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Summary

The number of enclosed residential domains (ERDs) in the Netherlands has seen a remarkable increase over the past twenty years. Roughly half of these projects are located in urban areas. This raises the question what the impact of large scale privatisation is on the city. Knowledge regarding the Dutch case is scarce. In particular, the relation between spatial aspects of ERDs and their effect on Dutch cities is a key aspect missing in the body of knowledge. In order to assemble and add relevant knowledge on this subject, this graduation project aims at answering the following question: How can the spatial design of private residential domains enhance the living quality in Dutch urban areas for both residents as well as the public? The project focuses on the scenario of an increase of private residential domains in urban areas.

The project is roughly divided into three phases. In the research part the problem is analysed and tools for analysis and design are developed. This is followed by the design phase in which the tools are applied and a privatised neighbourhood is designed. A large scale scenario featuring multiple ERDs in an urban area is simulated since there is a lack of such cases in reality to study.

In order to define the properties of ERDs affecting the city a vision tool is developed considering the juridical, social and spatial properties. An ERD can be seen as a combination of different layers of segregation on top of the built environment, namely the accessibility of the area (spatial and social), the communities (social), the liabilities for the area (social and juridical) and the rights of ownership (juridical).

To relate social, juridical and spatial properties of ERDs to future urban design, a literature research regarding the possible effects of an increase of ERDs on the Dutch public realm has been made. This research resulted in three recommendations for designing an ERD area. First, maintain a dense network accessible to the public. Second, the addition of expression of identity in space can have a positive influence on the role of public space. Third, homogeneity of a neighbourhood should be prevented.

The quality of ERDs for the dwellers is defined by research on the reasons to live in a Dutch ERD, abstracted from literature research and media analysis of real estate agent advertisements of Dutch urban ERDs.

For each layer different choices can be made, each affecting the others. Which properties form the starting point for an urban plan depends on the approach of the ERD project. An urban designer’s approach starts with the built environment, the accessibility and the right of ownership. The liabilities and the community are a consequence of the choices made in the urban plan. In contrast, an urban strategy approach starts with focussing on the social and juridical part. As a result, the built environment and accessibility are a consequence thereof. In order to focus on the effects of the spatial properties the urban designer’s approach is chosen.

The design process was a test case of large scale privatisation for residential purposes in an urban area. The location chosen is Rivierenbuurt Noord in the Hague. The first assumption is that in the coming years the municipality will hand over this area to private actors. After that the desired level of accessibility and density in the area is determined with respect to the influences of the surrounding cityscape. For further design, the accessibility in the area is set to meet the recommendation of having a dense urban network in private space. The next step is to test the possibilities for the built environment based on the density and the diversity of the neighbourhood. This includes a supply of different living environments, the diversity of resident groups and their possibilities to express identity and a diversity in accessible spaces for the public. The design process is a continuous process whereby choices for one property affected decisions made on other properties. The application of developed tools is a side product of this process. A ‘quality monitor tool’ developed during the research phase is used to compare the design with existing ERDs.

The conclusion of this research is: ERDs can be of an added value for both the public and the public in a Dutch city in one urban plan by integrating the qualities for both. New types of living environments created by private residential domains provide new demands on the housing market, without necessarily having a negative impact on Dutch cities. But in order to design ERDs in Dutch urban areas, it is of high importance to decide first what the accessibility plan of the area would be on both publicly and privately owned space, considering the value of the spaces for the public domain of the city.

Living quality in private domains are supported by the input initiators of projects add and the role municipalities have as inspirators and projectmanagers of the privatisation projects. It is also possible to transform current publicly owned space into collectively owned space while adding value for all users. A remark is that the current juridical ownership structures in Dutch law are insufficient to provide large scale longterm privatisation processes at the moment.
How can the spatial design of private residential domains enhance living quality in Dutch urban areas for both residents and the public?

What is the quality of ERDs for residents?

What are the reasons for residents to live in an ERD?

- What are recommendations for an urban design of ERDs?

What is the quality of ERDs for the public?

What are the assumed effects on the public realm of Dutch cities caused by ERDs?

- What are values of the public realm for the public?

- What is the relation between spatial characteristics of ERDs and the effects on the public realm?

- What are the recommendations for designing ERDs with a positive effect on the public realm?

How to design the privatisation of an urban residential neighbourhood?

- What are the different frameworks of ERDs compared to a residential domain in public space?

- How to implement the recommendations for the qualities of urban ERDs for both residents and the public?
1. Introduction

1.1 FASCINATION

My interest in ERD’s started with a planned visit to Le Medi in spring 2010 during my internship. On a Sunday the office employees cycled all the way to Bospolder-Tussendijken to see this project. Unfortunately the inhabitants of the domain do not open the gates for strangers on Sundays. We were not aware of that before that particular moment when we stood still in front of the closed gate, talking to a resident on the inner side of the closed gate of his Le Medi. The resident, although friendly, did not want to open the gate for us in the end.

It was their space. And they wanted safety after sunset and quietness on Sundays.

A few weeks later I saw their beautiful courtyard for the first time. It is one of the most attractive housing projects I have seen in the Netherlands. The people live in a beautiful project, the project attracted an other target group to a problem neighbourhood, the benches around the fountain are a quality for the entire neighbourhood. Yet the surrounding public streets do not have the higher standard the inner space has and those beautiful spaces could be gated. If the residents decide to gate their courtyard permanently, only a tempting view on a beautiful inaccessible space will remain.

This assailable balance between the interests of ERD residents and the interests of their neighbours, ‘the public’ aroused my interest in inner city enclosed residential domains in other Dutch cities.

semi-gated residential domain Le Medi with beautiful courtyard, in the neighbourhood Bospolder-Tussendijken in Rotterdam. Photographs taken by author
1.2 WHAT IS AN ERD?

