours have no desire to relate to one another. In particular, they encourage affluent groups to increase their social distance from what is perceived as the 'other'. A common representation of gating is derived from Davis' (1990) *City of Quartz*, where the concept of 'Fortress America' encapsulates an increasing polarisation between rich and poor in cities such as Los Angeles. Davis contends that 'we live in 'fortress cities' brutally divided between 'fortified cells' of affluent society and 'places of terror' where the police battle the criminalised poor (p.224).

Davis thesis is deliberately polemical but nevertheless highly influential in constructing a negative image of the gated society. Hence:

A pliant city government…has collaborated in the massive privatisation of public space and the subsidisation of new, racist enclaves (benignly described as 'urban villages')…a triumphalist gloss…is laid over the brutalisation of inner-city neighbourhoods (p.227)

Although rarely described in such stark dichotomies - Davis refers for example to

'spatial apartheid' and a 'Berlin wall' separating 'publicly subsidised luxury' from a 'lifeworld' 'reclaimed by immigrants' (p.230) - these fears have permeated the policies of inner city local planning authorities. Central and local governments have therefore attempted to prevent replicating the spatial polarisation of North American inner cities.

In similar vein, Scott *et.al.* (2002) argue that gating is a feature of the growth of 'global city regions' and the intensification of inequality and proximity which has accompanied urban growth and globalization of the 'free market':

> Violence, or the fear of it, becomes the a central preoccupation of the upper classes, pushing them towards forms of fortress settlement, gated high-rise communities surrounded by walls and guarded entries (Scott *et.al.* 2002 p.25)

Gated communties are thus seen as a feature of growing importantince in the development process of residential segregation taking place within cities. Some writers suggest that gating is an overaction to the real level of crime in an area compared to the perceived level of crime that results from local media coverage of crime incidents in the USA. This argument is part of the 'culture of fear' thesis put forward by Glassner (1999) suggesting that fear of crime is just one of a number of 'panics' (that also include deadly diseases, teenage lone mothers and African-american males) propagated by local television news and current affairs programmes. An overemphasis on individual cases results in unnecessary risk

reduction responses to these events. Glassner argues that the underlying drives of many of the current problems of American cities, poverty and income inequality do not register in the same way with Americans.

> One of the paradoxes of a culture of fear is that serious problems remain widely ignored even though they give rise to precisely the dangers that the populace most abhors (p.xviii) .

The 'culture of fear' is explained as the result of people embracing 'improbable pronouncements' (his example being the response of many Americans to the broadcast of Orson Welles 'War of the Worlds' in 1938). Glassner suggests that acceptance of these 'pronouncements' is the result of how they are delivered by 'professsional narrators' and presented in news and current affaris programmes

> Statements of alarm by newcasters and glorification of wannabe experts are two telltale tricks of the fear mongers trade…poignant anecdotes in place of scientific evidence, the christening of isolated incidents as trends, depictions of entire categories of people as innately dangerous (p.208).

Many approaches to the phenomena of gating suggest that it is response increasing social inequalities, status seeking behaviour, real or perceived fear of crime. Davis' references to the 'totalitarian semiotics' (1990, p.231) of urban design mark a deliberate attempt to deny the validity of certain forms of urban design per se. Consequently, rather than allowing local preferences to shape decision-making (as is claimed by many such critics), such analyses presume

that gating by definition is a form of design that should be rejected out of hand. Thus, heterogeneity is acceptable as long as it does not result in a denial of public space. Is this commitment to the public realm to be defended at all costs?

Club goods and gated communities

In contrast to much academic commentary, recent research from the USA by Sanchez and Lang (2002) suggests that the view of gated communities as the preserve of the white high-income homeowner is exaggerated. Their analysis of the 2000 census (which included for the first time questions on gated communities) identified significant numbers of poorer white and ethnic minority renters who live in gated communities. They conclude that gating not only functions as a status symbol for the better off homeowners but also provides a response to fear of crime and protection for lower income renters.

