

Gentrification as a Global Urban Strategy - Is There an Alternative ?

Snežana Đorđević, Professor, Faculty of Political Sciences, Belgrade University

Milena Dinić, PhD Student, School of International and Public Affairs, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Introduction

This article investigates if there is *an alternative to gentrification* as a global urban strategy and policy, which resettle poor population from their homes, in order to free space for building new, luxurious settlements for rich. Gentrification practice, strengthened by neo-liberal urban policy, has been implemented in cities worldwide, causing great spatial and social inequalities and injustice.

City leaders *often avoid the dialogue with local population*, causing protests, riots and even direct conflict including violence. Nowadays, one can find worldwide a shameful practice of maltreatment of poor population, prosecuting them as criminals (revanchist urbanization).

Research methods used in this paper are: analysis as description and explanation, contextual and qualitative analysis, comparison and case studies.

The first part of the paper will include description of gentrification, its features, causes and consequences. In this context we will present how *globalized world economy strengthens authoritarian political culture*, stimulates gentrification, causing great spatial and social problems.

The second part of the paper, is dedicated to case studies of gentrification from two great world cities: London as European city, and Shanghai as an Asian, Chinese city, as a kind of *contextual analysis*.

The third part of the paper will analyze an alternative to this neoliberal urban policy. We will present good practice from cities in developed and developing world, where projects on urban regeneration *totally exclude or decrease bad practice*.

In creating a city for people and not primarily for profit, urban leaders and planners should include citizens in creation of redevelopment projects and plans, asking for their participation, suggestions and final consent. These are good lessons for reaffirmation of open cities, just society and satisfied citizens.

Key words: spatial planning, neoliberal and social democratic urban policy, gentrification, spatial injustice, resettlement, affordable housing,

Part I Gentrification

Gentrification means gentrifying and beautification of neglected urban settlement which has for a long time lacked investments. This involves destroying old buildings, building new ones, better organization and design of space in order to create beautiful, functional and attractive space for living and business.

Gentrification has got negative connotation because regeneration process was predominantly led and motivated by the interest of profit, often violating rights and interests of

poor, marginalized and social sensitive groups, which are resettled without or with symbolic compensation. In this way, gentrification represents a source of various spatial injustices, it ruins democratic tradition and principles of open city and contributes to divided and separated city of unsatisfied and unhappy citizens.

Reluctance of public officials to protect vulnerable social groups, evident in resettlement process, can be seen as an indicator of serious democratic deficit in societies around the world. Numerous analysts identified *resettlement cost* as one of the invisible costs of gentrification (Vigor, 2002, Freeman, Braconi, 2004, Slotter T, 2011, Mc Kinnish et al, 2008, Bridge G, Watson S, 2011). They stress that this cost should be fairly covered by government as compensation not only for housing but also for a loss of favorable location, contacts, friends, neighborhood and local services (jobs, schools, health, culture, recreation, places for meeting and socializing, coffee-shops, parks, etc). It should be a remedy for decrease of the living conditions of resettled population. These authors therefore rightfully pointed out that civil society should insist on fairly led city regeneration (Marcuse 1985, Slotter T, 2011, Bridge G, Watson S, 2011).¹

Global Economy as an Ambiance convenient for Gentrification

Globalization and global economy represent convenient ambient for gentrification worldwide. Global cities of each nation or state are active in fight to get better position in global economy, in attracting investments, getting jobs and big projects.² (Saskia Sassen 2000, Neil Smith 2000). Global economy needs easier planetary movement of people as working force and migrations are more frequent then before. Highly educated people move easier, they get, professionally challenging and well paid jobs, while the opportunities for poorly educated decrease and this population is considered as burden for every society.

Many cities from *developed world* have lost investments, becoming the losers of globalization. Standard of their inhabitants decreased, as well as the quality of public services. In cities of *developed world*, economy relies on foreigners, migrants as cheap and competitive workers.³ On the other hand, domestic citizens are endangered by decreasing number of jobs that are offered to them, and when unemployed, they face with poor packages of social aid and support. This creates animosity towards foreigners (factor of authoritarian culture) and sometimes even serious class and racial conflicts.

¹ The author stresses the importance of Marcuse`s analysis (1985) and his classification on 4 forms of resettlement: direct resettlement of inhabitants, discrete chain of resettlement, exclusive resettlement implemented only on certain groups and finally forced resettlement.

² Capital in globalized world imposes hunger for profit as imperative identifying it with development. Neoliberal ideology often suppresses social-democratic standards and principles as too expensive and uncompetitive for global market race. Various imperialistic wars are started throughout the planet because of hunger for power and profit, but are presented as a "battle for democracy". At the same time, on national level more and more frequently demands and advocacy for social democratic values in society are proclaimed as dangerous, communist ideology.

³ Labor regulations have been changed and foreigners are working on lower wages, mostly as temporary workers, people who work half or part time, workers out of Unions, toward which employers have less obligations, etc. In these processes the precariat world "flourishes" as ugly side of capitalist society, which seriously endangers heavily fought human rights on: 8 hours work day, paid afterhours, right on minimal wages, right on good working conditions, on daily rest and annually paid holiday, etc. (Neil S, 2002: 427) Poorly paid migrants live mostly in bad conditions, new ghettos appear and these changes are visible on the face of cities in developed world. On the other hand, domestic citizens are endangered by decreasing number of jobs that are offered to them, and when unemployed, they face with poor packages of social aid and support. This creates animosity towards foreigners (factor of authoritarian culture) and sometimes even serious class and racial conflicts.

On the other hand, *third world cities*, mostly from Asian, Latino - American and African countries get, with globalization, developmental chance. These cities are characterized by the greatest *urban growth* caused by high birth rates and high inflow of migrants from rural parts of the country in need for a job.⁴ They traditionally have poor capacities to procure good living conditions and good quality of services for its population, but in globalization, investment of global capital in these cities changes this situation. Some of them, as economic incubators of global economy, can now offer a wide range of well paid jobs. (Gottdienern M, Budd L, 2005:39-44). The benefits of economic development has entire society, although the wealth is not equally distributed amongst the population.

Decisions on investments are predominantly *economic*, but big world projects are often driven by *political decisions*. Therefore it is great luck for cities to get to be hosts of great world sport manifestations and competitions (summer of winter Olympic games, Universiade, World Cups etc), international political, cultural, scientific, commercial and other meetings and conferences, etc. Additionally, big infrastructural projects that are important for global economy (dams, hydroelectric power stations, motorway networks, airports etc) are pretty often also followed by gentrification. It is called in these cases *developmental led resettlement*.