Dutch enclosed residential domains (ERDs) are often mixed up with gated communities (GCs), a typology associated with projects in the USA, South-Africa, South America or China. GCs are actually a subset of a wider range of privately or collectively governed residential neighbourhoods, in other words GCs are a type ERDs. Research on existing Dutch ERDs has shown that ‘the Dutch and Belgian private and enclosed residential domains’ differ spatially, in the ‘social trends underlying the popularity of these domains’ and also organizational from the international gated communities as well as from each other. (Hamers, Nabielek et al. 2009). Additionally, the Netherlands has its ‘own specific traditions in spatial policy, urban planning and design practice’ which makes the effects caused by ERDs different of those abroad. (Hamers, Nabielek et al. 2007). Non-public residential domains differ from each other in for example their architecture, in their way of enclosing, the reasons the inhabitants have for living in one, in their organisational structures, in their relation to the urban network, in their enclosed facilities.

Examples of projects realised in Dutch inner cities are:

– cul-de-sac or closed of streets or squares
– garden typology
– courtyards
– private parks
– enclosed blocks
– the maze typology

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Living in enclosed residential domains (ERD’s) wins popularity in the Netherlands. Those sub-set of privately or collectively governed neighbourhoods are already realised in Dutch cities as well as in the countryside. Paleiskwartier near Den Bosch or the private neighbourhood Le Medi in Rotterdam (fig. 3) are a few of the most well-known and striking examples of ERD’s.

Due to liberalisation and decentralisation policies in the Netherlands the municipalities gave space to private actors to construct collectively governed domains. Sometimes the municipality even initiates a project in order to execute their housing policies of different typologies for the higher income households, often part of gentrification processes. What they forget is the impact of privitisation of space on the public domain of their cities. Municipalities are in charge of making assessments for ERD’s in a larger context than the project itself in order to provide the quality of public space, private actors are not.

The type of residential domains that this research is focussed on incorporates private or semi-private spaces. Spaces which used to be public, like streets or parks. An ongoing increase of these private neighborhoods could therefore could decrease or devalue the public domain. On the other hand could the collectively or privately owned spaces add quality to the public realm because of several reasons. It is the scale, number and location of the private domains which determines their influence upon the city as a whole. To make decisions about ERD’s, more knowledge on the impact of ERD’s within Dutch cities is necessary. Therefore this research is focussed on the changes an increase of the development of ERD’s creates.
1.4 PROJECT AIMS

The research by design is focused on the decrease of public space in regard to an increase of non-public open spaces in a neighborhood due to an increase of ERDs.

The design is based on the assumption that in some inner-cities the number of ERDs will increase within a neighborhood. It is a test case of a possible development in order to show the problems and/or possibilities of an increase of ERDs in city centres.

To find out what an increase of non-public space will change of the quality of the public space and the quality of dwelling, a scenario has to give direction to the design of possible future developments.

The project is focused on the spatial elements of ERDs on different scales. The biggest scale will be that of the neighborhood and its relation and connection with the city parts around it. The smallest scale will be almost the architectural scale when the placement of spatial elements to enclose residential domains are discussed.

1.5 RELEVANCE

SOCIO-RELEVANCE

The privatization of Dutch cities causes groups to build their own world, but it is still somehow related to the world around it. Therefore knowledge on the relation between the enclosed residential domains and Dutch cities should be provided in advance and during these processes in order to maintain living qualities for all the inhabitants of the city.

By creating an example of a spatial urban design aimed at influencing society, at least awareness of the relation between design and society is made. Recommendations for actors involved could help future developments.

ACADEMIC RELEVANCE

The amount of enclosed residential domains (ERDs) in the Netherlands has been increasing over the past twenty years. Roughly half of these projects is located in urban areas. This raises the question what the impact of large scale privatization are on the city. Knowledge on the Dutch case is inadequate. In particular, the relation between spatial aspects of ERDs and their effect on Dutch cities is a key aspect missing in the body of knowledge.

In order to assemble and add relevant knowledge on that subject. This graduation project aims at answering the following question: How can the spatial design of private residential domains enhance living quality in Dutch urban areas for both residents and the public? The project focuses on the scenario of an increase of private residential domains in urban areas.

(see chapter 2.1 and 2.2 for research on the relevance)
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1.6 RESEARCH STRUCTURE

- literature research
- field research
- analysis method
- network design tool
- data on increase 1980-2010
- data on core trajectory

RQ: How can an increase in the residential domain enhance the quality of a Dutch inner-city neighbourhood for both residential and public purposes?

- media analysis
- field research
- literature research

What are the effects on the public realm of Dutch cities caused by ERDs?

- literature research
- field research

What is the quality of ERDs for residents?

- test case design

What is the relation between density and the design?

- analysis

what is the current state of ERDs in the Netherlands?

What are the implications of an increase in the same area?

- test case design

Recommendations for design

What is the quality of ERDs for residents?
This project is embedded in ‘The ‘In the Ghetto’ graduation studio. This studio focuses on economic and social segregation within cities and the spatial manifestation of these phenomena – it deals with the role of city politics, urbanism and architecture in this matter, to be more precise. Against the threat of cities falling apart into autonomous groups and zones that ignore and deny each other there’s also the perspective of emerging urban archipelagos, formed by communities that develop areas within the city and take planning initiatives.’ (Graduation studio In the Ghetto, Studio Guide, 2010-2011, Design as politics as posted on DUT Blackboard in November 2010)

In my opinion, the core of the studio consists out of two main topics; segregation in the city and the role of politics and urban designers. To study the fear for social segregation within Dutch cities due to enclave style communities I picked the spatial possibilities of ERDs as an realistic but also partly undiscovered dimension of urban design in the Dutch context. More background information on this can be found in the paragraph ‘academic relevance’.