An alternative approach to sociological and anthropological analyses of gated communities can be found in the economic literature on 'club goods' (Webster 2001; 2002; Webster and Wu, 2001; Webster and Wai-Chung Lai, 2003). This work focuses on the management of the property rights and uses the concept of 'proprietary communities' to delineate the nature of the gated community.
The gated community development thus provides wanted goods and services such as 'security zones', lifestyle and prestigious communities' (Blakely and Snyder, 1997, pp.38-45).

In club economic terms gated communities are merely a recent example of the growth of privately owned club goods such as shopping malls, business parks, timeshare apartments, golf and squash clubs. The club good is neither a 'private' nor 'public' good in the traditional economic sense. Rather it constitutes a hybrid in which a self-selecting community shares a range of benefits and reduces the costs of public good 'congestion' by the use of its pricing and membership requirements.

Developing Webster's argument we suggest a spontaneous evolution is taking place in the 'bundle of rights and obligations' that households are willing to purchase in securing their accommodation and communal service requirements. At the start of the 20th century, most households exercised rights associated with renting or long leasing a part of a property. During the second half of the 20th century, the trend was for more and more households to purchase the rights associated with the ownership of freeholds and entire properties. By the 21st century, we are witnessing the growth of gated communities because the additional rights and obligations of this desired and scare good are now being priced competitively for more households. Gated communities therefore offer a range of scarce goods, such as secure and guaranteed parking, enhanced security, common standards for property appearance and rules governing the use of managed communal areas. When purchased, these can enhance the traditional benefits associated with freehold or leasehold occupation.

If security, exclusive use of communal services, the managed prevention of unsolicited calling and guaranteed parking are valued by community members the key issue raised by gated communities is who can enjoy these benefits and are some households socially excluded from these benefits? This is not a new argument; it arose at the beginning of the 20th century when governments commenced providing rented housing as a merit good at below market price to selected households. The debate evolved in the 1980s to encompass the additional promotion of owner occupation via the Right to Buy provisions of the 1980 Housing Act and the emergence of shared ownership and other mechanisms for promoting ownership among lower income households.

The question today is should we regard gated communities as a merit good and provide public subsidy to enhance the provision and enjoyment of that good and service. This argument is not hypothetical because we already provide via public subsidy gated communities for the elderly in gated and managed sheltered accommodation.

In addition to its physical and environmental attributes, private communal areas, walls, gates and security patrols, the gated community also constitutes a 'territorial organisation' of the community members' property rights (Glasze, 2003; McKenzie, 1994). These can include Home Owners Associations (HOAs) or Common Interest Housing Developments (CIDs) (McKenzie, 2003). In principle, these organisations provide a vehicle of representative government in

the management of community interests. Both Glasze and McKenzie have questioned how democratic and representative such associations are in practice. However, the additional merit good of being able to directly influence the management of a community is one of the key objectives of the current government's neighbourhood regeneration policy (DETR, 1998).

Residential segregation and gated communities in a UK context

Social relations and social interactions within public space are fundamentally determined by the people who live there alongside a wider process of market and social housing allocation. In this respect, the locality and nature of housing is a major determinant of how connections between individuals and communties are formed and maintained. It is generally accepted that the distribution of residential units and their occupants is not a consequence of random events but the product of complex social, economic and political processess. One of the most significant results of these processes is that housing consumption patterns can result in segregated areas otherwise known as 'enclaves' (suggesting choice) or 'ghettoes' (suggesting constraint).

A primary motivating factor in the growth of the gated community phenomenon in the UK, as in most other countries, has been the evident rise in both public anxiety and government concern about crime, vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Other concerns linked to access to parking spaces in London and protection of vehicles has promoted a significant growth in gated developments.

These concerns have also occurred at an important time in the development and falling costs of some types of security devices and their incorporation in the design of buildings. The gated option for individuals, property developers and social landlords is now cheaper and more feasible than ever before.