Pattern and appearance of gentrification worldwide

In different countries, authors identify that the main actors of gentrification are: building industry as important development instrument, urban authorities, urban and land developers, building enterprises, financial capital (banks, insurance companies), business enterprises, housing owners etc. (Reese E, Daverteuil G, Thach L, 2010: 312)

Numerous authors analyze the form of gentrification in USA cities as well as in European cities. With liberal globalization, gentrification appears even in the countries which used to have very developed social democratic concept of spatial planning and affordable housing. There are interesting cases of gentrification in Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, etc. In Germany the examples of gentrification can be seen in a number of cities such as Berlin (in Prenzlauerberg, Kreuzberg, Marzan, see: Levine M.A, 2004: 89-108, Bernt M, Holm A, 2009, Papan U, 2012: 56- 80), Hamburg in the case of inhabitants` resistance in regeneration process of Sternschanze quart (Laura Neugel, 2012) etc. These processes are present even in Scandinavian cities, including Sweden in which, after World War II, was developed one of the best programs for affordable housing for the entire population (for example Malmo, Gothenburg, Stockholm - Jorgensen G, Ero T, 2008, Hedin K, Clark E, Lundholm E, Malmberg G, 2012).

Similar processes were present in cities of Spain, France, Italy etc. It is interesting that Barcelona is often given as the example of successful regeneration, although this project was also implemented with resettlement of inhabitants, with small compensation and without inclusion of inhabitants in decision making process.⁵

⁴ Out of 13 most populated cities in the world, only one is in western, developed part of the world (New York with 17,8 million of inhabitants), additional 3 are in developed part of Asia (Tokyo with 33,2 million, Seoul 17,5 and Osaka 16,4 million inhabitants) and all others (9 out of 13) are cities from countries in development.

⁵ Barcelona was in 1992 the host of summer Olympic Games. In the process of preparation city government regenerate part of cities and implemented model which was later often copied from other world cities as an example of best practice (pret-a-porte). It promotes urban design (top down, with some small interventions by inhabitants in order to procure the quality of neighborhood), strong city leadership and management which skillfully promote city

Authors from Latino American countries have contributed to urban studies with excellent case studies and analysis of gentrification from various cities like Sao Paolo, Rio de Janeiro, Brasilia, Santiago, etc.

Asian countries are rich with examples of mega resettlement in which sometimes a million of inhabitants were moved, without their consent, from their old neighborhoods in settlements on periphery. In this way, with high costs paid by poor population, these cities transformed in great, modern business and developmental world centers (Shanghai, Beijing, Seoul, Tokyo, Mumbai etc).

Cities of African countries also transformed through processes of intensive urbanization which included mega resettlement and gentrification (Cairo, etc).

Social democratic instruments for creating cities for people

Welfare state was devoted to affairs of spatial planning, design and building cities for people. Therefore this type of public policy was highly participative and citizens` needs represented important factor in decision making of urban authorities. In that context USA, Canada, Australia and European countries had good results in this field. Public enterprises procured sufficient number of public housing by affordable prices for citizens. In a number of countries great part of housing rent was paid by the state (city) and therefore the housing was easily affordable for citizens from each social layer. Such policy stimulated citizens to rent a housing very affordably, instead of buying it.

Social democratic urban policy affirmed mixed housing (inclusive zoning), creation of substantial public housing fund with stimulations for investors to build housing for vulnerable social groups. The most important stimulative instruments, prepared for investors in cases of acceptance of such public program, were: land donation which means favorable selling or granting of lots, simplification of procedures for issuing building permits and other documents, bonuses for building density (*density bonus*), getting the right to build on other, favorable lot - *offsite construction*, discharging of a part of financial obligations (*fee waiver, in-lieu fees*), giving to investors *buyout options*, as well as financial donations and allowances. (Wyly E, Hammel D, 2004, Reese E, Daverteuil G, Thach L, 2010, Schwartz H.L, Ecola L, Leuschner J.K, Kofner A, 2012).

Unfortunately, neoliberal urban policy neglected a field of affordable housing as very expensive and although a lot of countries formally have some of these instruments, they are rarely implemented. The following cases will be useful for better understanding of reality.

image (branding) and strategic planning (again, top down direction). Old industrial parts of the city renewed and designed as lovely residential and commercial quarter with activities of modern economy (economy of knowledge and economy of experience). Poor working class quarters are resettled (gentrification) and transformed in luxury residential quarters. In this city the resistance to gentrification was not distinctive.

Part II Case studies

A. London

This part of the article deals with London, the capital of Great Britain, and important European and world city. It presents the tradition of urban planning, housing and changes that appeared in time of globalization. In that sense three examples of gentrification of settlements on excellent locations are presented: Docklands in centre and Carpenters Estate in eastern part of London are both examples of *classical gentrification* and Barnsbury in western part of the city, situated by Regents Park, is an example of *super-gentrification*. This analysis includes also appearance of new urbanism which creates isolated and gated settlements for rich population, as contrast to concept of open, democratic and available city.

Britain has, in the period of welfare state, developed concept of participative spatial planning (Reimer et al, 2014: 189-215) and in practice great attention was paid to affordable housing for all citizens. Local governments were in charge of affordable housing's procurement. Main institutions in this field were: *Committee for urbanism and building*,⁶ as political and planning body and *Council for housing* which was in charge of procurement and maintenance of public housing fund. Council maintained contacts with citizens and especially in processes of regeneration took care of their needs, upgrading their living conditions. Therefore, in London, as well as in other British cities and municipalities, the quota of social housing made possible for inhabitants of weaker material conditions to stay in renewed and regenerated settlement, to continue with their way of life (schools, primary health centers, parks, neighborhood centers for meetings and socializing, pubs, coffee shops etc). The regeneration process contributed to the welfare of this population, preventing bad consequences of gentrification.

In this context local government offered numerous stimulating instruments for construction enterprises, from which it was demanded to build a certain number of affordable housing. They affirmed the concept of social mixed housing and strong neighborhood communities. Concept of social housing contains various instruments of supporting socially vulnerable citizens to upgrade quality of their life.

This practice was, however in time of globalization, strongly suppressed and according to numerous researches, this field is not among policy priorities. Although local governments mostly have in their spatial and building plans precisely defined quotas for affordable housing, and they should in process of issuing building permits to investors demand from them to implement this kind of obligation, the fact is that they mostly hesitate to demand it.⁷ Social

⁶ Model of local government in that time was Committee model (type of weak Mayor model) with great competences for Committees (working bodies of Assembly). Committee for urbanism and building was obligatory for each municipality and city.