Secondly the area of tension between politicians, designers and groups of inhabitants is what the studio wants to address. During the first months of research on Dutch ERDs my first hypothesis turned out to be false. The hypothesis was that most projects are initiated by groups of (rich) inhabitants and / or the real estate developers and that the municipalities has withdrawn from (that particular) housing market. But in all the inner-city projects analysed the group of inhabitants was not participating at all before the houses were sold. Simply because there was no group of inhabitants formed before the project was build by the real estate developers. In case of Dutch ERDs is ‘the community’ not the beginning of the project, but a possible outcome of it. And even that is unsure, it is difficult for the groups of inhabitants to act like a group, because their social bonding is nil. They are a collection of individuals who bought a house individually and have to take care of their non-public spaces with an home owners’ association. They might have the same interest for their environment and the same interest in encroachment from the daily public city life, but the initiative for the ERD was taken by the municipality and/or real estate developer. Wether it was build for the ‘good’ (gentrification) or the ‘bad’ (segregation of social lifestyles as an opportunity to make profit), uncertain was the impact on the city as a whole. And that is exactly what I do research on. What if more initiatives are taken and municipalities let real estate developers build more and more ERDs in their city? What could happen to our city centres?

With this design I would like to discover the possibilities of neighbourhoods in which the municipality placed open spaces in trust of members of the general public. Aim of the design is to make municipalities aware of their role in the development of ERDs in the context of the neighbourhood and the city as a whole. If they would become aware of threats and possibilities of a growth in ERDs close to eachother, they could plan on forehand what their aims are for the public space or neighbourhoods. This makes me state that local politicians still have an important role in the urban planning and design in the future. The representatives of all citizens are in charge of the cities main structures and functioning. Individual initiatives should fit in that, but they should not make the total structures by accident.

Wether or not a municipality has its own department of physical planning, the municipality commissions urban designers to come up with spatial solutions for problems they have indicated. Urban designers on the other hand are creative minds in charge of making politicians aware of spatial opportunities or threats for their city. With this graduate project I attempt to create a design to make people aware of opportunities and threats, as it could be done for other cities. It is a search for relevant tools and methods to use as urban designers for non-public spaces in the urban streetnetwork in the meantime.

Another question asked in the studio booklet “is integration within the city, or perhaps a further separation from the rest most desirable?” The studio’s schedule suggested to make a statement on this at the p1 and p2. The question on the desirability of integration of ERD projects actually became the core of this research by design. If an increase of the amount of ERDs is going to happen, should than they be integrated in the public domain or not?

1.7 STUDIO CHOICE


3. Location of realised urban enclosed residential domains in and around the Randstad area, Made by author, based on data from: ‘Prive terrein’ van Reijndorp en Lohof (2006)
The amount of enclosed residential domains (ERDs) in the Netherlands has been increasing over the past fifteen years. Policymakers, scholars and urban planners started a debate about privatisation of Dutch neighborhoods, mainly focused on negative aspects of social segregation and the ending of the public domain as we know it. However, how enclosed are enclosed residential domains exactly? Frequently the arguments used refer to international debates on the global spread of gated communities. However, recent studies showed that Dutch ERDs differ from those in spatial, architectonical, organisational forms as well as in ‘the social trend underlying the popularity of these domains’ (Hamers and Nabielek, 2009).

The growth of the number of ERDs in the Netherlands can be explained in different ways. Following the theory of global spread, the Dutch ERDs are a consequence of copy behaviour US gated communities in other countries. This theory is a popular statement in the press on which researchers respond. Le Goix and Webster (2008, p.1192) contradict the statement with the conclusion that “the discourse on gated urbanism seemed to spread from American sources, the phenomenon itself, had its own local history in every continent and country”. Furthermore they state that ‘socially and physically defined urban enclaves are as old as cities themselves’ in many countries. Le Goix and Webster (2008, p.1195) In other words, the debates and research might have started in the US, the phenomenon of private residential domains migth be much more related to local habits than they are to the US context. Changing from a global spread point of view to an emergence point of view enhances the need for research on local ancient typologies of ERDs. The new ERD projects cannot be seen as a totally new trend in the Netherlands, because a common ancient ERD typology is the urban private courtyard. The culture of residential ‘hofjes’ started in the Middle Ages and the culture had its peak in the Netherlands during the 19th century with eguinages and charity courtyards. (Lohof, Reijndorp et al. 2006; Hamers, Nabielek et al., 2007) This is one of the local examples Le Goix and Webster could point out as an example contradicting the global spread theory. According to Reijndorp and Lohof (2007) the current private residential domains actually are in line with the Dutch tradition of urban design and planning.

Social changes in society may directly have caused the increase of ERDs. Reijndorp (2009, p.81) paints a picture of ‘commercial parties taking over public institutions’ in the 1980s. This privatisation caused instability of the quality of citizens’ living environment, education and healthcare. In his opinion it makes sense that individual citizens create collectives in order to deal with these uncertainties and he explains that ‘in this perspective the new collectivity is not a reaction to individualization but the ultimate consequence of it.’ (Reijndorp 2009, p.81) Before the 70s the goal of emancipation of all citizens created the ‘social’ domain in order to achieve a welfare state. In this period the town planning was strongly connected with education, health care and cultural policies. In the seventies the structurising factor of social groups switched from ‘social-economic position’ to ‘life style’. Reijndorp (2009, p.81) In other words, the individualisation and of the Dutch society made progress. This individualisation combined with the privatisation could be considered as the cause of collectively governed residential domains and as an outcome of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism generally refers to the empowerment of private actors. Some scholars describe gated communities as ‘a physical expression of post industrial social changes (fragmentation, individualism, rise of communities).’ (Le Goix and Webster 2008) Some of them even state that ‘dominant economic and political actors including municipalities’ create a false sense of fear and insecurity. Furthermore Le Goix and Webster explain gated communities are viewed as part of a ‘postmodern trend towards the commodization of urban public space pitched at consumers sensitized to the risks or perceived risks.’ (2008, refering to Flusty 1998; Sorkin 1992)

Stijnie Lohof adds that ‘decentralisation and liberalization’ of the housing stock and public space caused a shift ‘from rental housing to sale housing’ and a ‘shift from public owned collective outdoor space to a privately owned collective spaces. (Lohof, 2009, p.81) She indicates money as one of the main reasons of privatisation of public space. Due to the shrinking budget for public space and liberalisation, making money with privately owned public space became possible since the 1980s.