These technological innovations coexist with a public perception of certain groups, for example the street homeless, drug users and gangs of young people as liable to cause disorder within the public realm. There are often now attempts to 'design out' such groups using new policing methods, CCTV cameras and other physical barriers limiting entry to permitted users (Raco 2003). However these developments can also have the effect of 'enclosing spaces' and thus preventing legitimate use by members of the public who are either prevented from using these spaces or perceive them as private spaces when they are actually public rights of way. For example in July this year, the Government announced that local authorities would have the power to close 'rights of way' in certain blighted areas in order to reduce the opportunity for criminal activity (DEFRA, 2003). While this may reduce burglar access to properties inside these gates, in many cases it will also prevent the continued use of these alleyways as safe pedestrian routes to local services.

There is a lack of empirical research examining the consequences of such developments within a UK context; far greater evidence exists on the impact of 'gated' communities within the US literature (for example, Blakely and Snyder

1997, Low 2003). A systematic review of literature in the UK found little dicussion of the implications of having developments where residents segregate themselves from the perceived threats of the outside world is lacking (Blandy *et. al.*, 2003).

Methodology

The research conducted for this paper consisted of case studies of two gated developments. One was located within a social housing estate and the other was designed as a private development (with additional social housing to be provided at a later stage). The former was a permanent gated settlement and the latter a temporary gated environment. The research included; interviews with a range of local stakeholders, the major organisations involved in the developments and those responsible for management of the schemes, representatives from the local authorities, private developers and estate residents. The initial purpose of the interviews was to gather more detailed information about management issues, relationships in the neighbourhoods, local service delivery and priorities for improvement. Additionally, observation and participant observation methods were used over a period of 6 months on one of the estates.

Case study one: the permanent gated community

The first development is a mixed tenure estate in West London built in the first half of the 1990s. The estate, which makes up 1/3 of the ward population, is located in a neighbourhood ranked 634 out of 8414 on the index of deprivation (DETR 2000). The estate is divided into a number of sub sections. A wall with two electric gates to permit and restrict entry to residents and their guests separates the owners from the wider estate. This part of the sub section houses around 200 owner-occupiers in the converted wing of a 19th century asylum. The remainder of the estate exists outside the gated area. This part of the estate is also semi enclosed within the historic walled grounds of the 19th century asylum (but without gates). In this part of the estate about 600 units of social housing, shared ownership and private renting accommodation are located in different sub developments. The estate can be described as a 'forted up' mixed tenure development inside two sets of walls.

These walls and gates were considered a key part of the problem of this development in that the social housing estate is physically separated from the privately owned and gated community. One local authority officer expressed the difficulty in the following terms:

> It has a history as a psychiatric hospital… I see it as the final bastion of stigmatisation. It reinforces the sense that it is still a madhouse; it is symbolic of care in the community. You put them in houses and put a wall around them. It conspires with a subliminal message…You could believe that it is still a psychiatric hospital. You should not underestimate the symbolism of the physical. Walled cities in ancient times were fortresses

to keep people in and out. The physical fabric is testimony to
separateness (Interview).

The estate was the largest RSL development of the early 1990's and probably
the only one to contain within its boundary a gated community. From its start the
estate has brought together many contemporary features of housing
development, private ownership and leasing, shared ownership and social
renting, RSL consortium development and a gated community (only local
authority housing is absent from the landlord mix). In one sense the estate is a
leading example of a mixed community development, in that it brings a range of
income groups together in one neighbourhood rather than being segregated into
different residential neighbourhoods.

However the practicalities of mixing diverse social groups proved highly
problematic. The development was not planned as a social housing scheme and
much of the infrastructure planned did not materialise (Interview data). In
addition, from the beginning there was a strong feeling of segregation between
social housing residents on the one side and private owners and leaseholders on
the other. As one private resident commented: 'there was a real "us and them"
scenario' (Interview). This meant that owners and leaseholders did not see
themselves as benefiting from the community facilities:

I very rarely go to the … shop. They can tell you by the car you drive or the way that you dress… that you are not from the housing association flats. It is aggressive (Interview).

A strong sense of conflict was generated between the different social groups on the estates. This was expressed in the following way by a leaseholder in one of the flats which was located on the estate but not within the gated community: 'there is definitely a bad feeling towards the people living in these flats because we are owners. There is a definite class divide I think' (Interview).