⁷ Researches pointed out that only 40% of local governments implemented planned quotas. Data from 82 greatest housing building projects in Britain, have shown that only 20% of demands for building affordable housing were accepted, meaning that even **80% affordable housing planned for building, were lost for the communities, because investors denied** this kind of demand, and refused to built it! See: Guardian, Saturday, April 28, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/apr/28/proportion-home-owners-halves-millennials>, visited 1.05.2018. It was calculated that only in 2017 in this way were lost about 2500 social housings, in spite of the fact that objective need for social housing is permanently growing in whole Britain, and especially in London, and that homelessness

housing was not priority anymore, the housing fund was sold and Councils for housing lost a lot of competencies. Numerous researches identified high decrease of affordable housing, the rise of rents and prices of housing, decrease of standard of the entire population and especially of social vulnerable groups (poor, migrants, young people, unemployed, etc) who have to move on periphery in much worse living conditions.⁸

Examples of regeneration and gentrification

Regeneration of Docklands in 1980^{ies} and Carpenter Estate in 2000s,⁹ were in function of upgrading capacities of London to ***maintain and strengthen the position of world financial and business centre in new globalised world*** in the context of deindustrialization, industrial restructuring and globalization (Hamnett, C, 2003: 760, Slater T, 2006: 737-757). In both cases city authority closely cooperated with British government in implementing these projects. In both cases market led gentrification was implemented, transforming poor settlements into luxurious ones created for rich population. Old population (workers, migrants and poor social class) was resettled either by direct resettlement, or by high prices of housing, rents and services. In these settlements, only small number of old inhabitants stayed. They lost former community, neighborhood, and between them and new inhabitants exists a big gap, misunderstanding and even tensions.

a. Docklands

Regeneration of Docklands¹⁰ created residential settlements for richer middle class, high professionals in the field of finance, IT and business while original, poor population was resettled. (Butler T, 2007: 760). The three renewed communities which belong to Docklands (Isle of Dogs, Royals and Surrey Quays) are characterized by highly educated population with high percentage of empty nesters of both genders (represent around 54% of the whole settlement's population). Only 14% of population are families with children¹¹ (Butler T, 2007: 771 - 773, Robinson G, Butler T, 2002: 70 -86). Inhabitants from these settlements have specific life style:

became serious social problem. See: <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2018/mar/19/affordable-homes-low-cost-rent-uk-planning-policy-government-developers> Visited 1.05.2018.

⁸ With resettlement, the time and cost of commuting highly threatens the citizens' quality of life. In mentioned Guardian's research, it was stressed that number of homeless people intensively grows, and that national and local governments are passive in regard to this problem. See: <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2018/mar/19/affordable-homes-low-cost-rent-uk-planning-policy-government-developers> visited 1.05.2018.

⁹ In 2005 London was in competition for hosting summer Olympic Games for 2012 with the idea to use this project for regeneration of central - east part of the city, which was very poor and neglected.

¹⁰ Docklands contain three parts of cities (in earlier periods used to be municipalities): *Isle of Dogs* and *Royals* as two parts of city on left bank of river Thames. *Isle of Dogs* contains financial and business part of London (City) while *Royals* contains *Quays* of Queen Victoria, Prince Alberta and King George V. Third former municipality is *Surrey Quays* on right bank of the river Thames, across the building of Parliament and Westminster and predominantly is defined as residential zone, with parks and commercial activities. Although situated on excellent location, Docklands were pretty neglected part of city in which mostly lived poor population. (Hamnett, C, 2003: 760, Slater T, 2006: 737-757).

¹¹ For small number of families, which live in this settlement, the main motive for choosing this settlement is also the quality of schools (Savage M, Bagnall G, Lounghurs B, 2005). In London (and other British cities) quality of schools greatly depends from the wealth of the municipality and its investing in schools. Students can only attend school in their municipality therefore this factor is very important when family decide where to settle.

they devote most of their time to work, and even their socializing primarily includes their colleagues and clients. They mostly do not enter in personal relationships, rarely get married and mostly don't have children. The older inhabitants mostly have another house (in suburbs or in other settlement in metropolitan region) in which they spend weekends with families and flat in Docklands is used only for working days in week. Mostly they are satisfied with tranquility and security of their settlement, as well as closeness to centre with all cultural, commercial and entertainment contents which London offers. This population expresses little interest in socializing which cannot be found in other parts of London.¹²

Small part of poor population who stayed in this settlements, have no contact with newcomers. There is a huge gap between them which creates certain tensions that could potentially turn into conflict. In central part of Docklands additionally exists conflict between original inhabitants (workers, poor, frustrated)¹³ and population that came from Bangladesh. All these factors don't contribute to the image of successful and content community. Unfortunately, the quality of local community and neighborhood is not a topic of great importance for city government.

b. Carpenter Estate (east London)

The case study of settlement Carpenters Estate,¹⁴ shows how regeneration changed old community, destroyed it and how former inhabitants could not cope with high prices and the lifestyle (unaffordable housing, jobs and services) in new settlement. Special attention was paid to activities of ***Council for housing estate*** as body which should help former inhabitants to adapt in this settlement and get benefit from regeneration. (Watt P, 2013: 99-108).

In the period of welfare state, this part of the city had a big fund of affordable housing, which enabled poor population to live here: young people and migrants created interesting, multiethnic community (Gunter A, Watt P, 2009: 515-529, Kennelly J, Watt P, 2012: 151-160).¹⁵ Three quarters of inhabitants lived in social housing (with subsidized rents), but part of them managed to buy their housings (Jones C, Murie A, 2006), using very favorable Law which contained Right - to - Buy legislation stipulated by Government in 1980^s.¹⁶ The remaining quarter of the population rented private housing with higher rents, but still lower than in other, richer parts of city. In the time when regeneration started, Carpenters Estate consisted of 3 skyscrapers with a great number of apartments, block of houses and University campus settled in this part of the city.

This municipality was very poor in the time of globalization, and had no capacities to maintain social housing properly. Through time the quality of housing and settlement

¹² From this point of view it could be said that these settlements in social sense don't have local communities and in a way they correspond to the description which Margaret Thatcher gave: "There is no such thing as society. There are individual men, women and families." (Butler T, 2007: 772)

¹³ These population was shown in series ***Only fools and horses***, placed in Peckham, in south-eastern part of London.

¹⁴ This settlement is situated in a part called Stratford, in Newham municipality.

¹⁵ In this community lived African and east Asian population, recently settled European migrants as well as domestic workers and poor population known as East Enders.

¹⁶ They greatly improved their position in regeneration processes because they have better bargaining position than inhabitants who only rented housing. Land and housing ownership of original inhabitants seriously decreased chances for their resettlement.

deteriorated. Instead of its renovation, municipal policy was to sell them, causing constant lack of social housing in this part of city.¹⁷

In the process of regeneration, Council additionally sold social housing and building lots, highly decreasing possibility for poor people to stay and survive in this settlement. The old buildings were demolished or completely renovated, the lots have been re-arranged and completely new settlement was created. The number of homeless increased, the flats became overpopulated and around 8000 families stayed in temporary housing.