AUTHORITY
Collective ownership of former public space implies a shift of authority from the government to the residents, while local authorities remain responsible after all. (Eshuis and Klijn, 2011) Within a democratic society three ways
of governing can be distinguished: hierarchic governing, network governing and self-management. During hierarchic governing the government rules the processes in society as the most important participant, while the government is an equal participant in the network governing model or even less important than other actors in the self-management model. (Dam and Eshuis, 2005)

In the Netherlands housing policy recently was an example of strong and hierarchic governing with ‘a culture of deliberation’. (Bailey and Manzi, 2010, p.16) A shift from hierarchic control to network control or even self-management will cause new interdependent relations between local governments and citizens. An high dependance on the municipality shall contradict the residents’ ideas of ruling the neighbourhood by themselves. An high level of authonomacy of the domain makes the residents state that the municipality interferes too much and the local taxes are not for them. Therefore a balanced dependance is necessary. A shift of authority is also seen in policies the last decennia. In Europa in general is more interest in the empowerment of communities by ‘reforming governance systems’. (Baily and Manzi, 2010, p. 17)

Policy may have its role in the increase of ERD projects. Baily and Manzi refer to the introduction of ‘a National Urban Renewal Policy’ in 1997 ‘aimed at increasing the variation of residential environments’. (Bailey and Manzi, 2010, p.16) ERDs are clearly a search for renewing housing projects as mentioned in chapter 2. Moreover Baily and Manzi state that ‘urban regeneration policies have aimed to replace affordable rented properties by more expensive, larger owner-occupied property.’ Furthermore, ‘local government agencies’ and other private actors assume that ERDs ‘meet a need for consumer choice’ and that ERDs even make participation possible. (Lohof, 2009, p. 81.) Contrastingly many Dutch ERDs bring disadvantages for their residents as well due to unexpected problems of private or collective governing of the neighborhood. (Lohof, Reijndorp et al. 2006)

CONCLUSION:

The increase of ERDs is related to changes in society, and since these new developments in society likely remain for an unknown period, it is likely the increase continues. Therefore research on the increase of ERDs is still relevant.
LITERATURE RESEARCH

Why would people want to live in an ERD project? Already in 1998 Brandt had analysed the ‘housing demand of the Dutch elite’ in order to discover the reasons of a longing for ERDs. He pointed out ‘desired safety’, ‘exclusiveness’ and in some cases ‘a sense of community’ are causing the rise of gated communities in the Netherlands. Boelhouwer and Hoekstra recently made a report on the housing demand titled ‘New Trends in the Dutch Housing Market’. One of the three main sociocultural trends which are currently manifesting themselves on the Dutch housing market they write about is a ‘growing interest in living in communities and in common-interest housing concepts’. They believe this trend will have an important role in the future Dutch housing and that the new interest ‘will raise new dilemmas in spatial planning and housing policy and necessitate a different way of thinking.’ (Boelhouwer and Hoekstra, 2009, p.2)

Lohof (2007) explains that privately governed domains offer a wide range of residential surroundings to different target groups, instead of meeting the demands of the average. She also adds that people is a need for collective spaces. Motivations of residents to enter ERDs in the Netherlands differs per project, especially for thematic housing projects. After a recently made small qualitative research on ERDs, Eshuis and Klijn (Bagaeen and Uduku 2009; Eshuis, Klijn et al. 2011) concluded that overall the main reason to move is not safety but a pleasant environment based on the quality of open and green spaces or quietness. Likewise Hamers (2007) explains that feelings of security is a main reason to move and that real safety issues are not. Therefore most of the ERDs are physically enclosed but not inaccesible.

MEDIA ANALYSIS UTRECHT AND THE HAGUE

To analyse more specifically the reason ERD’s are wanted in Utrecht and the Hague a media analysis of the advertisements of real estate agents is made. This method is not common in urban design or planning. It is a systematical way of analysing texts in order to say something about the terms used. In this research, the words analysed had to do with the qualities of the projects sold (besides the qualities of the house itself). Literature research became the basis of indicators of qualities of the enclosed housing domains.

Many guidebooks are written about this method, of which Classical Content Analysis: a Review is one. As we are not taught in this matter, a simple version of such a method is used, explained to me by a PhD researcher from the faculty of Social Sciences of the Erasmus University Rotterdam. First step is to set out ‘codes’. Codes are groups of themes you expect to read in the text, themes you need to find to draw conclusions.

For example, literature research related the popularity of the Dutch ERD’s to ‘sense of security’, so sentences like ‘a safe home’ would than count as one term used under the code ‘sense of security’. A difficulty is the insight you get while reading. To prevent using codes incorrect, it is best to start with a detailed coding and put together codes in the end. In this way terms different real estate agents use to sell different projects could be compared numerical. If, for example ‘parking facilities’ or ‘child friendly’ is more used in Utrecht and ‘security’ and ‘identity’ are more used in advertisements for projects in the Hague a relation could be made with the spatial analysis.

The projects are selected because of the location. Haegsch hof in the design area and Vondelparc and Mariaplaats of a comparable urban location in a comparable Dutch town seize. Besides that the availability of multiple advertisements per project was necessary. Approximately 15 advertisements are analysed.