The owner-occupiers within the gated community also felt that removed from much of the day to day activities on the estate. As they did not share the experience of the majority of residents in the neighbourhood the scale of the social problems reported by other residents surprised them. For example one owner occupier commented:

I have been to a few of the resident meetings. We were absolutely horrified to hear what they were saying about prostitution and drug abuse. Residents said that they knew who was perpetrating these crimes but that they did not dare come forward to report them due to the fear of reprisals. I also heard that some of the neighbours did not come to the meeting as they were watching who was attending. It was felt that it was a 'grassing' situation (Interview).

In addition, the gated residents saw themselves as having to be very careful about their behaviour towards social housing residents. Owners were aware of

the class distinctions between those within and outside of the walled community and acknowledged that a high level of diplomacy was called for in making contributions to collective management.

> I am the only one who has gone to the … meetings. I am very careful about what I say. I know that a lot of them are on income support. For example if I talk about kids damaging out cars, I need to be diplomatic. You only have to compare the cars inside and outside (Interview).

Despite the disparities in income and wealth, there appeared to be some cooperation between residents; in particular they felt they shared common gaols in terms of improving their neighbourhood. Nevertheless, residents felt that the gated development was essential in preserving a sense of security and distinguishing and protecting them from the varied social problems occurring on the estate.

> A couple of people were mugged … when they were waiting for the gates to open. It was a prime opportunity as they had to get their swipe cards from their wallets. We used to have a code to enter the grounds but [the youths] knew the code. They are not stupid. I dread to think how much we are paying for the gates but they are a necessity. When they were broken (by the kids of course) cars were getting broken into (Interview).

Despite the very serious social problems on the estate, voiced by residents and workers in the neighbourhood, owners generally felt happy and secure in their properties.

I bought the flat at a very good price. I have never felt unsafe inside. I have installed a spy hole and extra window locks. For the first two years I lived on my own. The gates have done a lot to help. Personally I have never had problems that I wouldn't find on any London street but I tend not to walk around the estate (Interview).

Such views illustrate how there can be reasonable levels of safety and security despite residents living within an area widely perceived as a high crime neighbourhood. Significantly there appeared to be very different perceptions between those within the gated community (who were largely positive) and those living in leasehold flats that were integrated within the social housing estate. The latter appeared much more negative about their environment and reported much more serious instances of harassment, intimidation, victimisation and crime.

As argued above, the gated community is not normally identified as one of the aspects of a mixed community development in the statements of government and other interested parties. Rather it is commonly viewed as the opposite of a desirable social mix in urban living the government wishes to promote; gated communities challenge these aspirations given their target population of affluent households. However the legal structure means that most are owned and managed collectively by the residents. This represents something of a paradox given that one of the 'solutions' to the sustainable development of the estate is seen as the development of tenant management. Such trends represent what can be termed 'an unusual blend of collectivism combined with a retreat into

privatised spaces' (Blandy *et al.,* 2003, p.3). This suggests that the phenomenon of gating represents a more complex set of processes than is often acknowledged.

Interestingly one recent report on gated communities (RICS, 2002) while concerned with the lack of planned growth of gated communities did conclude

> Policies to create greater balance should be directed towards new development, which increasingly includes gated communities, as well as the regeneration of blighted areas (p.6).

This case study suggests that the way to promote mixed tenure developments in areas of deprivation is by acknowledging community members concerns for safety and security. The study suggests this can be done by developing gated sub-subsections in the neighbourhood.

Case study two: the 'lifestyle' temporary gated community

Owned by a large private sector property development company this southeast London site was previously a derelict industrial estate. The development is located in one of the poorest wards in the country; ranked 468 out of 8414 on the Index of Deprivation (see DETR, 2000). The development is an example of the vision of the local authority to use culture and the arts as a driver to regenerate the area and bring higher income households into the inner city Landry, 2001). It also meets the objectives of the economic regeneration strategy of the borough

to create accommodation for office workers in the borough. The estate manager explained the developers' objectives:

> the vision was to design a 'new concept for living' – a 'lifestyle' community. This encapsulates a total living environment comprising home and leisure facilities with 24-hour concierge service to care for residents every requirement (Interview).