In this context, most inhabitants expressed a great dissatisfaction. A part of former inhabitants resettled instantly and regretted almost immediately. The other part of the population decided to stay and fight for their rights. A group of them organized protest marches, riots, debates and round tables. Even a film was shoot about gentrification that happened in this part of the city (Watt P, 2013: 110,111).¹⁸ All of this, however, had small influence on the final results of the regeneration process. Only small share of former population managed to survive in new circumstances, staying, similar to such population in Docklands, marginalized and without adequate neighborhood and community.

At present, these parts of the city are renewed, with luxury housing and facilities, which attracted rich inhabitants to settle here. This quarter is one of the most attractive parts of the city because it is close both to city centre and the City in which the majority of the new inhabitants works. City of London, and municipality Newham did not put on agenda the question of injustices made through this project: the violation of rights of original inhabitants to decide on changes in their settlement and then, in the process of resettlement, they violated their right to get just compensation that would allow them to procure good life conditions and good quality of services in new community and neighborhood.

c. Barnsbury

Barnsbury is a settlement in Islington municipality in north-western London, near Regent`s park, and is an example of super-gentrification.¹⁹ This phenomenon means great investment in housing and facilities by extremely rich newcomers, creating elite settlement in which, by time, only the richest population can reside. Loreta Lee, together with Tim Batler, made case study (Butler T, Lees L, 2006).²⁰

This part of the city during 20th century was nicely arranged in urban and architectural sense and settled by middle and higher social class (architects, planners, university professors, teachers in schools, social workers, physicians and other medical professionals, etc). When it comes to political values, this population was predominantly liberal and inclined to Labors party, which gave to this community and neighborhood certain democratic and civil quality. In time of welfare state, in period from 1960 to 2000, inhabitants of this settlement, using the stimulative

¹⁷ Today, all London municipalities (not only poor municipalities) report great demand for affordable housing (by quality and prices) especially from social vulnerable categories of population. See: <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2018/mar/19/affordable-homes-low-cost-rent-uk-planning-policy-government-developers>

¹⁸ University community had an important role in these processes, actively supporting former inhabitants.

¹⁹ Up to the end of 18th century Barnsbury was rural part of London, and in 19th century it became attractive location for building settlement for rich population who wanted to move from overcrowded London.

²⁰ Loreta Lee is urban sociologist who lives in this settlement, and has researched for decades changes in this part of London. She recently identified super gentrification as pretty interesting phenomenon.

measures offered by Islington municipality,²¹ bought out their flats and houses and consequently *the structure of housing owners* changed. The share of housing owners rose from 7% to 34% of the entire population. Municipality developed social democratic policy that procured adequate number and good quality of affordable housing. In this period the growth of the population who live in public housing was evident. The share of this population rose from 15% to 48%. During these 40 years, Barnsbury transformed from neighborhood in which population mostly rented private housing into the settlement where population owns their housing (34%) or lives in public housing (48%). Private renting fell from 75% to 16% (Power A, 1972, Hamnett C. 1973: 252, 253, Butler T, Lees L 2006:473).

Since 2000, this part of the city was inhabited by extremely rich financial professionals (popularly called Oxbridge)²² who work in the City or in Canary Warf. They bought nice villas with swimming pools and rearranged them into extremely luxurious villas. They drive the most expensive cars and live the luxurious lifestyle. The quality of local community and neighborhood suffered because new inhabitants have poor communication with community. This pattern of behavior of rich newcomers is common in almost all super-gentrifications around the world.²³

d. Gated Communities

Some authors point out on appearance of gated, rich settlements with fences, gates, guards, electronic protection systems which guarantee security and privacy to its inhabitants. These settlements appeared first in USA and later developed in British cities including London.²⁴ They are considered as phenomenon of new urbanism motivated by greater security and privacy that they offer to their inhabitants. It is, however, questionable how well gated settlements succeed in this intention.

On the other hand, consequence of these settlements is great isolation of their inhabitants from other people (even in this settlement, because they are inclined to have as less communication with others, as possible). This seriously threatens the quality of neighborhood, prohibits the concept of mix housing, as well as the principle of open and democratic cities and urban communities (Butler T, 2007: 763,769,770, 772-777, Atkinson R, 2006: 819-832, Atkinson R, Flint J, 2004: 875-892, Grant J, Mittelsteadt L, 2004: 913- 930, Law S, 2004).

²¹ In 1970^{ies} municipality used right given by Housing Act (1969), to give donations to inhabitants for upgrading their housing in form of co-finance in proportion 50:50. This helped inhabitants (middle and upper class) to upgrade their housing and living space.

²² Popularly called Oxbridge, alluding on their expertise, high education and the best British universities on which they graduated: Oxford and Cambridge.

²³ The authors rightly compare the experience of super-gentrification of Bursnbury in London with the one in Brooklyn Heights in New York. These two world cities are in top position for getting most favorable jobs in global economy. In both cases super-gentrification appeared from investments in housing from excellently paid professionals from financial and IT sectors. Traces of their enormously high wealth can be seen in these luxurious settlements, where housing prices reach astronomic levels (Lees L, 2003: 2487- 2510, Lee L, 2000: 389-408).

²⁴ As examples of gated communities in London, are often mentioned: borough of Lambeth Gated Community (GC) and Runnymede, Surrey as Commuter belt of London. Case studies show that all communities have gates, walls with punch code and key entry systems. Surrey GCs has additional guards, while the Lambeth GCs has CCTV. (Atkinson R, Flint J, 2004: 879)

B. Shanghai – urban regeneration and gentrification from 1990^{ties} to nowadays

This part will be devoted to urban regeneration and gentrification of Shanghai as the most populated and economically developed Chinese city. It is interesting to analyse how this city in country with socialist political system and market economy, regulates urban planning, building and reconstruction and how it solves emerging problems. Two cases are presented: *the first one* is an example of classical regeneration with gentrification on centrally located Xintiandi lot and Taipingqiao park`s lot in Luwan district, along famous Huaihai street and *the second one* is the example of rehabilitation of Taikang street and Tianzifang neighborhood in Dapujiao district, as a kind of piecemeal gentrification without enforced resettlement and with active participation of inhabitants of this district.

