"Us up here and them down there": how design, management and neighborhood facilities shape social distance in a mixed-tenure housing development

Anouk K. Tersteeg & Fenne M. Pinkster

Abstract

Despite the fact that social mix is an essential component of urban policies in Western Europe, it remains unclear at what spatial scale housing diversification programs may be most effective. When people with different backgrounds, household compositions and lifestyles live in close proximity to one another, the emergence of close social ties is not always guaranteed. On the one hand, living in socially mixed environments may create bridges between residents of different social positions. On the other hand, it can lead to processes of social distancing and reproduce negative stereotypes. This paper aims to provide insight in how these diverging experiences of social closeness or distance relate to place-specific features such as housing design, management practices and the structure of local facilities. Lessons are drawn from a qualitative study on resident experiences of living with difference in a fine-grained mixed-tenure development in a newly built neighborhood in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Keywords: social mix, tenure-mix, resident perceptions, social distance

Introduction

Despite a wealth of literature on social mix it remains unclear at what spatial scale social mix may be effective (Andersson and Musterd 2010; Arthurson 2010; Galster 2012; Sautkina et al. 2012). Most studies on housing diversification focus on the effectiveness of mixed-income housing at the neighborhood or community level. Fewer studies investigate how different tenant groups experience living together at a micro-scale (Chaskin et al. 2012; Chaskin and Joseph 2013; Stokoe 2006) and even fewer studies focus on the place-specific features that may influence these experiences. Yet, fine-grained mix, sometimes referred to as pepper-potting, has become a widely practiced housing policy strategy in Western European cities today.

When people with different social positions live in close proximity to one another and encounter each other on a daily basis, positive experiences of the "other" are not always guaranteed (Valentine 2008). Living with difference can lead to the situation where tenure groups live parallel lives (Atkinson and Kintrea 2000), develop dissocial attitudes (Chaskin and Joseph 2013), or even come into conflict (Graves 2010). However, under certain circumstances convenient experiences of social closeness may occur (Kearns et al. 2013). Indeed, the coincidence of physical closeness and social distance can result in complicated and contradictory social processes (Crow et al. 2002). In order to understand these diverging findings of fine-grained mix, it is essential to study the ways in which context- or place-specific factors influence the nature of resident interactions and experiences (Bailey and Manzi 2008). Yet in-depth evidence on resident perspectives of living in socially mixed neighborhoods is relatively scarce. Therefore, this study examines to what degree residents experience social closeness and distance in a newly built fine-grained mixed-tenure housing development.

The study builds on Bourdieu's (1985) conceptualization of social distance, focusing on the extent to which people feel different from others in terms of behavior, norms and tastes and other individual attributes, and how they assess or evaluate these differences. Bourdieu (1985, p. 730) argues that differences only lead to social distances when they are perceived as "significant" distinctions in lifestyles. For example, the distinction between owner-occupiers and renters in a housing development may become meaningful when the former agree that the latter cause more noise nuisance. Nevertheless, social differences amongst residents do not have to be a problem per se. Some may be observed neutrally or experienced in a positive way, while others are more decisive in determining social boundaries. Distinct social groups emerge when people acknowledge and agree that a particular social difference is significant to them, leading to processes of othering. Moreover, as several studies in mixed neighborhoods have also shown (August 2014; Chaskin and Joseph 2013; Fraser et al. 2013; Jackson and Benson 2014), in these subjective processes of boundary drawing, symbolic power differences between social groups may become apparent when some ways of defining, organizing and using the shared space are legitimized over others (Bourdieu 1989).

The main aim of the paper is to understand how resident experiences of living in mixed housing developments are related to place-specific factors such as housing design, management practices and local facilities and amenities which create additional opportunities for everyday encounters and interactions. The role of the physical context and its interaction with the institutional context remain under theorized in debates on the effectiveness of social mix. By bringing

together Bourdieu's theory on social boundary drawing and a design perspective, this paper however illustrates that residents in mixed-tenure settings use both demographic and physical and institutional contextual markers to draw social boundaries between resident groups.

We focus on design, management and local facilities in particular, because these features form important elements in Dutch place-making strategies. In the Netherlands, tenure-mix is not only a key planning strategy in area-based interventions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, but also in the construction of new neighborhoods. This study therefore focuses on a mixed-tenure apartment complex in the newly developed neighborhood of IJburg in Amsterdam, which was planned and designed to be a "neighborhood without borders". Here, neighbor relations were thought to be constructed afresh rather than reflecting the existing in- and out-group configurations and territorial stigma found in disadvantaged neighborhoods, where most empirical evidence on experiences of social mix originates.

The next section provides an overview of existing evidence on living with difference in mixed-tenure projects and discusses a number of place-specific factors which seem to influence resident experiences of social distance such as housing design, management and neighborhood facilities and amenities. Then the research context and methodology are discussed. The findings show that - despite policy intentions – the reality of living in IJburg is far removed from idealized "neighborhood without borders". Although tenure groups in the examined building have a relatively similar socioeconomic background, residents perceive strong social distances between fellow residents. Negative encounters are related to problems in the design of the building and unequal power relations in terms of management of the apartment complex and the social boundaries that are drawn within the housing complex are further enhanced by segregated use of neighborhood facilities and amenities.

Living with differences in fine-grained tenure-mix

Empirical evidence on resident interactions in fine-grained mixed-tenure housing developments is relatively limited and these studies report diverging outcomes on resident experiences of living with difference. Many studies on social interaction between residents in fine-grained tenure-mixed housing developments describe these relations as socially tectonic (after Butler and Robson 2001), whereby residents of different backgrounds live together in close proximity without interacting much. For example, a recent case study of social cohesion among residents of a new mixed-income development in Milan finds that residents feel more socially close when they live among residents with similar tenures and lifestyles (Mugnano and Palvarini 2013). Atkinson and Kintrea (2000) also find that owners and renters in a mixed-tenure development largely reside in different life worlds, partly due to the fact that the daily activity patterns of renters are more local than those of owners. A study by Tach (2009, p. 291) in a Hope VI mixed-tenure development in Boston even finds that higher-income groups "actively resisted the formation of social ties with their neighbors and adopted daily routines that minimized their own and their children's contact with neighbors and neighborhood spaces".

Other studies find that housing residents with diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, interests and needs together resulted in significant tensions or even overt conflicts between residents, which reproduce negative stereotypes

between tenure groups. For example, Graves (2010) describes conflicts between subsidized and market-rate residents in a mixed-income housing community in Boston over parental management strategies and sounds of children's play in shared outdoor spaces. A study by Stokoe (2006) on public intimacy in neighbor relationships demonstrates that social tensions between neighbors often occur over visual and audio nuisance that transcends the shared boundaries of domestic properties. Such conflicts are often related to differences in lifestyles. Davidson (2012) notes that the experience of social distance between residents may be (re)produced through everyday practices, which reflect more fundamental differences in socio-cultural dispositions or habitus (Bourdieu 1989). Observed differences in use of both private and collective spaces in fine-grained mix housing developments may therefore result in residents clearly positioning themselves vis-à-vis the "other" as they construct their own identity (Davidson 2010; Jackson and Butler 2014; Jackson and Benson 2014).