The advertisements and marketing for the scheme present the development as a prestigious housing and living complex situated in what could be taken as an upmarket area across the river and 15 minutes away from Canary Wharf and Bank. However, the immediate location is not the focus of the marketing of the estate. The main selling points about the area are the local rail station opposite the development and the lifestyle that is available inside the complex at affordable prices. The marketing focus is on the 'living experience' referring to modernist interiors and immediate surrounding exterior facilities such as a gym, landscaping and restaurant. It is presented as 'the development where you <u>can</u> have it all" (www reference, emphasis in original).

The development was targeted at a number of different groups; as an investment vehicle, it was marketed at overseas buyers who would gain rental income and capital gains from letting to young professionals working in the new 'City of London' situated at Canary Wharf. The development was also targeted at young families and thus incentives for first-time buyers were offered. The development

comprises 50% buyers and 50% tenants. These units are seen as comparatively cheap in the London housing market. A single bedroom flat costs £160,000 and a flat can be rented for just under a £1,000 a month.

Under section 106 planning requirements, the developer was required to provide 30% affordable housing for the scheme. Consequently, in the last phase of the development there will be three blocks of social rented housing let by three housing associations. However this part of the estate is only expected to be ready for occupancy in December 2003. The estate manager explained that differential access to estate facilities would apply and that tension between the different groups might follow from the opening of the social housing blocks

> The residents of the housing association blocks will have access to some but not all of the developments facilities, [such as] the restaurant and coffee bar but not the gym or swimming pool…and there will be a view that the housing association blocks may not be a welcome feature of the estate for the private residents (Interview).

However there have already been problems about maintaining the standards of the estate and the blocks; litter, security doors left open by a large number of absentee landlords and the turnover on the estate of private renters.

Security is one of the features of the estate and this includes; CCTV cameras linked to reception area, a concierge which will eventually be staffed 24 hours a day, site security patrol night checks, an emergency mobile number for residents,

and access point fob keys for all resident blocks and the car parks. In addition to these features, residents have been offered extra day and night security cover (but there will be an extra charge for this). Residents are also being encouraged to set up a neighborhood watch scheme. The estate manager has regular liaison with the local police.

The development also has 'temporary' gates while development work is in progress. However, these gates, which have a robust and sculptured quality, do not give the impression of being temporary. The estate manager informed us the residents are happy with the gated entrance. Residents had also assumed these gates were a permanent feature of the development. However, the planning agreement requires these gates to be dismantled and retractable bollards to be installed in October 2003.

To the casual visitor (and many residents) the estate looks like a gated community with patrolling security and gated access staffed by security guards. In fact, it is intended to be a development that will have no gates but will only limit the public right of way to walking access (currently not permitted). The development could be an example of what Lowe (2003) has called a 'faux-gated' community.

The gates have now become a major issue on the estate because of criminal incidents within the neighbourhood. The estate manager, the planning officer and

local residents have all identified crime and fear of crime as a key reason why the residents want the gates to stay. Residents claimed in letters to the council planning department and at a meeting with the planning officer that if the gates are removed and public access footpath through the estate is reopened more residents will become victims of crime. Officers stated that overseas property owners had been contacting the council because their tenants were advising them about how dangerous the area is and that the gates they thought to be permanent and were in fact only building site gates. The planning officer and the estate manager reported that sales were decreasing and that rents had adjusted downwards as a consequence of these security concerns.

The planning officer stated that gated community developments were a new issue for the planning team. Gates were previously allowed in the Borough but the situation was described as entirely different in that developments were situated on private land with no public access. However, in the case of the Fairview Homes development (previously Millwall Football ground) and the former New Cross Hospital site, gates were disallowed. Residents from both sites petitioned to fence out council tenants living adjacent to their site but failed. The planning officer stated that with reference to this latter development:

> The developers erected gates without planning permission. Obviously some sort of makeshift security gate was required as expensive building materials were present on the site. However, these gates had a 'permanent' feel from the start (Interview).