China as a socialist country used to have developed planning system, centralistic management, state ownership of land and building lots, and great state housing fund, with flats of various quality. In Chinese cities one can often find poor informal settlements (lilong) with neglected infrastructure and poor living conditions. Another characteristic of China is a regime of territorial registration of population (Hukou system) which enables inhabitants to use public services on this territory.²⁵

Since 1990^{ies} when China has turned to market economy, it started development of market oriented urban regeneration. Reform of housing policy and especially political decentralization has transferred competencies for urban redevelopment and public finances (for these activities) from state on local governments. The regime of urban land use and construction has changed, to market and privately financed urban regeneration (a form of public private partnerships). This partnerships were very efficient in great urban reconstruction which made huge transformation on the face of Chinese cities. Most of them are good examples of classical gentrification with both, good and bad sides.²⁶ (Wang, 2014:16)

Urbanization of Shanghai

From 1949 to 1990, Shanghai developed as industrial city and production centre of this socialist country. Although the greatest production and financial contributor in the country, the quality of life in this city was very bad. Great part of the population, including rural migrants

²⁵ Hukou system appears as *urban and rural hukou* means that right to education, health care, social and other public services are available only for registered on this territory. All others, including huge number of migrant population who came from rural settlements in Shanghai, have no rights for using these services. Out of 25 million of Shanghai inhabitants, 10 million are migrant population which are in poor living conditions (Sha, Wu, Ji, Chan, Lim, 2014:13). This system causes great inequalities and injustice, which are even more visible in processes of urban regeneration.

²⁶ Central government remains in charge for macroeconomic planning. Local government gets charges for urban reconstruction, and building funds are transferred to them through reallocation of central and local tax revenues. This decentralization makes possible greater financial autonomy of local government in order to regenerate cities and to develop and properly maintain infrastructure. It was also of great functional importance for local government their right to lease state land. Reform of housing policy in 1990ties established great private, besides public housing market in China. Transforming socialist, welfare housing system in market housing system also stimulated greatly urban development (Sha, Wu, Ji, Chan, Lim, 2014:13)

attracted with jobs in industry, lived in informal, wild settlements (Lilong settlements) which were overpopulated, with sharing bathrooms, toilets and kitchens, with poor infrastructure (electricity, waterways, sewage) often dangerous for health and life (Sha, Wu, Ji, Chan, Lim, 2014:10).²⁷

With urban reconstruction in 1990^{ies} Shanghai went through huge transformation and became one of the most beautiful world cities. In this process lilong settlements were first to be demolished.

Case 1: Classic gentrification with population resettlement in Taipingqiao district

Project of strategic regeneration of main commercial centers situated in famous Huaihai street was initiated in 1996 (Wang, 2014:89).²⁸ Basic problems for inhabitants in these settlements were overcrowded flats and poor living conditions caused by longstanding lack of investment.²⁹ First lots planned for regeneration were in Xintiandi and Taipingqiao park. Housings were demolished and population resettled in two peripheral Shanghai districts – Pudong and Minhang (Chang, Yang, 2007:29, Wang, 2014:182).³⁰

In the beginning, it was very important for district government to have a good start with the project. Therefore, it procured adequate compensation for inhabitants who had to be resettled.³¹ Inhabitants have gained greater and better quality of housing, together with ownership of them. Mostly, they were satisfied because their quality of life upgraded and they have got a good quality of services on these locations.³² Later, however, new resettled inhabitants got worse quality of housing, inadequate location with poor quality of services, poor transport connections to jobs, schools, health centers, parks etc.

Therefore, significant inequalities and injustices appeared. Policy of compensation for resettlement was implemented only on inhabitants which lived in public housing or in their own housing (with ownership over housing). All other inhabitants who rented housing, including migrant workers, didn't have right on compensation. In process of resettlement they are left to find housing on expensive housing market without any kind of public help or support.

Before reconstruction Xintiandi district was inhabited with low and middle class population, who after the regeneration could not afford to remain there, because it was created for rich population, foreigners and tourists.

²⁷ Overcrowded lilong settlements are characterized by small living space by person (in one or two rooms lived members of three generation of one family). there exist a practice of sharing mutual toilets, kitchens and other rooms where neighbors together cooked, played with children, entertained and function as one widen family.

²⁸ Taipingqiao district has a space of 52 hectares, settled with about 70 000 of inhabitants (20 000 households) and around 800 enterprises which work on this territory. In this district, around million m² were covered with lilong settlements, mostly owned by state (Wang, 2014:165).

²⁹ Housings were of a poor quality because of the lack of daily light, moisture, poor sanitary conditions. Whole families with members of three generation live in small space without privacy.

³⁰ Plan of regeneration for this district considered demolition of these lilong settlements, and all inhabitants (70 000 inhabitants and 800 enterprises) was planned to be resettled in other parts of city. Several actors were part of the project. Investor was in charge for procuring finance for building and new housing for resettlement in accordance with the district government policy, standards and recommendations. Special commissions were in charge for resettlement of inhabitants and negotiations with them. (Wang, 2014:186)

³¹ In this period still existed only compensation like donation of housing and not compensation of financial means.

³² The size of housing was defined by the size of the family. For example, three member family which used to live in housing of 20m² was entitled to 70 m² equipped with toilet, kitchen and all comfort and privacy. The practice of sharing common rooms did not exist in new settlements. (Chang, Yang, 2007:29).

Local population could not oppose the resettlement because companies which were in charge of resettlement could force them to move out. Inhabitants could also be arrested if they resist or confront the company. Therefore, a lot of citizens consider resettlement as very unjust activity of authoritarian government, that has jeopardized the rights and interests of social vulnerable groups.³³ (Wang, 2014:190).

Although citizens are almost never included in decision making process, and their opinions are not of a great significance for officials, Chinese governments try to avoid riots, procure legitimacy and general satisfaction of inhabitants. Therefore public dissatisfaction with resettlement process and inadequate compensation, followed by riots, stimulated government to reform compensation policy.

Since 2001 the compensation in housing was replaced by financial compensation, which should allow inhabitants to purchase new housing. Unfortunately, monetary compensation did not solve problems for citizens. Financial compensation were not transparent and investors and companies in charge of resettlement, have taken a share of compensations for themselves (Wang, 2014:199). Therefore the amounts that inhabitants receive were not high enough to buy housing. Additionally, the housing prices were constantly increasing (both, for buying or renting), while compensations stagnated (Wang, 2014:197). In these circumstances citizens resisted to resettlement, trying to get more money from investors. Younger, more influential and more skillful got higher compensation, while older and marginalized population could not manage to get support and sunk in poverty. This example is a good illustration of regeneration projects that happened in other parts of Shanghai as well.

Case 2: Market gentrification with rehabilitation of Taikang street and Tianzifang neighborhood in Dapujiao district

Besides numerous regeneration projects which included demolition of old settlements, there are also examples of regeneration without resettlement and negative results (Wang, 2014:238). Since 2000, Shanghai government considered the political and cultural importance of historical conservation of old buildings and neighborhoods stimulating appearance of ***piecemeal gentrification***.³⁴ One of such examples is rehabilitation of Taikang street and Tianzifang neighborhood in Dapujiao district, which in 10 years transferred from old neighborhood into "creative industry cluster" and one of the most visited tourist attractions in city. In order to revitalize and turn Dapujiao district in residential and commercial part for rich middle class,³⁵ Dapujiao Street Office in 1998 recommended to change the use of industrial buildings in Taikang street. The idea was to conserve the exterior of these industrial buildings while regenerating interior for commercial and artistic activities. Increasing number of businesses wanted to open their boutiques, bars, galleries, elite artistic schools (sculpturing, painting, music), shops for jewelry, souvenirs, tea, etc. In this way, this neighborhood transformed into

³³ Social relations in lilong settlement were main factor for perception of the resettlement process from resettled population. Resettled population lost neighbors and friends, lost ***sense of belonging to community***, and their life drastically changed. Besides this, they lost ***centre location*** which made their everyday life easier, because of good transport connections, closeness to schools for children, health and social institutions for old and poor, markets, shops, etc. The closeness to parks made them possible to have common activities as recreation, dense, singing which represent specifics of Chinese culture.

³⁴ Piecemeal gentrification means long-term changes with participation of inhabitants with implementation of various measures tailored for this specific situation.

³⁵ District government had a plan to demolish this settlement and to build the new one.

attractive settlement which is in accordance with taste of new inhabitants. (Arkaraprasertkul, 2017:3).

This trend was also beneficial for local inhabitants because collected good rents from their valuable rented space and sometimes, they even voluntarily moved in other parts of the city. In such a way this lilong settlement became an example of *market led commercial gentrification* (Wang, 2014:247). It turned out that this kind of gentrification resulted beneficially for everyone: city preserved the spirit of old Chinese culture and neighborhood, enterprises developed new creative industries and businesses and local population profited as well.

The consequence of this regeneration was creation of new mixed community combining both old and new inhabitants which resulted in new vibrant neighborhood.³⁶

Although China has developed market economy, it also preserved socialist values and concept of social justice. In the field of urban regeneration, local governments turn from profit oriented policy to the concept of "balanced and sustainable development". Wang pointed out that local governments are increasingly promoting socially responsible entrepreneurship, where issues of justice and social harmony are integral parts of competitiveness. Wang (2014:324-325).

In previous years the governments showed more sensitivity to citizens` needs trying to solve emerging problems. A number of important strategies and laws was stipulated regarding the transparent and just compensation policy with precise formula for its calculation. A lot of funds are now dedicated for building affordable housing of good quality, supported with good public services, protecting citizens from identified malversations and scams. These activities, although new, are encouraging. In that sense one can assume that in future urban regeneration projects will be more socially responsible.

³⁶ Great part of lilong settlements were in state ownership. Formally regarded, inhabitants of these settlements had right to rent their housing for this purpose. The changing of purpose was not legal but government tolerated it. Wang (2014:253-254) conclude that this "bottom-up" revitalization process was possible because of that government support which is good indicator of changes of local governments` attitudes.

III Is there an alternative for gentrification as social and spatial injustice ?

Having in mind overall presence of gentrification in the world, last years the more intense professional and academic debates have been led in order to identify if there is an alternative to gentrification. Is it possible to conduct regeneration of neglected parts of the city without resettlement of original inhabitants (especially poor population), without violating their rights and without causing social and spatial injustice ? Can regeneration project also upgrade the living conditions of these vulnerable groups ?

It is not easy to find an alternative for gentrification in sense of complete exterminating of spatial injustice which goes with this phenomenon, but one can say that until neoliberal concept dominates, gentrification in present form will survive. If neoliberal urban policy remains, one can expect further spatial and social inequalities, injustice and possible social conflicts. In a number of cases, when local government ignored citizens` needs and rights, inhabitants *resisted and tried to protect their right to city* with more or less good results.

There are number of cases in which citizens fought for justice. For example, inhabitants of Sternschanze in Hamburg have resisted to resettlement for a decade and their efforts are good example of successful fight against unjust neoliberal urban and regeneration policy. There were for years high tensions that several times ended in severe physical conflicts between police and the extreme parts of local population.³⁷ In spite of the efforts of Hamburg officials and police to criminalize this population, they failed, strengthening support and solidarity of inhabitants not only from Sternschanze, but also from entire Hamburg and other German cities.

They succeeded to protect from demolishing some institutions with historic values (like old theater Rote Flora), their way of life, to create new institutions (Elternhaus, small factory and clothing store). They developed subculture of resistance to brutal capitalism recognizable in whole country. Their fight encouraged people to protect their rights and this activity became a symbol of Sternschanze which highly contributed to attractiveness of this settlement. In this part of the city owners and employees from shops, restaurants, coffee shops, etc, created services and goods inspired by this subculture.

Similar symbolic value has Yuerba Buena Center project from 1970^{ies} in San Francisco in which attorneys succeeded to win adequate compensations for resettled population.

Important democratic value has also the success of attorneys in Los Angeles (they worked pro bono for vulnerable social groups) in:

a. preventing intention of city officials to remove *Social Centre* from *excellent location in the centre of LA*,³⁸ as well as,

b. success of attorneys to procure more just and favorable *public transportation network* for poor population, completely dependent in all aspects of life (schools, works, health care and

³⁷ In Sternschanze is situated the Headquarter of pro-communist party called *Autonomous Scene* (Autonome Szene), with young and very agile members.

³⁸ Los Angeles government officials, together with investors and land developers, saw this space as wonderful for regeneration and economic development. City officials decided to resettle the biggest Social Centre in USA from this location, although a huge number of poor and vulnerable groups highly depended of its services. Huge support in this process was given by church who donated to Social Centre this land together with the building as its legal owner. A number of civil organizations and a number of municipalities (Beverly Hills) supported this fight for vulnerable population.

other services) from public transportation system. (Soja E, 2010: 157-179) Having in mind American common law system, the success scored in these cases changed the legal regulation, making it possible for other people with similar problems to use these instruments in fight.

Excellent example of resistance to gentrification can be seen in settlement *Pedro Aguirre Cerda* in central zone of *Santiago (Chile)*. Its inhabitants opposed to aggressive plan of city officials, taking over the whole project and tailoring new settlement to their own needs. They actively participated in all phases of decision making process and procured far better living conditions for themselves.³⁹ Similar example of resistance to resettlement was in a case of regeneration project led in order to prepare for Olympic games in favelas in east part of Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). The inhabitants of *Vila Autodromo* favela, resisted to resettle, in spite of a great pressure made by city government officials, who were motivated with great possible financial gains from this project. At the end, this favela was regenerated without resettlement.⁴⁰

Local governments should abandon the practice of imposing already prepared projects without consultation with citizens, which often results in conflict and dissatisfaction. Local governments should make effort and find solutions to minimize negative effects of gentrification which is also recommended by numerous researchers like Loretta Lees and David Ley who accepted the ideas of Slater and Freeman that gentrification should be rather managed instead of resisted.⁴¹

Lessons from comparative studies pointed out that practice from welfare state has better results and therefore should be again accepted. Social democratic concept assumes including citizens in decision making about all changes in their settlements and this principle should be affirmed again. This means that citizens should participate in process of *spatial planning* (process must be open and participative from the beginning and enriched with various forms and types of cooperation),⁴² as well as in creation of *public policies*, including creation of regeneration and building *projects*. Participation in projects assumes all phases: from analysis of regeneration concept, contents and creation of optimal solutions, to final implementation of the

³⁹ Santiago is a capital of Chile with 5,5 million inhabitants. Master plan selected several neglected parts of the city, inhabited by poor population, for regeneration. Project defined that huge part of poor population should be resettled, and whole settlement should become elite residential zone for higher and middle social class. Original inhabitants from settlement *Pedro Aguirre Cerda* did not accept resettlement. Luckily, 80% of the population had ownership on land and housing and city government could not implement their plan. Inhabitants actively participated in creation of the regeneration plan, demanded that the purpose of the land stays the same, and showed great creativity in developing various cultural contents. In this way their settlement became very attractive both for life and for tourists. (Lees L, Shin H.B, Lopez-Morales E, 2016:163-167).

⁴⁰ In spite of attempt of city officials to resettle whole settlement on other location, inhabitants who were owners of the land and lived here for a long time, refused to go. They continued to co-exist with Olympic settlement. For investors and local government this significantly decreased their profit. See: <https://www.pakistantoday.com.pk/2012/08/23/rio-favela-dwellers-resist- eviction-for-2016-olympics/> Visited: 15.10.2017. in 12:30h.

⁴¹ In that sense they quote them: "if ... gentrification is becoming a widespread trend that represents the future of many cities, we should be thinking about how to manage the process to help us achieve a more equitable and just society." (Lees L, Ley D, 2008:2382)

⁴² The projects *Imagine your city* are very interesting, inspiring and very beneficial for the creation of imaginative, functional and good solutions for buildings and public spaces. These projects are created as a kind of movement for creation of cities for people and not for profit.

project.⁴³

It is important to remember, that the best urban and architectural designs were inspired and created in communication with citizens, which in everyday life use the spaces which are to be rebuilt. Therefore local population could easily see the weak and the strong sides of existing solutions, and therefore give very useful suggestions for renewal, based on their needs and experiences.

Inhabitants' participation in urban regeneration projects had great benefits all over the world. One can mention successful phase of regeneration of Berlin at the end of 20th century. After the first phase of reconstruction without citizens, Berlin government understood that participation is beneficial. They created Stadtforum that included 15 managers in 15 units in the city assigned for regeneration. They constantly collaborated with citizens through working groups⁴⁴ in finding and implementing the best solutions in their settlements. City procured the stirring of the project, professional support of architects, designers, and finally financial support (Levine M, 2004:101) .⁴⁵

In Latino American cities there is a lot of examples of successful inclusion of citizens in regeneration of their settlements (regeneration of *Rocinha and Vidigal favela*⁴⁶ in Rio de Janeiro and numerous others).

Similar case of beneficial influence of local population was seen in rehabilitation of Taikang street and Tianzifang neighborhood in Shanghai (China), which transformed old, neglected ghetto (lilong settlement) into beautifully designed "creative industry cluster". They creatively saved old cultural spirit of the settlement which became one of the greatest touristic attractions.

⁴³ Aarhus Convention (stipulated in 1998 in Aarhus, Denmark) has additionally obliged European states and local governments on this participative way of decision making and creation of public policies.

⁴⁴ Stadtforum had 80 meetings and scored very good results.

⁴⁵ In partially gentrified Prenzlauerberg (one of the central municipalities in Berlin), five neighborhoods successfully implemented regeneration programs. They left the same functional zoning (housing, commercial activities, recreational zones, spaces for cultural and entertainment contents and activities etc) and minimized resettlement. These programs were focused on upgrading housing and living conditions for inhabitants with upgrading the size and the quality of apartments, quality of infrastructure, streets, transport, heating, waterways and sewage system, waste disposal, schools, kindergartens, green spaces (building public garage with high capacity and convenient prices for parking, contributed to the functionality and beauty of the settlement). Recreation facilities, places for meeting and socializing (project 100 yards) etc. (Levine M, 2004: 98) Inhabitants created great solutions regarding the arrangement of public spaces, initiating innovative institutions, the new way of work, and including new contents in program. In such a way various artistic workshops, theater programs, exhibition spaces, interesting youth projects as well as projects of useful cooperation of youth, middle and old population were developed. Especially useful were *self-help programs* for marginalized and poor population which were financed by city as a kind of social program.

⁴⁶ In this neglected settlement, situated on excellent location on the side of the hill with great view on Copacabana and Ipanema beach, which was highly attractive for investors and new inhabitants, a part of a project contained affirmation of existing cultural scene in this settlement. A number of cultural projects implemented by local population made this settlement vibrant, increasing its attractiveness. Dutch painters decorated buildings, a great hotel was built with the pool on the top, drug trafficking was repelled upgrading security of the neighborhood. This settlement has become *chick favela*, very attractive for life, work, and for tourists. The price of housing assets instantly increased 50% with further rising trend, but local population stayed happily integrated in this new, regenerated quarter.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that affirmation of social democratic instruments connected to participative urban planning and building should maintain, strengthen and consequently be implemented as a remedy for bad practice.

Participative spatial planning together with debates on spatial plans, on creation of urban policies, and on building projects are important instruments for creation of "cities for people". It is good to affirm the *concept of mixed housing* because it is one of the instruments for decreasing spatial injustice and inequalities. Beside this concept it is important to procure *building quotas* for affordable housing, and if they already exist, to implement them consequently.⁴⁷ Additionally, vulnerable social groups should be better supported with a number of instruments such as: increase of affordable social housing fund (almost destroyed with selling and privatization), subventions for rents, procure housing for free, etc.

Implementation of urban regeneration projects has to be defined in detail, especially when these projects affect living conditions of local population. Examples presented in this text have shown how local inhabitants can be creative and devoted to regeneration project, procuring great benefits for themselves, their settlement and the city as a whole.

If project however includes resettlement of local population, it is vital to establish clear and transparent criteria on prepared compensation as well as to organize debates with the beneficiaries regarding the adequacy of compensation in size and in scope (which costs can be covered by it). This procedure is democratic, transparent, decreases dissatisfaction and potential conflicts. It also decreases chances for misuse and profiting from unhappy situation of this vulnerable population. Finally, local government should make sure that resettled population has all the necessary services provided in new settlements (kindergartens, schools, health and social institutions, good transportation system, etc).

Local community is a crucial word for urban system. Besides the beauty of the buildings, settlements and public spaces, the true beauty of the city *comes out of its community*, from satisfied people, good quality of their relationships, good values as trustfulness, friendship, solidarity, security, good neighborhoods, democracy, etc.

Countries which have a good regulation and are devoted to good participatory practice in planning and implementation of regeneration projects procured very good results. Their citizens are happy with the life in their community and society as a whole.⁴⁸ Therefore they give us excellent lessons from experiences.

Economic development should not be the only priority for local government in local reconstruction projects. Local government, as the closest to citizens, should represent their

⁴⁷ As it was already mentioned in the text, British cities often have building quotas in their plans, but their officials rarely implement them, what presents a bad practice.

⁴⁸ Denmark has good regulation and Danish cities affirm participatory urban planning, creation and implementation of urban projects. Copenhagen has a number of excellent solutions made in the process of communication between city officials, Urban Architecture Centre (experts) and inhabitants. Citizens in Denmark are very happy with living condition in their cities and society as a whole.

interests, care of their needs and help them with problems that emerge in local community. The stimulation of local economic development is highly connected to the quality of life of all citizens. If local economic development turns out to become instrument of making wealth for the few at the cost of the majority of inhabitants, then local government lost its primary purpose.

REFERENCES

1. Arkaraprasertkul, N. (2017) Gentrification and its contentment: An anthropological perspective on housing, heritage and urban social change in Shanghai, *Urban Studies*, 55 (7), pp. 1561-1578
2. Atkinson R (2006) *Padding the Bunker: Strategies of Middle Class Disaffiliation and Colonization in the City*, *Urban Studies*, 43.4, pp. 819-832,
3. Atkinson R, Flint J (2004), *Fortress UK ? Gated Communities, the Spatial Revolt of the Elites and Time - Space Trajectories of Segregation*, *Housing Studies* 19.6, pp. 875-892.
4. Berry B, (1985), *Islands of Renewal in Seas of Decay*, In Preston P (ed.) *The New Urban Reality*, Brookings Institute, Washington,
5. Bourne, L.S (1993), *The Demise of Gentrification? A Commentary and Prospective View*. *Urban Geography* 14.1, pp. 95-107.
6. Butler Tim (2007) Re-urbanisazing London Docklands: Gentrification, Suburbanization or New Urbanism?, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 31.4, 2007, pp. 759-781 (DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2007.00758.x)
7. Butler Tim, Lees Loretta (2006), Supergentrification in Barnsbury, London: globalization and gentrifying global elites at the neighborhood level, *Trans Inst Br Geogr* NS 31
8. Grant J, Mittelsteadt L, (2004) *Types of Gated Communities*, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 31, pp 913- 930. Law S (2004), *Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*, Routledge, New York.
9. Gunter A, Watt P, 2009, *Grafting, Going to College and Working on Road: Youth Transition and Cultures in an East London Neighborhood*, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 12 (5), pp. 515-529,
10. Hamnett, C, (2003), *Unequal City: London in the global Arena*, Routladge, London, pp. 760.
11. Jones C, Murie A (2006), *The Right - to - Buy. Analysis and Evaluation of a Housing Policy*, Oxford, Blackwell, UK.
12. Kennelly J, Watt P (2012), Seeing Olympic Effects through the Eyes of Marginally Housed Youth: Changing Places and the Gentrification of East London, *Visual Studies*, 27 (2), pp. 151-160.
13. Levine Myron (2004), Government Policy, the Local State and Gentrification: the Case of Prenzlauer Berg (Berlin), Germany, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, volume 26, Number 1, pp. 89-108.
14. Lees Loretta, Bang Shin Hyun, Lopez-Morales Ernesto (2016), *Planetary Gentrification*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK, Malden, USA.
15. Lees L, Ley D. (2008) Introduction to Special Issue on Gentrification and Public Policy, *Urban Studies*, 45 (12), pp. 2379-2384, Sage Publications, Ltd. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43197722>.

16. Lee Loretta , Butler Tim (2006). Super-gentrification in Barnsbury, London - Globalization and Gentrifying Elites at the Neighborhood Level, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS31 467-487 2006, Royal Geographical Society, Journal compilation, pp 467-487.
17. Lee Loretta, (2003) Super-gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights, New York City. *Urban Studies* 40.12, pp 2487- 2510.
18. Lee Loretta, (2000), A Reappraisal of Gentrification towards a "Geography of Gentrification, *Progress in Human Geography* 24, pp 389-408.
19. Naegler Laura (2012): *Gentrification and Resistance - Cultural Criminology, Control and the Commodification of Urban Protest in Hamburg*, Hamburger Studien zur Kriminologie und Kriminalpolitik, Band 50, Lit Verlag, Berlin.
20. Robinson G, Butler T. (2001), Coming to Terms with London: Middle - Class Communities in a Global City, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25.1, pp 70-86.
21. Sha, Y, Wu, J., Ji, Y., Chan, S.-L.-T. and Lim, W.-Q. (2014) *Shanghai Urbanism at the Medium Scale*, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer
22. Slotter Tom (2011), Gentrification of the City in, *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*, Ed. by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp 571-585.
23. Slater Tom, (2006), *The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research*, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30.4, pp 737-757.
24. Soja Edward (2010), *Seeking Spatial Justice*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, London.
25. Wang, S.-W.-H. (2014) *The Urban Politics of Housing Renewal in transitional Shanghai: Reassessing the Chinese Pro-Growth Coalition Perspective*, Michigan: ProQuest LLC
26. Watt Paul (2013), It`s not for us, Regeneration, the 2012 Olympics and the Gentrification of East London, *City* , Vol.17, No.1, page 99/118, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
27. Yang, Y.-R. and Chang, C.-h. (2007) An Urban Regeneration Regime in China: A Case Study of Urban Redevelopment in Shanghai's Taipingqiao Area. *Urban Studies*, 44 (9), pp. 1809-1826.

web pages:

1. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/apr/28/proportion-home-owners-halves-millennials>,
2. <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2018/mar/19/affordable-homes-low-cost-rent-uk-planning-policy-government-developers>
3. <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2018/mar/19/affordable-homes-low-cost-rent-uk-planning-policy-government-developers>
4. <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2018/mar/19/affordable-homes-low-cost-rent-uk-planning-policy-government-developers>