---

CONCLUSION

The value of ERDs according to real estate agents is not safety (not mentioned at all) but the terms used in the scheme below. This states the conclusion that the Dutch case differs from the research on gated communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identiteit/herkenbaarheid</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemeenschappelijkheid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veiligheid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maatschappelijke onzekerheid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beperken overlast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontevredenheid huidige woonopgeving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slechte wijken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afscherming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geborgenheid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedrag buurtbewoners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectuurstijl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groenvoorziening</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autovrij</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindvrijwijk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leefstijldifferentiatie / sociale homogeniteit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigendomsituatie</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwaliteit/comfort woning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedenbouwkundig plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woningtypologie</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonlasten</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woningwaarde</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwbouw</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parkeervoorziening</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hoogwaardige) binnenruimte</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status / uitstraling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doelgroep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonfunctie / woonbuurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voorzieningen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activiteiten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bereikbaarheid ongedefinieerd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ligging tov stadscentrum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ligging tov stad</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatie met omliggende buurten</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatie met stad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levendigheid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Staafdiagram)
2.3 EFFECTS ON THE PUBLIC REALM OF A CITY

Designers must be aware of the impact of privatised space on the public realm of the city. In order to relate social, juridical and spatial properties of ERDs to future urban design, the following research question is answered with literature research:

What are the assumed effects on the public realm of Dutch cities caused by ERDs?

If more and more ERDs appear in Dutch cities, what major changes could appear? Some policy makers and scholars fear a division between luxurious enclaves for the rich and the left-over public space for the rest. One of these is Maarten Hajer who warned us for ‘monocultural enclaves’ in the Netherlands already in the 90s, analysing a retreat of citizens in enclosed private domains. Another opponent of ERDs is the Belgian philosopher Lieven de Cauter, who wrote a book on ‘cellulair cities’ as a result of the increasing ‘capsulair society’. De Cauter expects ‘capsules’ to make public domain disappear, a development he reflects as an undesirable social consequence of capsular urban design and architecture. (Cauter, 2009) In general, one can also say that ‘gated communities are no better or worse than society as a whole in producing a strong sense of community.’ (Blakely and Snyder, 1999 quoted in Aalbers, 2001)

Boelhouwer and Hoekstra (2009, p.13) share the fear and state ‘enclosed housing domains could easily lead to exclusion and spatial segregation’ but they add a contradictory possible positive effect. they state that ERDs can ‘help to keep families with children in the city’ or even build ‘a more integrated society’ by establishing projects which ‘enable like-minded people to live together within a larger socio-economically and ethnically mixed district’. This means lifestyle based projects could help regenerating deprived city districts and therefore solve issues in urban planning. ERDs can be a way of maintaining or even attracting desired target groups to the (inner) city.

Public space is a dominant structuring element of Dutch urban design. Therefore the exact impact of privatisation of space on Dutch cities due to ERDs is an interesting topic for many researchers. The role of public domain as part of the social cohesion of a city depends on the point of view on the function of public space for the public. Hamers and Tennkes (2008) take three points of view on public domain into account to explain to impact of ERDs. Two of these points of view are normative political theories dominating the discussion about ERDs in the Netherlands: the liberal perspective and the republican perspective. The third point of view is a sociological perspective to understand the relation of public domain with behaviour of citizens.

From a liberal normative-political point of view, public space is part of the public domain as a necessary part of the distinction between private and public. The government rules the public domain instead of the citizens for efficiency reasons and therefore interaction in the public space is set by rules. In this perspective, privatisation of the public domain is the privatisation of liabilities. ‘Club goods’ or ‘club economy’ are terms borrowed from economic researches, oftenly used in researches on ERDs worldwide. In short, club goods are goods paid by a group and reserved for the same group. If one does not pay, using the goods is not allowed. (La Guix and Webster, 2006; Glasze et al. 2006) In a privately governed ERDs, home owner associations take care of neighbourhood and residents also have to pay tax to this association. Private governance adds a layer of policy between individual citizenship and the municipality. Reijndorp and Lohof (2006) show that private governing in the Netherlands still is in its infancy. From the liberal perspective, a possible advantage of privately governed housing is the self-regulation.

The republican point of view makes public space the domain of dealing with conflicts, organising solidarity and giving identity. Hamers and Tennkes identify the view of Hajer and Reijndorp as republican, because of their ideas on the public domain as an extension of public space. The public domain requires display and exchange of ideas, backgrounds and preferences and this will cause a domain of surprise and reflection. Public space is not always the location of the interaction of citizens (anymore), citizens choose who to interact with and where. Local interaction is no longer needed due to new media. Enclosed living, in other words a decrease of public space, does not necessarily imply a decrease of the public domain in this perspective. In case homogeneity of neighbourhood and a decrease of public space implies a decrease of confrontation possibilities it has a negative effect on the public domain. In the republican perspective ERDs can even increase the public domain by adding possibilities for identification and increasing open discussions in and between homogeneous communities.
And thirdly the sociological point of view which describes the public domain as a place for interaction between strangers and therefore public space is part of the public domain, contrarily to the private domain and the parochial domain. Within a parochial domain communication occurs between people of a community. Parochiality in the public domain is the expression of the identity of a group in public, which could be a positive influence on the public domain. The idea of the parochial domain gives us a different perspective than the division between private, collective and public. Lohof and Reijndorp (2007) also use the parochial domain in their research. From a sociological point of view, the ‘in between’ domain of parochiality exclusively exists when people act like a community. Therefore it is important to ascertain in what way ERDs stimulate the forming of parochies, or, in other words, are ERDs communities in a social sense? Many theories from social science can be applied to find out the commonality of ERDs, which will not be discussed in detail in this paper. From a sociological viewpoint an increase of ERDs can lead to an increase of parochiality of former public domain.

LEGAL PROPERTIES

Five forms of ownership of ERDs in the Netherlands can be found in Dutch laws (Lohof, Reijndorp et al. 2006) namely ‘appartementsrechten’, ‘mandelighheid’, ‘erfpacht op opstal’, ‘erfdienstbaarheid’ and cooperations. All forms have advantages and disadvantages. Hamers and Tennekes (2008) conclude that ownership and management is not related to the degree of closing off of an ERD. This means that analysing the layout of a project will not reveal its organizational set-up. The link between legal forms and the impact on the city is therefore irrelevant.

SPATIAL PROPERTIES

Spatial differences in Dutch cities caused by ERDs can have advantages and disadvantages. Changes of travel behaviour within the city due to few access points in the urban network (Le Goix & Webster, 2008) are a disadvantage in case a city becomes hardly walkable due to the long distances or when the amount of possible routes decreases. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that relatively small Dutch ERD projects have less influence on travel behaviour. In addition, spatial segregation is less relevant because of its open structure. (Lohof, 2009) On the other hand, the empirical research of Lohof and Hamers showed the Dutch ERD projects have typologies such as cul-de-sac, courtyard or enclosed park. These typologies can be considered as deadend streets and pedestrian zones, which undoubtedly have their effects on the urban network, especially when these typologies would be increasing in the same area. In case the project itself has a low-density road network and few access points to the public environment, the distances to the outside world increases and therefore the use of cars will increase for sure. (Lohof et al., 2006) Another possible for its residents is the difficult entrance for police and emergency services. (Aalbers, 2001) Time-varying gating of ERD projects enhances flexibility in accessibility. Closing a gate can transform an ERD from a public park in a gated community every minute. Some effects of gated projects can therefore be time-varying too. An important remark not mentioned in the reports consulted.

The causes and effects of ERDs in the Netherlands are various. From the legal point of view, ways of governing ERDs can have disadvantages for residents of ERDs, but the link with effects on the public domain is undefined. From a spatial point of view, ERDs can influence travel behaviour and accessibility of the public domain, possibly as a time-varying effect. Furthermore, the global spread theory can be considered as not applicable, since ERDs are possibly in line with Dutch urban design traditions. From a social point of view, the normative-political or sociological perspective taken defines the impact on the public domain. In a liberal perspective, the self-management is an advantage of privately governed ERDs. In a republican perspective, ERDs can have a positive effect in case ERDs create possibilities for identification of groups and individuals. In addition, ERDs will have a negative effect in case homogeneity and a decrease of public space decreases the total amount of possibilities to interact and deal with conflicts. The sociological perspective draws the same conclusions as the republican perspective, adding the forming of social parochies as a necessary condition.

CONCLUSION

Based on the literature review, the following conclusions for designing Dutch inner-city ERDs can be drawn:
1) Maintain a low-density network inside and outside ERDs.
2) Use ERDs for identification of residents.
3) Avert homogeneity of neigbourhoods.
It is important for further research to distinct the different domains of an ERD. An ERD can be closed of in many ways in a juridical, social or spatial way. For instance an ERD can be privately owned, give access to the public, be cleaned by the municipality and still have a coherent social community taking care. All these different aspect determine ERDS and that gives opportunity to create different structures of ERDs.
2.5 ANALYSING THE ACCESSIBILITY DOMAIN

The first image shows a method developed by Birgit Hausleitner taken from her research on ‘design principles to approach the complexity of the urban block’. (2009)

The second image shows a method developed by David Hamers and Kersten Nabielek developed for research on Dutch ERDs. They focus on ownership combined with accessibility barriers.

The third image is made by the author in order to combine these methods and add the entrances of the houses with the domains in one image. This in order to overview the complexity of the project. The combination of methods was not yet satisfying the need on an overview on the complexity of the accessibility of ERD projects. Therefore I developed a schematic approach to ERDs.
conclusion: Starting with the analysis method of Hamers and Hausleitner resulted in a scheme instead of map with more detailed information about the barriers used in ERDs. The ideas behind these methods are later on used in a method to design the accessibility of a residential domain.
3.1 ASSIGNMENT AND LOCATION CHOICE

How to design a large scale private residential area in an urban area in the Netherlands considering its effects for both residents and the public? The assignment therefore starts with an urban area which is assumed to be privatised. The value for the public increases in case the area has a dense network of accessible spaces and routes, the addition of identity of the residents to public space and diversity of the living environment and inhabitants.

A designer influences the spatial and juridical parts of an ERD. The research will focus on the built environment by taking the ownership and accessibility into account. Ownership is the starting point, since the increase of privatisation of an area is the Accessibility is taken into account because of its spatial consequences for the design, but therefore the assumption is made about the wishes of the future communities in the area.

Location choice is based on several choices. The area is an inner city area with residential function. In and around the area are private (residential) domains which makes an increase more likely. In its surroundings a lot of high rise puts the pressure on the developments in the area. Also the situation between the two main stations of the city (Holland Spoor en Centraal) makes the area wanted. At the moment the status of the neighbourhood is poor. The municipality has plans to densify the borders of the area. In addition, the municipality and a housing corporation, together they are owner of 60% of the housing stock, wish to refresh the housing stock with other types of living environments. With the upgrade of the status of station area Holland Spoor and the future plans for the area Binckhorst south of the area makes it likely that the area urbanises due to an increase of residents and commuters around all sides of the area. The seize of the location is

The location is surrounded by high rise buildings, of which the buildings ‘Strijkijzer’ and the Kroon recently build. In the image all buildings taller than 50 meters in the area are shown. The length of the image is in proportion to the real height of the building. Besides these plans, more high rise in the area is to be expected. The maximum allowed building height increased in and around the project location.
If the ownership domain changes due to privitisation, how will the accessibility and built environment change?

Design location Rivierenbuurt the Hague
3.2 BUILT ENVIRONMENT

ACCESSIBILITY AND DENSITY > TYPOLOGY

Accessibility is one of the properties of ERDs defining their impact on the city by transforming the urban network. Density is an important feature for developing different types of living environments by integrating different building typologies and open spaces. Both have an impact on the built environment. To chose a scenario, 4 models are made with the distinction of two exaggerated choices for high or low accessibility (X-axis) and a high or low density (Y-axis). The models are a first guess of what typologies then will rise and what sort of spaces will appear.

**High Density (FSI)**
- Much Public Accessible Space
- Narrow streets, narrow and courtyard of 6 floors
- Little public squares in between
- Water as possibility to decrease public spaces
- Existing collective spaces remain
- Some people want to take care of a garden / private open space; some people don't
- Differentiation of living qualities per courtyard

**Low Density (FSI)**
- Less Public Accessible Space
- Passages public domain, privately owned during daytime
- Narrow streets, narrow and courtyard of 6 floors
- Public domain, public passage but private street
- Water as possibility to decrease public spaces
- Existing collective spaces remain
- Some people want to take care of a garden / private open space; some people don't
- Differentiation of living qualities per courtyard

**High Public Accessible Space**
- Passages public domain, privately owned during daytime
- Narrow streets, narrow and courtyard of 6 floors
- Public domain, public passage but private street
- Water as possibility to decrease public spaces
- Existing collective spaces remain
- Some people want to take care of a garden / private open space; some people don't
- Differentiation of living qualities per courtyard

**Low Public Accessible Space**
- Passages public domain, privately owned during daytime
- Narrow streets, narrow and courtyard of 6 floors
- Public domain, public passage but private street
- Water as possibility to decrease public spaces
- Existing collective spaces remain
- Some people want to take care of a garden / private open space; some people don't
- Differentiation of living qualities per courtyard
FSI - OSR - GSI calculations of the four models and the existing area concluded that the low density typologie without public space is as dense as the current density of the neighbourhood. It seems that increasing the density of the neighbourhood is easy with private domains. The design will point out the density of a more detailed plan.

This raised the question what the relevance of the calculations is. A side path taken is the development of an addition to spacemate calculations based on the number of public accessible space in relation to other open space. This index number says something about the likely liveliness on the public streets. Also the relation to private spaces can say something about the quality of the living environment and used typologies. This method is not

New calculation method for ERDs adding the division between accessible open space and non accessible open space.
ACCESSIBILITY INCREASES TOWARDS THE CITY CENTRE

Density increases towards Central Station

The area will not be one private neighbourhood, but consists out of several ERD projects. This assumption is more likely to happen in a transformation period with the help of several private actors. A consequence of this is the need to maintain some public roads, owned by the municipality. Which ones depends on the context of the location.
Their are seven private sites in the neighbourhood. Per field different accessibility and relation to its surroundings provides possibilities for diversity in the neighbourhood which is one of the main goals of the design.

The connection of the surrounding areas have influence on the maintenance of the public roads. The canal is a reference point for the entire city and the road along it will be accessible. The main road of the area will remain in order to reduce costs for the existing utilities, sewege and infrastructure.
The desired accessibility in the area. This drawing method displays ownership, pedestrian routes, public car routes, and urban programme.

Drawing method displaying ownership, pedestrian routes, places and barriers or attractive points.
MATCHING THE ACCESSIBILITY PLAN WITH THE EXISTING BUILT ENVIRONMENT

- passer-by
- visitor
- private / dwellers
- cars -public
- cars -collective
- cars -collective - underground / inside
- barriers before entrance
- make attractive to enter
MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS

3.4 FINAL DESIGN

REPLACE WITH FINAL DESIGN IN 3D
THE PUBLIC STRUCTURES
1. Living street designed by residents. (wolvenhof, Utrecht)

The biggest challenge of this block is the conflict between a crossing of walking routes and maintaining a quality for residents. Residents should want to own it only when they benefit from it. By closing a street a living environment is created. (1) To create the network a short cut in a block is made. (2)
Accessibility

1. Heigth differences

2. Heigth differences
This blocks deals with a large infrastructure and building blocking routes and sight in the north. At the moment people rather avoid the area, so to create the desired accessibility and connections in the area an attractive area is necessary. One of the changes is the lifting of the street level in the north. (2) above the entrances of the parking garages. Also a breakthrough in the existing buildings along the canal provide an attractive route through block 3 to the central station. This area has high potentials for urban living with voids in the area pleasant to live as the images show. A parking garage will be the basis of this plan, therefore the area should be developed in once.
The challenge of this block is giving access to a high quality park/square area in the high rise dwelling and office area. This without creating a public space the owners do not want to maintain. The solution is a time varying accessible park with an always accessible route above it. During office hours the park could be open. The area gives opportunity for some shops, restaurants or services to be located.
The main challenge of this block was to create a shortcut to Hollands Spoor for nonresidents walking from the north and residents of the neighbourhood. This is done by dividing the area into an urban square courtyard and a park typology inside. (2) Other challenges were the closing of the existing streets while maintaining almost all of the existing buildings along the main road and the change of the canal street into a private and accessible area. This is done by positioning new urban blocks to block the old routes.
1. The existing water area will be transformed to a new heart of the neighbourhood, accessible space. The area will be connected to the north side with a bridge for cyclist and pedestrians.

2. For the new private space the existing urban structure is used. Adaptations to the streets should mark the differences with public space. Owning the space means residents will get more rights in the public space, collectively or per household.

3. New housing can adapt to the situation by use-varying openness of houses on streetlevel. f.e. as at Borneokade Amsterdam

The main challenge was to adapt to the existence of a recently built ERD project by Rob Krier dominating the structure of this area. The decision to maintain this had a major influence on the connection of the urban network of the surrounding neighbourhoods. This is solved by transforming the public space with small scale projects (2)(3)
Accessibility

1. The inner area probably will be a fusion of initiatives taken by different collectives surrounding the park and in the end of the caretakers of the central area.

It is up to collectives to add a collective space in their own property. This adds initiatives available for others and could make the inner area more lively. Although participation is wanted here, the process of demolishing and controlling still has to be regulated by the municipality first.