The planning department agreed to retractable road bollards to control entry but an application will need to be submitted for the gates to be a permanent fixture The request to gate a public parked area was refused and any replacement for the current temporary gates was thought likely to be vetoed.

.

The original planning brief stated that although there would be no provision for vehicular traffic, a public access route would be a feature of the development. Therefore keeping the gates in place would be contrary to the spirit of the provisions in section 106. The council is keen to uphold this situation and any argument to the contrary it was suggested would have to be presented very convincingly. As discussed earlier, petitioning for gates goes against the current government advice on good urban design practice and mixed development guidelines. Additionally the legal implications would need to be thoroughly assessed.

The planning officer advised that at a recent residents association meeting the main concern was security, particular 'that the gates be a permanent feature as there have been a number of incidents ranging from vandalism to actual physical assault' (Interview).

The second major issue was access to a public garden located on the edge of the estate. Residents wished this to remain private as they are paying a service

charge for its upkeep and maintenance and therefore feel it is inappropriate for

non-residents to use it and possibly abuse it. Furthermore, residents were

concerned that if the community was to be open-access that the Council would

not foot the bill for any vandalism or graffiti that may occur. As one estate

resident noted the estate is a private development, the council have no liability

for any damage occurring on it. The planning officer stated at the meeting she

was 'concerned with the resident's exclusive attitude' (Interview). In turn, the

residents were frustrated by what they perceived as an unsympathetic response

to their anxieties.

This example illustrates the conflict between the planning department's

responsibilities to protect 'rights of way' and promote 'permeability' (ease of

movement in an area) and the desire of the residents to secure a safe

environment in which to live.

> Issues arose at the initial planning meeting for the scheme concerning the
> potential lack of integration into the wider …community from prospective
> residents. Several of these buyers have subsequently called claiming that
> they thought the estate was more exclusive than it actually is, and saying
> that tenants now wish to vacate their flats as they fear for their safety
> (Interview).

These gates have become the focal point around how to manage higher income

housing in an area of acute deprivation, with a high level of crime and fear of

crime. What the example shows is that the battle to maintain gating represents

an important area of conflict between residents and council staff and between

principles of safety and security on the one side and those of community,

neighbourhood and social cohesion on the other.

Conclusions

Academic commentary about housing and neighbourhood renewal commonly assumes a relationship between neighbourhood cohesion and community development, based on an idealised model of housing design. As society has become more fragmented and privatism is highly desired by residents, to see gating as the antithesis of social cohesion by reinforcing social and class divisions, producing new forms of segregation between rich and poor, ignores the much more complex relationship between individuals and their environments. Undoubtedly gated communities represent a choice to exclude others, but as a club good, they may also represent a more positive model of housing development. The evidence from these two case studies suggests that whilst there is some validity in these arguments, they are too simplistic in capturing the complex choices that residents make in their attachment to urban neighbourhoods.

In the case studies both the fear of crime and actual crime levels have either resulted in gates being erected or in the demand for temporary gates to be made permanent. The cases provide examples of developments that have reduced residential segregation in areas that otherwise would have either accommodated either multiply deprived households exclusively or have been used for other purposes.

Recent research (Manzi and Smith-Bowers, 2003) on a housing estate with a large number of social landlords responsible for the communal services and facilities that tenants enjoyed, showed how ineffective local residents felt in influencing and getting a better service from their landlords. Institutions such as Home Owners Associations and Common Interest Housing Developments can provide useful models of self-managed, territorial organisation, in conjunction with other more traditional residents associations. In one of the case studies the HOA had been able to secure the gating of the estate to reduce crime, to protect motor vehicles and to prevent unsolicited entry. Outside the gates, the consortium of landlords could offer no such service.

The theory of club goods illustrates an alternative model of conceptualising gated developments. By providing a hybrid model of property ownership and rights alongside a representation of new forms of territorial organisation, the theory can extend an understanding of the function of gated developments that provides a more detailed insight into this increasingly common phenomenon.