In contrast, a few studies show that fine-grained mix can also foster social closeness between residents of different tenure positions. A comparative study by Kearns et al. (2013) of resident perceptions of social mix in three mixed-tenure settings in Glasgow finds that residents in a setting of fine-grained tenure-mix are more positive about tenure-mix and report more social interaction with other tenure groups, rather than in other types of tenure-mix neighborhoods. Kleit (2005, p. 1439) hypothesizes that "physical integration of tenure types and income groups may be key in helping create neighbor relations among people of different tenures and incomes". Similarly, Galster (2012) and Jupp (1999) suggest that fine-grained mix can prevent processes of stigmatization between privileged and more disadvantaged resident groups that are witnessed in studies of tenure-mix at higher levels of scales because residents interact most often and most positively with direct neighbors.

Housing design
These diverging ideas about and social outcomes of fine-grained tenure-mix may be related to a number of place-specific features that can influence resident interactions. First, several studies suggest that housing design may influence the way in which residents of different social backgrounds experience living together in close proximity. Different aspects of design are thought to be important. One is design coherence of the housing units, which can reduce observable differences between different tenures and thereby positively contribute to bridging social divides (Groves et al. 2003; Norris 2006; Roberts 2007). A coherent design may overcome stigma as it "accentuate[s] similarities between residents rather than differences" (Arthurson 2013, p. 437). This can reduce tenant prejudice about other tenure groups (Casey et al. 2007; Kearns et al. 2013).

Another design element that can influence resident experiences of "others" in their apartment building is the way in which privacy and proximity are balanced (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Joseph 2008). For example, Stokoe (2006) describes how visual and audio nuisance, which transcends resident norms on privacy, generates negative experiences of "other" neighbors. Van Eijk (2011) argues that clear boundaries between "in" and "out" of the home – by way of walls, doors and fences - are important for neighbor relations, which often develop in shared spaces outside the private home. The boundaries are important because "neighbour relations are bound up with the (unchosen) spatial proximity of neighbours and the need for privacy in one's home that follows from this

proximity" (Van Eijk 2011, p. 6). Finally, other researchers have emphasized the importance of a "comfortable shared environment among residents of […] different backgrounds" (Chaskin and Joseph 2010, p. 316) for developing positive perceptions between residents of different backgrounds. In several studies it is argued that shared spaces – parking lots, footpaths and corridors - can encourage informal positive interactions between residents with different backgrounds (Tunstall and Fenton 2006). For example, Joseph (2008, p. 252) argues that positive experiences between residents can occur "where proximity affords repeated interactions or the identification of shared needs and common interests […]". Nevertheless, behavioral differences can cause disputes over appropriate uses of the shared residential environment as well for example over unauthorized garbage disposal (Buys 2009). Recent studies on social outcomes of fine-grained mix show that conflicting expectations on the uses of shared spaces in mixed-tenure developments often generate tensions between owner and renter groups (Chaskin and Joseph 2013; Lelevrier 2013).

Management practices
A second factor that may influence residents' perceptions of other tenant groups is the way in which mixed-tenure developments are managed. For example, several studies show that residents negatively experience living in tenure-mix housing when project managers do not provide correct information beforehand about the social structure of the project. In a study on mixed-tenure estates in Ireland, owners felt they had been given misleading information on the nature of the project prior to purchase (Norris 2006): they were told about the existence of social renters after paying a deposit. Also, they were incorrectly told that renters would be handpicked and their behaviors strictly monitored. However, in cases where purchasers have to be misled into believing they will live in a more socially homogenous environment than is really the case, Bretherton and Pleace (2011, p. 3442) note that "questions arise about both the ethics and the effectiveness of what is actually an attempt at spatial social "integration" by stealth". In order to foster positive experiences of difference all resident groups need to be prepared for what they can expect. According to Buys (2009), involving both owners and renters in the early development phases of a project, and guiding them in their early interactions with (future) neighbors can decrease social distances between the resident groups.
In addition, experiences of social distance may be influenced by the degree to and ways in which the everyday use of shared spaces is regulated. Rules that are suppressing and discriminating particular ways of doing and being within the housing development can exacerbate social divides between different tenure groups (Fraser et al. 2013; McCormick et al. 2012; Rosenbaum et al. 1998). For example, Graves (2010) illustrates how regulations favored market-rate owners and renters by restricting outdoor playing of the children of public renter in a mixed-income community in Boston. August (2014) found that middle-classes in mixed-income neighborhoods in Toronto are better able to translate their interests into formal regulations and thereby impose their preferences about the use of space onto other resident groups. Yet, good management practices can also provide conditions for positive experiences and social closeness (Bailey and Manzi 2008). For example, Mugnano and Palvarini (2013) show that empowering vulnerable social groups in the management of mixed-tenure housing developments can decrease social distances between residents, particularly when this happens on a voluntary basis, allowing residents to choose not to

participate. Similarly, Chaskin and Joseph (2010, p. 312) state that social distances between tenants can be decreased by "creating or supporting various participatory mechanisms for planning, decision-making, and governance; shaping a range of community events; and establishing different kinds of projects meant to incorporate a broad range of resident participation in concrete activities". Inclusive management practices, in which all residents can participate equally and experience equal rights, are therefore found to be crucial for overcoming tensions between tenure groups. At the same time, social differences between residents and unequal power dynamics between owners and public housing renters makes this more difficult (Tunstall and Fenton 2006; Chaskin et al. 2012).

Neighborhood facilities
Finally, resident experiences of living in mixed-tenure housing may also be influenced by the ways in which they encounter each other in the wider neighborhood (Matejskova and Leitner 2011; Nast and Blokland 2014; Roberts 2007). As Valentine (2008) notes, local facilities and amenities such as shops, day care centers, gyms, schools, playgrounds and parks, offer opportunities for intergroup contact through everyday encounters. Jupp (1999) suggests that sharing such facilities can reduce prejudices and decrease social distances between residents with different social positions. Yet sharing local services and institutions may also reproduce existing patterns of social distance in fine-grained mixed-tenure developments. For instance, when local schools are segregated along income and racial lines, bonds between neighbors with children are likely to develop along these lines as well. In contrast, through inclusive services and institutions – such as mixed local schools – diverse residents can become more acquainted (Casey et al. 2007).
Nonetheless, developing inclusive local facilities, institutions and amenities has shown to be challenging. Research in gentrifying neighborhoods shows that local services and institutions in mixed-tenure environments often represent the socio-cultural interests of residents with high levels of social, financial and cultural capital (Zukin 2010). Local amenities may become more expensive and therefore less accessible for lower-income groups. Conversely, research on social mix projects in disadvantaged neighborhoods show the opposite: new affluent residents may choose to avoid the neighborhood in their daily routines (Tach 2009; Watt 2009). So even when local services and institutions are accessible to all, resident groups may develop different everyday routines. This is most evident in studies of school segregation, whereby parents with more economic and cultural capital bring their children to White schools[1] – which are thought to provide a higher quality of education - while less advantaged parents bring their children to a neighborhood school (see also Boterman 2013; Karsten et al. 2006; Karsten 2011).

Research design and methodology

---

[1] In public and policy debates in the Netherlands, schools with high numbers of non-Western ethnic minority pupils are referred to as 'Black' schools, while schools with high numbers of native Dutch pupils are referred to as 'White' schools. Yet, 'Black' and 'White' schools do not only refer to the ethnic composition of the pupils. Rather, they are used interchangeably with 'bad' and 'deprived' schools (Boterman 2013).

To explore how residents of different tenure positions experience living together in close proximity, and how this is influenced by factors of housing design, management and local facilities, an in-depth case study was conducted in a fine-grained mixed-tenure development in the relatively new neighborhood of IJburg in Amsterdam. Social mix has been an important element in Dutch urban policies since the early 1990s (Van Kempen and Bolt 2009; Musterd and Andersson 2005). IJburg was planned as a mixed-income quarter at the end of the nineties. Under the slogan, "neighborhood without borders", the area was supposed to house people of diverse social classes, with and without disabilities (Broekhuizen et al. 2012). At the moment, it houses a total of 15,000 people of with equal groups of social renters, owners and private renters, but the area will be developed further to house 45,000 people in 10 years' time. Although IJburg comprises of 30% social housing and almost half of its residents do not have a native Dutch ethnicity, within the context of Amsterdam it has a relatively high share of native Dutch, middle-class families (Regiomonitor 2014). IJburg has many services and facilities including a large shopping center, schools, sports facilities, and cafés and restaurants. In line with planning discourses in the 1990s, these were built to satisfy the needs of individual users and not to generate cohesive communities.

The examined housing development in IJburg is a square-formed apartment complex containing 110 dwellings with a common backyard and a ten-story tower at one of its corners (see Figure 1). Of the dwellings, 40% are owner-occupied two and three-bedroom apartments. These are located on second and third floors in the low-rise section of the building. The remainder consists of social housing of which approximately 10% is reserved for disabled people, and one third for large families. Two and three-bedroom apartments for disabled people are located in two corners of the low-rise section of the building. The large families live in two-story high family apartments, located at the ground floor. These have their main entrance in the common yard. The remainder of social housing exists of two and three-bedroom apartments in the tower. Architecturally, the building was designed to prevent observable differences in tenure type and size from the outside. This fine-grained form of tenure-mixing can also be found elsewhere in IJburg.

Figure 1 about here

In-depth interviews were held with residents to capture their experiences with living with differences and social closeness and distance towards other residents. After Bourdieu (1989), the study speaks of social distance when respondents experience social differences negatively or when a large gap exists between their experiences and expectations of other resident groups. A form of theoretical sampling was used. Residents were interviewed in the different subsections of the building to ensure a range of tenure types as well as variation along other dimensions of difference such as occupational status, gender, life course and ethnic background. Sampling stopped when theoretical saturation occurred, thus when narratives started to repeat themselves (Bryman 2012). This led to 20 interviews with 21 respondents. The interviews were held in respondents' homes and lasted approximately one and a half hours. In addition to resident interviews, semi-structured interviews and a round table discussion were held with 8 neighborhood professionals including (former) project developers and managers, and housing officers. These served to contextualize and to triangulate data from the resident interviews and to gain insight in management practices and the

original design principles of the apartment complex. Data were collected in the spring and fall of 2013. Interviews were transcribed and analyzed using the software Atlas.ti.

Table 1 provides an overview of the respondents' individual characteristics. Most respondents are aged between 35 and 65 years old. About half of the respondents have children. Half of the respondents are native Dutch. Almost half of the social renters have a non-Western European ethnic background including Moroccan, Turkish, Iraqi, and Surinamese people. While the interviewed owners have relatively small household sizes part of the renters (those in the family apartments) have relatively large households including three or more children. All respondents with large households have a non-Western European ethnic background. Most respondents have medium and lower service sector jobs such as working as a nurse, taxi driver, pharmacy assistant, primary school teacher or an SME entrepreneur. Furthermore, most have relatively modal household incomes, and only three respondents have relatively high net monthly household incomes for the Dutch context (above €3000). Although the monthly income levels of households per capita are slightly higher among owners than among renters, the socioeconomic status of residents in the building is relatively similar, which is a reflection of the fact that social housing in Amsterdam is still accessible to some middle-income groups and – as of yet - not very stigmatized (Musterd 2014).

Table 1 about here

The interviews addressed respondents' perceptions of, and interactions with neighbors, as their daily routines in and outside of the neighborhood, and their attitudes towards building management and design and local facilities. During the interviews the method of narrative mapping was used (Reinders 2015). Respondents were asked to visualize on paper the housing development, the people and the places in the wider neighborhood that they talked about. During the interview a map emerged that acts as an instrument to make respondents' abstract notions of their living spaces more tangible.

Experiences of social distance between resident groups

The interviews with both residents and urban professionals in the apartment complex indicate that the planned social mix has been experienced as highly problematic and that significant social distances exist between residents. Ongoing social tensions in the building have led residents to distinguish between three groups: "downstairs" residents, "upstairs" residents and "tower" residents. "Downstairs" residents are described as large households of non-Western European ethnic background (Morocco, Suriname and Iran), with somewhat older children, living in the social rental two-story high family apartments, located at the ground floor. The "upstairs" residents are native Dutch, have relatively small households, some with young children, and live in the owner-occupied apartments that are located above the family apartments. A third group of residents "in the tower" have diverse ethnic backgrounds (Western and non-Western), relatively small households, some with young children, and live in two-bedroom social rental apartments in the high-rise corner building. This group is seen as somewhat similar to the "downstairs" residents in terms of tenure and ethnic background, but is more like "upstairs" residents in terms of

household size and the age of children. Nevertheless, this group is less the subject of social tensions because of their more distant location in the tower. Underlining the pervasiveness of the social boundaries between the three resident groups, respondents refer to their spatial distribution in the building on their narrative maps, when discussing differences between residents in their stories (see Figure 2). For example, when asked to describe the residents in the building John says:

I think the owners are just, like me, average, just normal people […]. And the renters are in general young families, often of foreign descent, actually, only of foreign descent, no White people downstairs. In the tower are apartments [with] a similar size as this [apartment]. There are fewer families in there [the tower]: the apartments only have two bedrooms. The tower is quite mixed. It is all social rent, but White people live there as well. [Instead], downstairs, [floor] one and two […] that is all foreigners. That have multiple children (owner-occupied upstairs apartment, native Dutch, single).

Figure 2 about here

The three resident groups are said not to interact. Respondents explain how they live in different life worlds and miss a connection. For example, Meriam says:

Almost all [residents] downstairs are foreigners. Almost all [residents] upstairs are Dutch. They are totally different. I cannot get used to them. […] And, I feel that [the residents from] the upstairs houses do not like me (social rental downstairs family apartment, non-Western background, couple with three children).

Furthermore, respondents describe the other residents groups in negative ways. Similar to the studies of Chaskin and Joseph and Graves, they often use normative words to express their discontent. For instance, several upstairs and tower residents refer to downstairs residents as "those problem families", or as "anti-social foreigners". Vice versa, Harriett (social rental downstairs family apartment, non-Western background, lives with two sons, daughter in law and two grandchildren) refers to her upstairs neighbors as "the-terrible-people". Communication with people from other resident groups is mostly experienced as unpleasant, particularly between upstairs and tower residents who are native Dutch and downstairs residents of non-Western ethnic background. Several respondents discuss how the groups regularly yell at one another, often between "upstairs" and "downstairs", reconfirming the perceived divides between the groups. According to Marlene, at times:

The conflict became so intense and there was so much aggression between one another. The owners accused the downstairs renters of many things and in their turn the renters were yelling many things to the owners (social rental apartment in tower, non-Dutch Western background, single).

Housing design

Several aspects of the building design were found to facilitate the evidenced social distances between the three resident groups. First, the allocation and distribution of different tenure types within the development contribute to the construction of social groups. The family apartments on the ground floor are only occupied by social renters, who all have a non-Western ethnic background. In

contrast, owner-occupied dwellings are located on higher floors. Both aspects make it easy for respondents to perceive the dwellings and their inhabitants as a distinctive group (Arthurson 2013; Groves et al. 2003; Roberts 2007). Indeed, Sue says:

There are many foreign people in the houses downstairs, and more of the actually high educated Dutch people at the upper floors. Personally, I would say: mix it all up. [...] Otherwise, there will always be that difference (social rental apartment in tower, native Dutch, single parent with two children).

Likewise, Meriam says:

[These are] all large families down here. I do not find it a smart design. They all have five rooms down here. Of course at least five people will come to live there. [...] That is a lot. They planned it this way.

An interviewed housing officer stated that in this development owners literally look down on renters with a family apartment, preventing the two to develop healthy neighbor relationships.

Second, respondents' stories show that in their experience the building's design does not secure a proper balance between privacy and proximity. A main source of tension among resident groups is the outdoor play of children of downstairs residents who are playing in the common yard. Upstairs and tower residents with a Dutch or other Western European ethnicity find that the children make too much noise when playing in the yard, particularly in the summer. The children are said to destroy the garden and other parts of the development with their play, and to play rough with one another. Some upstairs residents visualize their experiences on their narrative maps. For example, Figure 3 shows one of Anna (owner-occupied upstairs apartment, native Dutch, single parent with two children) and illustrates the noise and rough play of children of renters in the common yard.

Figure 3 about here

Echoing findings of Chaskin, Sichling and Joseph (2013), the noise, vandalism and rough play are thought to be the result of a lack of supervision of the mothers of these children. For instance, according to Anna:

Many children from renters yell, scream, are more aggressive [and] are left to themselves in a certain way when they are outside. [...] And well, the owners, we always look from our balconies where our child is about. Those mothers you never see looking where their children are. We all find that very strange.

Consequently, the children of upstairs residents and Western European renters in the tower do not play with the children of downstairs residents. Rather, they let their children play on the balconies of the upper floors or elsewhere in the neighborhood. As another consequence of the nuisance, upstairs residents and some residents in the tower complain that it inhibits them to open up their windows or use the balconies for relaxation. Residents in the apartments for disabled people also discuss the conflicts about children of residents in the family apartments, yet in less negative ways as their apartments do not border the common yard.

In contrast, downstairs residents feel the shared yard provides a safe, enclosed environment for (their) children to play independently outside. They are relatively large families without a private outdoor space. They are aware of and disturbed by the discontent from residents upstairs, about their children's play. They notice that many do not let their children play downstairs. Several downstairs residents believe that the segregation of upstairs and downstairs children is rooted in ethnic prejudice. Salma states:

A lot of upstairs neighbors with Dutch children do not let their children play here with our children. When it is a nice day, there are opened balcony doors. They let their children play there [at the balconies]. [...] They keep their children away. [...] Perhaps because they do not want [them to play] with foreign children. [...] I find it strange to not let your child play here, why? You can see that there are other children playing outside (social rental downstairs family apartment, non-Western background, couple with four children).

Two aspects of the design were found to particularly contribute to the observed conflicts over noise nuisance. Respondents argue that the design of the building with a small shared yard surrounded by at least four-story apartments turns it into a resonance box. Mike for example argues:

If you stand downstairs here, and you yell or you shout something it reflects against all those walls. That is simply not taken into account in the design (owner-occupied upstairs apartment, native Dutch, single).

In addition, the main entrances and outdoor spaces of the family apartments and owner-occupied apartments, the living room windows of part of the tower apartments, and the shared walking spaces are all located on the inside of the development adjoining the common yard. This causes conflicts because respondents use and have different expectations of the uses of these spaces. For example, upstairs residents wish to use their balconies for relaxation and hence expect it to be quiet, while residents in the family apartments want to use the common yard downstairs for their children to play.
Finally, several respondents experience the design of the shared spaces in the building as non-inclusive. For example, respondents from all resident groups argue that as adults they would like to but do not use the shared garden because it has no seats. Upstairs residents and Western residents in the tower often add that the garden is taken over by the children of downstairs residents anyway. Furthermore, a disabled respondent argues that she cannot access the common yard with her wheelchair. A more inclusive design of shared spaces could enable more positive encounters between residents with different backgrounds (Casey et al. 2007; Chaskin and Joseph 2010, 2013; Kearns et al. 2013).

Management practices

In addition, management practices were found to contribute to social distances between native Dutch owners and the social renters of ethnic minority background on the ground floor apartments. First, the advertisement of the housing development by brokers has raised expectations among owners that are in sharp contrast with their experienced realities. According to Mike, owner-occupiers were told that:

"It is a mixed block, with owner-occupied and rented houses, but the rented apartments are mainly occupied by disabled and elderly people". That is how it was presented to me by the broker. […] if I could go back five years in time with the knowledge that I have now, I would never, honestly never ever have bought in this building. I am confident and I know that other people think of this in the same way.

Furthermore, in the advertisement for the building it says that "The garden […] will have benches […]. [And that] the design will shortly be an extended living room for all. Every season". Yet, benches and trees were never realized in the common yard by the developer due to financial cuts, the common yard is not experienced as inclusive, and it has evoked tensions between resident groups. The findings reconfirm that misleading owner-occupiers into thinking they will live in a more socially homogenous environment than is really the case can enlarge social divides among resident groups (Bretherton and Pleace 2011; Norris 2006; Vale 1996).

Second, respondents observe a considerable power asymmetry between the degree to which residents of different tenures can influence maintenance and management of the housing development (Graves 2010). The apartment complex is governed by an *Association of Owners* that exists of both the housing association and individual owners. An officer of the Housing Association is supposed to represent the interests of renters in the management of the building. However, the majority of renters, both with family apartments on the ground floor and in the tower apartments, feel that their voice is not heard. Alice for instance explains:

Officially it is 40% owner-occupied and 60% rented [housing]. […] I would like to see that renters actually get these votes. Because I have never, honestly never, been asked for my opinion. And at the bottom of the letters it says "opinion of renters" or "on behalf of the renters". […] So there is one fool of the housing association that represents all the renters, we renters do not know him anyway, we have never seen him. But on behalf of the housing association he says what the renters want. Often they [the Housing Association] actually do things […] [which] as a renter I would never want to happen (social rental apartment for disabled residents, native Dutch, couple without children).

Under Dutch law, renters in mixed-income complexes have the right to form a so-called *resident committee* of renters, which advise the Housing Association on their decisions in the Association of Owners, but such a committee has never existed for this building. Nonetheless, the institutional entities would be separate for owners and renters, encouraging residents to distinguish between the two groups and it would still not be able for renters to directly influence managerial decisions of the Association of Owners.

Owners do not see problems with how the Association of Owners operates. They argue that owners naturally have, and take, more responsibility for their residential environment than renters because they own the house which they have paid for through hard work. This view is even shared by some social renters with an apartment in the tower. For example, according to Anna:

Generally, social renters […] are a bit more heedless. People that buy a house, this whole block, this is the first house for all these people. Therefore, they are very proud of [it] and yes, careful with it.

The unequal distribution of power has allowed owners to implement regulations and to modify the shared spaces of the development in a way that – respondents

of all resident groups agree - is often not in the interest of social renters, particularly downstairs residents. For example, in response to nuisances of children's play in the common yard, owners have realized – what they call – "child unfriendly plants" and wooden beams in the downstairs courtyard that prevent children from playing football.

Figure 4 about here

Not surprisingly, renters on the ground floor express discontent about the ways in which the Association of Owners is governing the apartment complex. They mention receiving letters by the Association of Owners and the Housing Association with rules and measures that they do not agree with and about which they have not been consulted. The letters include age, time and behavioral restrictions for children's play in the shared yard, the rule that residents are (not) allowed to grow plants in the shared yard other than the existing child-unfriendly ones, the request for residents on the ground floor to water the child-unfriendly plants, and a description of what are considered "good" neighboring practices (e.g. on greeting behavior, the use of the private spaces adjacent to the shared yard and the passage ways, (un)authorized rubbish disposal, and noise standards).

According to downstairs respondents and one respondent in an apartment for disabled people, the owners upstairs behave superior because they believe that they belong to a higher social class, or have more rights. Harriett for instance, says:

You have owner-occupied houses and social housing. The people of the owner-occupied houses feel as if they are better people and that they are allowed to run the place and the people of the social housing are not.

Furthermore, some believe that the perceived superiority of owners is rooted in racism. According to Salma:

[Owners] feel higher than us, because we are foreigners. [...] I disapprove of that [...] because we are all people, be it rich, be it poor, or whatever. [...] Perhaps it is their character, or the way they were brought up. They bring up their children like that as well. I disapprove of that. Maybe there are bad Moroccans and Turks, but you cannot judge all people for that. They are not all the same. You should get to know them first before you judge them.

Finally, according to all residents, management by the Housing Association has exacerbated social tensions by not responding quickly and adequately to social and maintenance problems in the development. Instead of acting as referee or mediator for individual and joint problems between residents, the perceived lack of responsiveness of the responsible housing professionals helps sustain the social divides between resident groups (Vale 1996). For example, Mike says:

The nuisance that takes place, the Housing Association is responsible for those rented houses, they do nothing. [They] always say to be tied by hands and feet, not to be able to do anything. I don't know the regulations well enough for this but yes, not taking responsibility.

Social renters also complain about low maintenance levels of rented properties by the housing association. In contrast, interviewed housing officers argue that it

is the responsibility of residents themselves to solve problems, that individual owners are largely responsible for physical maintenance, and that the housing association does not have the financial means to become more involved. Clearly, there are very different expectations about the role of housing professionals. Consequently, owners state that inactiveness of the housing association has motivated them to increase their influence in the management of the building through the Association of Owners, sustaining the divides between owners and renters groups.

Neighborhood facilities

Finally, in addition to housing design and management practices, the particular configuration of local facilities in the wider neighborhood has reinforced social distances between residents in a number ways. First, not only do the interviews indicate that the respondents from the different tenure groups use different local facilities and amenities, but these differences in everyday routines are also discussed by respondents to draw boundaries between the social groups in the building. According to respondents, neighborhood facilities do not serve as places of encounter (Valentine 2008) between residents of different tenure positions. Downstairs residents state that current neighborhood facilities cater to more affluent residents in the neighborhood, but not to lower-income groups. Vivian explains:

They [planners] want more arts, what does that bring for me? In the local newspaper, De Brug, I read about activities. […] sailing and surfing [pulls a face]. […] There was a market but they [planners] decided the type of stalls: vegetables, organic [food], things. What does it bring me? […] [I'd rather have] just a market with many [less expensive] things, clothes, diverse things (social rental apartment in tower, non-Western background, couple with two children).

Several social renters describe that they are forced to visit other parts of Amsterdam for their interests and needs. Elsa observes:

People with money go to the nice cafés at the harbor. Those are mostly people from the Gold Coast [a more affluent part of IJburg] and from this block [points towards owner-occupied houses]. Other than that, there are no facilities that people like you and me - normal people - can use. There is a bank, and a snack bar, that is it. […] So, there are no facilities anyway. […] awful, I find it disastrous (social rental apartment in tower, non-Dutch Western background, single parent with two children).

In contrast, most interviewed owners are quite satisfied with local facilities, but they are aware that renters do not use them. Owners regularly use local cafés and restaurants, a gym, etcetera. They also mention visiting local parks and beaches with their children and fellow owners more often than renters in the building do with their children. At first glance, these findings seem to contradict the finding that there are relatively small differences between owners and renters in terms of income, educational background and occupational status. An explanation may be that social renters have to support bigger families. More importantly, however, different consumption preferences and practices may also reflect lifestyle and ethnic differences, whereby minority residents in particular miss group-specific facilities in the neighborhood.

In terms of the use of local public institutions, another difference between the resident groups relates to enrollment in local schools. Respondents of all resident groups observe that there is significant segregation between primary schools within the area, which reproduces the perceived social divides between resident groups in the building, particularly between residents with a Western European and non-Western European background. Respondents collectively distinguish between Black, mixed, and White schools in the neighborhood. According to owners, and Western European renters, the schools are segregated by the socioeconomic status of parents as well. In the examined housing development, children with parents with a non-Western European background and those with a Western European ethnicity go to school together more often. Consequently, the parents of these children are said to interact with one another more often and to have closer social bonds. According to Elsa:

In the morning, parents leave the development and low-educated, mostly Black parents go that way and White parents go that way [a different way]. So, regarding children, total segregation. […] Therefore, you don't know your neighbors as parents at school. So it has an impact. […] You get to know each other at school.

Respondents with "Black" children accuse residents with "White" children of deliberately keeping their children away from schools with Black children in the same way that they do not let their children play with the children downstairs. The interviews with the respondents with White children confirm this, explaining that they are worried about a bad influence on their children (see also Boterman 2013; Butler and Hamnett 2007; Hollingworth and Williams 2010). Although the initial goals of the municipality were to generate inclusive primary schools in IJburg, this has clearly failed. The class and ethnic differences between primary schools are both seen as symbolic for and amplify the social distances between resident groups along lines of ethnicity, and tenure-type, and the location of the dwelling in the examined building.

Discussion and conclusions

Literature on resident experiences of social distance in tenure-mix projects show diverse results, varying from a situation where tenure groups experience significant social tensions, live parallel lives, or even become socially closer. The aim of this paper was to develop a better understanding of these diverging findings, by exploring the way in which place-specific factors of fine-grained, mixed-tenure developments may contribute to positive or negative experiences of residents in terms of social distance or social closeness between different tenure groups. The study used an in-depth approach and incorporates multiple factors of design, management and local facilities to explore the contextualized nature of these experiences. The study focused on a newly built neighborhood because here social distances between neighbors were thought to be constructed afresh rather than a function of in and out-group (re)productions over time. The research outcomes complement existing studies of tenure-mixed projects at higher spatial scales.
In line with previous studies (Chaskin and Joseph 2013; Chaskin et al. 2012; Fraser et al. 2013; Graves 2010; Joseph 2008; Norris 2006), significant social distances were found amongst residents in the fine-grained mixed-tenure project in IJburg. Clearly, the findings do not reflect a situation of "social tectonics"

(Butler and Robson 2001). Instead, residents interact with one another quite a lot and take clear positions versus the "other" at the group level (Jackson and Butler 2014), resonating with Davidson's (2010, p. 525) observation that there are "inherent politics bound up in any act of neighboring". Despite the uniform housing design in the apartment complex – in which different tenures are not visible from the outside - and the relatively small social distances in terms of educational training, occupational status and income, recurrent negative encounters between residents have led to considerable social divides, in particular between apartment owners and a specific group of social renters. In these processes of boundary drawing, tenure is not the only fault line. Rather, differences in tenure coincide with differences in ethnicity, household size and location within the apartment complex, leading residents to distinguish between three groups: those who live "upstairs" (owners, native-Dutch, small families, some with young children), "downstairs" (social renters, non-Western migrants, large families with somewhat older children) and "in the tower" (social renters, varied ethnic background, different household compositions, some with young children). This third group of "tower" residents is interesting because they seem to fulfill an ambivalent position in the apartment building, siding with upstairs residents for some issues and downstairs residents for other issues, also depending on their own social background. For example, native Dutch tower residents may identify with owners, when it comes to conflicts about noise and parenting practices, while at other times sympathizing to some degree with their fellow social renters of minority background downstairs when it comes to unequal treatment of tenure groups in management practices and the quality of neighborhood facilities. Similarly, from the perspective of "upstairs" owner occupiers, the tower residents are seen as "good" social renters who are more like them. So for these groups, tenure differences do not transform into social distance, reinforcing reinforcing Musterd's (2014) analysis of the particular status of social housing in the Netherland as not (yet) very residualized or stigmatized, compared to many other Western European and North American contexts. These findings illustrate that differences between residents along tenure and ethnicity are not reproduced in fixed categories of renter versus owner or minority versus native Dutch.

Moreover, despite the social boundaries drawn at the group level between downstairs and upstairs residents in particular, respondents in this study do report positive interactions and everyday friendly encounters with residents from the "other" categories. It seems, however, that these positive experiences between individual residents are hardly ever scaled up to the level of the group (Valentine 2008). In other words, native-Dutch owner occupiers would for instance mention regularly greeting an ethnic minority neighbor downstairs, while at the same time expressing intolerant, sometimes explicitly prejudiced discriminatory views about "those" inconsiderate social renters downstairs. This raises important questions about the value and meaning of such everyday positive encounters for decreasing social distances and, hence, studies of and policy for creating such encounters.

What is striking about the negative experiences of living with difference is that they are the opposite of the planning ideal behind IJburg to create "a neighborhood without borders". In fact, although we only examine one development, reports in the media and resident meetings about social conflicts between residents in other fine-grained mixed developments in IJburg indicate that our findings do not stand alone. Several place-specific features of housing design, housing management, and neighborhood facilities and amenities were

found to intensify social boundaries. First, the distribution of apartments for different tenures as well as types of households, the compact building design, as well as the location of leisure, passage, and outdoor spaces on the inside of the building were found to emphasize the different uses of these spaces among different types of residents (Chaskin and Joseph 2010; Roberts 2007). The design did little to safeguard residents need for privacy in a context of close proximity to people with very different ways of living (Van Eijk 2011; Stokoe 2006).

Rather than reducing these social tensions, the management structure and everyday management practices were found to enhance tensions between the different resident groups (August 2014; Chaskin et al. 2013). Most notably, the asymmetry in the decision-making power between owner-occupiers and renters enabled the former to modify the rules and regulations and the physical residential environment in a way that does not reflect the interests of the latter. Owners have for instance been able to introduce child-unfriendly plants and wooden logs in the shared yard to prevent - mainly renters' - children from playing here and making noise. Consequently, as a result of the particular management structure, symbolic power differences between the upstairs owners and the downstairs renters have become inscribed in the physical layout of the apartment complex (Bourdieu 1989; Davidson 2010), excluding ways of using the shared courtyard which are deemed unfit. Not surprisingly, the social renters, particularly those in the ground floor apartments, feel marginalized within their own building, a feeling which is enhanced by the fact that also in the wider neighborhood they feel that their everyday needs have not been accommodated. Local facilities and amenities are perceived to mostly reflect the interests and lifestyles of the owners and segregated routines in the neighborhood were seen as symbolic by all respondents for the divisions within the apartment complex.

Combined, these findings show that creating a "neighborhood without borders" entails much more than mixing tenures within a coherent design. In the case of IJburg, other place-specific factors, at the scale of the apartment complex itself and at the scale of the neighborhood, could have been planned in a more inclusive way. Consequently, what could have been a "best practice" case seems to actually have become a worst case scenario: living with difference has resulted in substantial social tensions and even overt conflict in which social renters feel stigmatized and out of place in their own homes. In fact, in a recent meeting about IJburg with urban and housing professionals and active residents, it was cynically agreed upon that the original intention to design "exciting inner court yards in fine-grained mix projects has led to altogether too much excitement of the wrong kind". Housing corporations have therefore apparently decided to avoid further fine-grained mix projects in new extensions of the neighborhood.

The question can be raised, however, whether this is ultimately the lesson that should be taken from the experiences in IJburg. This study suggests that the "blame" for the problems does not lie in design alone. Fine-grained mix also requires inclusive and proactive management and an inclusive facility structure at the scale of the neighborhood. The study therefore demonstrates the need for more integrated approaches in the planning for and management of mixed-tenure projects, which acknowledge the wider socio-institutional residential context and facilitate more opportunities for positive encounters between different tenure groups.

References

Andersson, Roger, and Sako Musterd .2010. "What Scale Matters? Exploring the Relationships between Individuals' Social Position, Neighbourhood Context and the Scale of Neighbourhood." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 92 (1): 23-43.

Arthurson, Kathy. 2010. "Operationalising Social Mix: Spatial Scale, Lifestyle and Stigma as Mediating Points in Resident Interaction." *Urban Policy and Research* 28 (1): 49-63.

Arthurson, Kathy. 2012. *Social mix and the city: challenging the mixed communities consensus in housing and urban planning policies.* Melbourne: CSIRO publishing.

Arthurson, Kathy. 2013. "Mixed Tenure Communities and the Effects on Neighbourhood Reputation and Stigma: Residents' experiences from within". *Cities* 35: 432-438.

Atkinson, Rowland, and Keith Kintrea. 2000. "Owner-Occupation, Social Mix and Neighbourhood Impacts." *Policy & Politics* 28 (1): 93-108.

August, Martine. 2014. "Negotiating Social Mix in Toronto's First Public Housing Redevelopment: Power, Space and Social Control in Don Mount Court." *International Journal of urban and regional research* 38 (4): 1160–1180.

Bailey, Nick, and Tony Manzi. 2008. *Developing and Sustaining Mixed Tenure Housing Developments. Round up.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Boterman, Willem R. 2013. "Dealing with diversity: middle-class family households and the issue of black and white schools in Amsterdam." *Urban Studies* 50 (6): 1113-1147.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1985. "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups." *Theory and Society* 14 (6): 723-744.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* 7 (1): 14-25.

Bretherton, Joanne, and Nicholas Pleace. 2011. "A Difficult Mix: Issues in Achieving Socioeconomic Diversity in Deprived UK Neighbourhoods." *Urban Studies* 48 (16): 3433–3447.

Broekhuizen, Jolijn, Erik Van Marissing, and Ron Van Wonderen. 2012. *Samen Leven met Verschillen in Oost. Spanningen en Vertrouwen in Betondorp, Indische Buurt en Haveneiland West* [Living Together with Differences in East. Tensions and Trust in Betondorp, Indische Buurt and Haveneiland West]. Amsterdam: Bureau Onderzoek en Statistiek Gemeente Amsterdam/ Verwey-Jonker Instituut.

Bryman, Alan 2012. "Expert voices." In *How many qualitative interviews is enough,* edited by Sarah Elsie Baker and Rosalind Edwards, 18-20. National Centre for Research Methods Review Discussion Paper. http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2273 (accessed 6 July, 2015).

Butler, Tim, and Chris Hamnett. 2007. "*The Geography of Education: introduction." Urban Studies* 44 (7): 1161-1174.

Butler, Tim, and Robsen. 2001. "Social Capital, Gentrification and Neighbourhood Change in London." *Urban Studies* 38 (12): 2145-2162.

Buys, André. 2009. *Het Woonklimaat op IJburg: Een Evaluatie* [The Residential Climate in IJburg: An Evaluation]. Amsterdam: RIGO Research en Advies.

Casey, Rionach, Sarah Coward, Chris Allen, and Ryan Powell. 2007. "On the Planned Environment and Neighbourhood Life." *Town Planning Review* 78 (3): 311–334.

Chaskin, Robert J., and Mark L. Joseph. 2010. "Building "Community" in Mixed-

Income Developments: Assumptions, Approaches, and Early Experiences." *Urban Affairs Review* 45 (3): 299-335.

Chaskin, Robert J., and Mark L. Joseph. 2013. "'Positive' Gentrification, Social Control and the 'Right to the City' in Mixed-Income Communities: Uses and Expectations of Space and Place." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 (2): 480-502.

Chaskin, Robert J., Amy T. Khare, and Mark L. Joseph. 2012. "Participation, Deliberation, and Decision Making: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Mixed-Income Developments." *Urban Affairs Review* 48 (6): 863-906.

Chaskin, Robert J., Florian Sichling, and Mark L. Joseph. 2013. "Youth in mixed-income communities replacing public housing complexes: Context, dynamics and responses." *Cities* 35 (2): 423-431.

Crow, Graham, Graham Allan, and Marcia Summers. 2002. "Neither Busybodies nor Nobodies: Managing Proximity and Distance in Neighbourly relations." *Sociology* 36 (1): 127-145.

Davidson, M. 2010. "Love Thy Neighbour? Interpreting social mixing in London's gentrification frontiers." *Environment and Planning A* 42 (3): 524-544.

Davidson, M. 2012. "The impossibility of gentrification and mixing." In *Mixed Communities. Gentrification by Stealth?,* edited by Gary Bridge, Tim Butler and Loretta Lees, 233-250. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Fraser, James C., Ashley Brown Burns, Josh T. Bazuin, and Deidre A. Oakley. 2013. "Hope VI, Colonization and the Production of Difference." *Urban Affairs Review* 49 (4): 525-556.

Gans, Herbert J. 1961. "The balanced community: Homogeinity or heterogeinity in residential areas?" *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 27 (2): 176-184.

Galster, George C. 2012. "The Mechanism(s) of neighborhood Effects: Theory, Evidence, and Policy Implications." In *Neighbourhood Effects Research: New Perspectives*, edited by Maarten Van Ham, David Manley, Nick Bailey, Ludi Simpson and Duncan MacIennan, 23-56. Dordrecht: Springer.

Graves, Erin M. 2010. "The Structuring of Urban Life in a Mixed-Income Housing "Community"." *City & Community* 9 (1): 109-131.

Groves, Rick, Alan Middleton, Alan Murie, and Kevin Broughton. 2003. *Neighbourhoods that work: A study of the Bournville estate, Birmingham.* Birmingham: The Policy Press.

Hollingworth, Suri, and Katya Williams. 2010. "Multicultural Mixing or Middle-class Reproduction? The White Middle Classes in London Comprehensive Schools". *Space and Polity* 14 (1): 47-64.

Jackson, Emma, and Michaela Benson. 2014. "Neither 'deepest, darkest Peckham' nor 'run-of-the-mill' East Dulwich: the middle classes and their 'others' in an inner-London neighbourhood." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38 (4): 1195-1210.

Jackson, Emma, and Tim Butler. 2014. "Revisiting 'social tectonics": The middle classes and social mix in gentrifying neighbourhoods." *Urban Studies* Pre-published September 5, 2014.

Joseph, Mark L. 2008. "Early Resident Experiences at a New Mixed-Income Development in Chicago." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 30 (3): 229-257.

Jupp, Ben. 1999. *Living Together. Community Life on Mixed Tenure Estates.* London: Demos.

Karsten, Sjoerd, Charles Felix, Guuske Ledoux, Wim Meijnen, Jaap Roeleveld,

and Erik Van Schooten. 2006. "Choosing Segregation or Integration? The Extent and Effects of Ethnic Segregation in Dutch Cities." *Education and Urban Society* 38 (2): 228-247.

Karsten, Lia. 2011. "Children's social capital in the segregated context of Amsterdam: An historical-geographical approach." *Urban Studies* 48 (8): 1651-1666.

Kearns, Ade, Martin J. McKee, Elena Sautkina, Jennifer Cox, and Lyndal Bond. 2013. "How to Mix? Spatial Configurations, Modes of production and Resident Perceptions of Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods." *Cities* 35: 397–408.

Kleit, Rachel G. 2005. "HOPE VI new communities: neighborhood relationships in mixed-income housing." *Environment and Planning A* 37 (8): 1413-1441.

Lelevrier, Christine. 2013. "Forced Relocation in France: How Residential Trajectories Affect Individual Experiences." *Housing Studies* 28 (2): 253-271.

Lupi, Tineke, Walberg, Annemarijn M., and Sako Musterd. 2007. *Pioniers in Place Making: Proeftuin IJburg* [Pioneers in Place Making: Laboratory IJburg]. Gouda: Habiforum.

Matejskova, Tatiana, and Helga Leitner. 2011. "Urban Encounters with Difference: The Contact Hypothesis and Immigrant Integration Projects in Eastern Berlin." *Social & Cultural Geography* 12 (7): 717-741.

McCormick, Naomi J., Mark L. Joseph, and Robert J. Chaskin. 2012. "The New Stigma of Relocated Public Housing Residents: Challenges to Social Identity in Mixed-Income Developments." *City & Community* 11 (3): 285-308.

Mugnano, Silvia, and Pietro Palvarini. 2013 ""Sharing Space Without Hanging Together": A Case Study of Social Mix Policy in Milan." *Cities* 35: 417–422.
Musterd, Sako. 2014. "Public housing for whom? Experiences in an era of Mature Neo-liberalism: The Netherlands and Amsterdam." *Housing Studies* 29 (4): 467-484.

Musterd, Sako, and Roger Andersson. 2005. "Housing Mix, Social Mix, and Social Opportunities." *Urban Affairs Review* 40 (6): 771-790.

Nast, Julia, and Talja Blokland. 2014. "Social Mix Revisited: Neighbourhood Institutions as Setting for Boundary Work and Social Capital." *Urban Studies* 48 (3): 482-499.

Norris, Michelle. 2006. "Developing, Designing and Managing Mixed Tenure Estates." *European Planning Studies* 14 (2): 199-218.

Reinders, Leeke G.A.J. 2015. "Re-imagining Nieuwland: Narrative mapping and the mental geography of urban space in a Dutch multi-ethnic neighbourhood." In *Narrating the city: Histories, Space and the Everyday,* edited by Wladimir Fischer-Nebmaier, Matthew P. Berg, and Anastasia Christou. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Roberts, Marion. 2007. "Sharing space: Urban design and social mixing in mixed income communities." *Planning Theory and Practice* 8 (2): 183-204.

Rosenbaum, James E., Linda K. Stroh, and Cathy A. Flynn. 1998. "Lake Parc Place: A study of Mixed-Income Housing." *Housing Policy Debate* 9 (4): 703-740.

Sautkina, Elena, Lyndal Bond, and Ade Kearns. 2012. "Mixed Evidence on Mixed Tenure Effects: Findings from a Systematic Review of UK Studies, 1995-2009." *Housing Studies* 27 (6): 748-782.

Stokoe, Elizabeth. 2006. "Public Intimacy in Neighbour Relationships and

Complaints." *Sociological Research Online* 11 (3): 1-20.

Tach, Laura M. 2009. "More than Brick and Mortar: Neighborhood Frames, Social Processes, and the Mixed-Income Redevelopment of a Public Housing Project." *City & Community* 8 (3): 269-299.

Tunstall, Rebecca, and Alex Fenton. 2006. *In the mix: a review of mixed income, mixed tenure and mixed communities.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Valentine, Gill. 2008. "Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter." *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (3): 323-337.

Van Eijk, Gwen. 2011. "'They Eat Potatoes, I Eat Rice': Symbolic Boundary Making and Space in Neighbour Relations." *Sociological Research Online* 16 (4): 1-12.

Van Kempen, Ronald, and Gideon Bolt. 2009. "Social cohesion, social mix, and urban policies in the Netherlands." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 24 (4): 457-475.

Vale, Lawrence J. 1996. "Public Housing Redevelopment: Seven Kinds of Success." *Housing Policy Debate* 7 (3): 491–534.

Watt, Paul. 2009. "Living in an oasis: Middle-class disaffiliation and selective belonging in an English suburb." *Environment and Planning A,* 41: 2874–2892.

Zukin, Sharon. 2010. *Naked City: The Life and Death of Authentic Urban Spaces.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Author biographies

Anouk Tersteeg is a junior researcher in the Faculty of Geosciences at Utrecht University, The Netherlands. She currently works on the EU-funded research project DIVERCITIES, which examines how cities can benefit more from urban diversity in terms of social cohesion, social mobility and entrepreneurship. Her PhD-research focusses on resident experiences with living in hyper-diverse contexts. Besides urban diversity, her main interests include socio-spatial inequalities, neighborhood change, urban regeneration and urban policy.

Fenne Pinkster works as lecturer at the department of Geography, Planning and International Development Studies at the Universiteit van Amsterdam. As researcher in the field of urban geography she is affiliated to the Center for Urban Studies and the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research. Her research focuses on a broad range of questions relating to the meaning of neighborhood including place-based social networks, neighborhood effects, belonging and disaffiliation and micro-politics of neighborhood life.