2. Playground surrounded by housing attached to a collective park. (Massena neighbourhood, Paris)
The main challenge for this area was to create a separated quality for the residents of the block, adding a different quality to the urban plan in order to provide diversity. For the residents this area gives opportunity to develop small scale projects and cooperate for a collectively owned space inaccessible for the public. The downside is that the area does not have qualities for the public. Only for the ones using facilities such as a school or office might get access to the space giving quality to the area. In this area it is up to the municipality or other project manager to inspire investors in the area.

3. The presence of a school surrounded by (green) collective space gives opportunities for educational purposes.

4. The diversity of the surrounding block gives opportunity for an office or light industry to settle in this area and even to use the park. Preferably only plots from the public street are used because of the maintenance of social control after working hours.
1. The collective green area at the back of all the houses is an example of an investment of an real estate development with a core quality. The area could be a park comparable to Notting Hill residential parks. The houseowners have to pay for the maintenance of the area.

2. The inside could be anything what the residents want, a forest, a little Disneyland or a little ‘country’. (social housing Renzo Piano, Paris city centre)

3. A view on the different inside world adds quality to the public space, although not always accessible spaces are visible. It gives opportunities for stating identity.
4. Urban villas and dense housing projects create several collective spaces.

5. Adding a private park to the public space while maintaining the control of the neighbours needs a precise study on scale and use of such an area. If it succeeds it is a great opportunity to add quality to public streets by showing identity and use of private space.

The main challenge for this area was the lack of people passing by and therefore the absence of needs for the public. The main quality of this area will be the street profile sharing the live in the private areas. The area does not need to have accessible space but still is able to show some beautiful scenes. This area is like a painting, nice to look at although you do not own it. The seize of the area is remarkable, the biggest field of the urban design. Regulations on the area still have to provide the different qualities added and totally different worlds consisting out of totally different urban forms appear it is no problem. As long as the livability on the public streets is enhanced.
OVERVIEW ACCESSIBLE SPACES
3.5 PROJECT REALISATION: INITIATORS

Large scale project:
- Public private cooperation
- Real estate developer

Intermediate
- Private homeowner association
- Companies

Small scale projects:
- Private individuals
The ‘quality monitor tool’ developed during the research phase is now used to compare the design with existing ERDs. (see p.48) Goal of this quality monitor is a way to visualise the underlying qualities for the residents and the public as an overview on all the conclusions drawn in the research done.

First conclusions are that most of the blocks score a higher quality rate. Still, recommendations for changes in the design could be drawn by updating the quality monitor tool. The quality monitor as a tool is able to pass on most of the data gathered during the project to others. Relating the steps of this monitor to spatial possibilities and reference projects helps others to understand the subject better. (see p. 49)

The last step in this project is passing on the knowledge gathered during the project aiming at urban designers. This will be done by improving the visual quality of the design, updating the quality monitor with the recent conclusions of the research and editing the thesis.

The conclusion of this entire research is: ERDs can be of an added value for both the public and the public in a Dutch city in one urban plan by integrating the qualities for both. The quality is related to design choices and these choices are related to research on the effects for residents and the public realm. Final product is a design method to enhance the quality of large scale ERD environments. A scale not yet seen in the Netherlands.
Quality measuring of the inner space (my opinion)
Range: -2 really bad –1 very bad 0 not better or worse than usual 1 good 2 really good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th>Block 5</th>
<th>Block 6</th>
<th>Block 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it accessible?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the parking problem solved inside the project?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the quality of the design/furniture?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the quality of the green?*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it a place to stay for you?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you control meeting inhabitants?</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it add quality to the public space outside</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open architecture/urban design (instead of defensive)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there facilities located for your purpose?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal non dwellers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,56</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0,33</td>
<td>-0,44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* if not accessible -2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>dwellers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it a place to stay for you?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private outdoor space for you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you control meeting strangers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it stimulate meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you control meeting neighbours? Privacy of dwellings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the quality of the green?*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there collective facilities besides parking places?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>0,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it feel safe and secure for you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it feel safe and secure for kids?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal dwellers:</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality monitor: analysis + design
Aalbers, M. (2001). The double function of gate
Social inclusion and exclusion in gated
communities and security zones. EUREX.
Amsterdam, De Rooij.

Bagaeen, S. and O. Uduku (2009). The Urban Form
of Inner City Gated Communities: the
Links with and Implications for the
Debates Surrounding Social Sustainability.
The 5th International Conference of the
Research Network Private Urban
Governance & Gated Communities.
Santiago de Chile: 17-18.

Bailey, N. and T. Manzi (2010). Governing through
Community? A Comparative Study of
Changing Management Practices in Mixed
Tenure Housing Development.
Comparative Housing Research –
Approaches and Challenges in a New
International Era. TU Delft, Netherlands,
University of Westminster Eprints.

in the Dutch Housing Market. Delft
University of Technology / OTB Research
Institute.

Over de stad in het tijdperk van angst, NAI
Publishers.

Dam, R. v., J. Eshuis, et al. (2005). Closed
Communities. Een verkennend onderzoek
naar geslotenheid van gemeenschappen in
Nederland, Wageningen Universiteit en
Researchcentra.

beheerde woondomeinen: beloftevol of
beangstigend fenomeen?” Beleid en
Maatschappij, 38, 1.

cities: global and local perspectives. Oxon,
Routledge.

beperkt publiek. De effecten van besloten
wooncomplexen op het publieke domein in
Nederland.”,KRISIS, 2, 18-36.

communities, sustainable cities and a
tragedy of the urban commons.” Critical
Planning, 13.

Communities.” Geography Compass, 2010.

en de veranderende verhouding tussen

Space within a Public Society. 5th
International Conference of the Research
Network Private Urban Governance &
Gated Communities. Santiago de Chile: 81

beheerde woondomeinen in Nederland.
Rotterdam, NAI Uitgevers.

Exclusion in The Netherlands. The 5th
International Conference of the Research
Network Private Urban Governance &
Gated Communities. G. G. e. al. Santiago
de Chile: 80.