The process of collective ownership and management may serve to increase permeability as much as decrease it. The development of an active resident association in both cases can provide an opportunity to develop links across tenure divides. The consequence may well be that such neighbourhoods are less segregated in socio-economic terms than would be the case if the gating were

not available. By protecting property prices and offering opportunities for social

mixing (albeit in limited terms) gating may present opportunities for urban

renewal that are at present little understood.

Bibliography

Blakely E, and Snyder M. (1997) *Fortress America* (Washington, Brookings

    Institution).

Blandy, S., Lister D., Atkinson R., and Flint, J. (2003) *Gated Communities: A*

    Systematic Review of Research Evidence, CNR Summary 12: Sheffield

    Hallam University & University of Glasgow

    www.neighbourhoodcentre.org.uk.

Caldeira T. (2000) *City of Walls* (Berkeley, California, University of California

    Press).

Davis, M. (1990) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (London,

    Verso).

Department of the Environment (2000) *Index of Deprivation* (London, The

    Stationery Office) *http://www.odpm.gov.uk/*

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (1998) *Modernising*

    Local Government: Local Democracy and Community Leadership

    (London, The Stationery Office).

Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2003) *Closing*

    Alleyways in the Battle Against Crime (London, DEFRA News Release

30/07/03) www.defra.gov.uk/news/2003

Glassner, B. (1999) *The Culture of Fear: Why Americans are Afraid of the Wrong Things* (New York, Basic Books).

Glasze, G. (2003) Private neighbourhoods as club economic and shareholder democracies, Unpublished paper to be published in Privatisation of urban spaces in contemporary European cities, Belgeo: Bruxelles.

Gottdiener, M and Hutchision, R. (2000) (2nd edition) *The New Urban Sociology* (Boston, McGraw Hill).

Landry, C. (2001) *Creative Lewisham* (London, London Borough of Lewisham).

Low, S. (2003) *Behind the Gates* (London, Routledge).

McKenzie, E. (1994) *Privatopia: Homeowner Associations and the Rise of Residential Private Government* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press).

McKenzie, E. (2003) Common interest housing in the communities of tomorrow, *Housing Policy Debate*, 14 (1/2), pp.203-234

Manzi, T. and Smith-Bowers, W. (2003) Developing unstable communities? The experience of mixed tenure and multi-landlord estates, Paper presented to the *Housing Studies Association* conference, Community, Neighbourhood, Responsibility, University of Bristol, 9th-10th September.

Pacione, M. (1997) Urban restructuring and the reproduction of inequality in Britain's cities: an overview, in M. Pacione (ed.) *Britain's Cities: Geographies of Division in Urban Britain* (London, Routledge) pp. 7-60.

Raco, M (2003) Remaking place and securitising space: Urban regeneration and the strategies, tactics and practices of policing in the UK, *Urban Studies* Vol. 40 (9), pp.1869-1887.

Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) (2002) *Building Balanced Communities the US and UK Compared,* Leading Edge report series, (London, RICS).

Rykwert, J. (2002) *The Seduction of Place: The History and Future of the City* (New York, Vintage Books).

Sanchez, T and Lang, R (2002) *Security Versus Status: The Two Worlds of Gated Communities* Draft Census Note 02:02 November 2002 Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech

Sandercock, L. (2002) Difference, fear and habitus, in J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (eds.) *Habitus: A Sense of Place* (Aldershot, Ashgate), pp. 203-18

Scott, A.J. (ed.) (2002) *Global City-Regions Trends, Theory and Policy* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) (2003*) Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion* www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk

Webster, C (2001) Gated cities of tomorrow, Town *Planning Review,* 72 (2) pp.149-170.

Webster, C (2002) Property rights and the public realm: gates, green belts and gemeinschaft, *Environment and Planning* 29, pp.397 – 412.

Webster, C and Wu, F. (2001) Coase, spatial pricing and self-organising cities, *Urban Studies* 38 (11) pp. 2037-2054.

Webster,C. and Wai-Chung Lai, L. (2003) *Property Rights, Planning and Markets* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar).