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Abstract

The point of departure of this thesis is regeneration and how it is carried out in two countries, USA and Sweden. Urban regeneration, according to the used definition, seek either to support vulnerable communities by redistributing resources so that they can take advantage of them, or to promote growth and development and through this improve the situation for those in need. The thesis investigates and compare how the projects and their actors formulate, relate to and strive for a better use and higher value of space. The comparison will help to find lessons to be learned across the contexts. The main questions to be answered are:

What elements of the projects or programs strive for a higher value of space in a similar way and what does it in different ways?

What lessons for future regeneration can be learned from the comparisons?

The comparison is based on the assumption that regeneration schemes can learn from one another across contexts and that this is a constructive way to improve knowledge of regeneration. Three cases are investigated. Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg in Washington D.C., USA, are regenerated under the federal HOPE VI program that targets public housing areas. Gårdsten in Gothenburg, Sweden, is regenerated according to the aim of the municipality to decrease segregation. The comparison is made over five themes, organization, public participation, physical regeneration, social programs and social mix. The thesis highlights differences and similarities in the regeneration approaches and show how the cases aim to increase social, cultural and economic capital. The conclusion is that regeneration in USA could benefit from the way of regeneration according to the Swedish case with more participation and a long term focus of the process, and regeneration in Sweden could benefit from a greater focus on design and architecture as in the U.S. cases.
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1. Introduction

The need to regenerate distressed housing areas exists everywhere. The situations in these housing areas are the results of unequally dispersed resources across the cities. Different areas of a city experience different degrees of inclusion and importance. They have different roles for the city as a whole. In the same way people rooted in these different areas are to more or less extent subject to the positions of their area. Related to where one’s home is situated some people experience limitations on their access to the city and the society. Since there is a great need for regenerating parts of the cities there is also a great need to improve the knowledge on how to do this.

The way regeneration is carried out depends much on the urban problem and what is seen as the ideal outcome of an area. It is also related to the societal situation in which the neighborhood is situated. As we understand regeneration, the way that the urban problem is defined can support a certain procedure of regeneration, and to put a result of regeneration in relation to the urban problem can further legitimize this procedure. This however does not mean that this is the only way to solve the found problem. Therefore, in this thesis we have chosen to make comparisons between different cases of regeneration. Through putting one legitimized procedure of regeneration against another and to investigate how their respective parts function and how they relate, one can better assess whether this is the only solution for this urban problem. It is a matter of highlighting schemes through other examples to gain other perspectives. This we think is a constructive way to improve the knowledge on how to conduct regeneration. Through comparisons we can gain lessons across different settings.

Our interest in the subject of regeneration comes from our academic background and from what we see in the city and in the urban context around us. Both of us have an interest in how the municipal housing policy in Sweden has evolved. This has been a reoccurring theme in studies throughout our education. This housing policy has left behind urban problems in some areas. The way that different city districts are portrayed in media and literature, and the attention given when changes are made, give us one side of the story. A curiosity has developed between the two of us to complement this story through a closer investigation of cases of regeneration. So when we got the opportunity to
study American regeneration cases, this provided a great basis to investigate regeneration deeper through comparisons. Processes of regeneration tell a lot about the city, of how separate parts function and relate to one another, how the image of a city is constructed and what ambitions the city officials have with different parts of the city. It also tells about the people and their varying potentials and conditions.

In order to get different perspectives on regeneration we focus our attention to USA and Sweden and how projects in these countries have dealt with regeneration. The need to regenerate parts of the municipal housing stock in Sweden has been clear for some decades. This need is especially visible in suburbs that rose during the million homes program in the 1960s and 1970s. In USA, the HOPE VI program has helped to regenerate deteriorated public housing areas. Its methods have been debated, and it has been discussed from different points of view. In recent years its budget has decreased and its future being has been unclear. The program however still gets funding and prevails. We have focused our research on one case from a Swedish suburban location, in Gothenburg on the west coast of Sweden. This case is compared to two sites from Washington D.C. that are both part of the HOPE VI program.

Background
This thesis seeks to compare the attempts by Swedish and U.S. housing authorities to through regeneration improve the physical and social qualities of distressed neighborhoods. These neighborhoods are what can be called low-income neighborhoods. The focus in the U.S. is on public housing developments, and the focus in Sweden is on its possible equivalent, municipal housing. The areas of study experience social problems and segregation. We will initially introduce the reader to the concept of regeneration, the housing policy that aims to provide housing in the respective countries and the urban problems that the regenerations schemes attempts to solve. We will also give an introduction to the cases that are to be the focus of this paper.

Regeneration and value of space
Urban regeneration, according to Tim Hall, seeks either to support vulnerable communities by redistributing resources so that they can take advantage of them, or to promote growth and development and through this improve the situation for those in need (Hall T., 2006, p. 57). He points to four major goals of regeneration, from which he considers most regeneration projects to aim for at least one:

- Improvements to the physical environment
- Improvements to the quality of life of certain populations
- Improvements to the social welfare of populations
- Enhancement of the economic prospects of certain populations (Hall T., 2006, p. 58).

He emphasizes that the definition of the urban problems that regeneration acts to solve plays a crucial role, this as it influences how the regeneration policies are legitimized. (Hall T., 2006, p. 60) The definitions of the urban problems have changed focus during the decades of the later 20th century. During the 1990s, according to Hall, the focus of the urban problems was on the globalizing world and the competition between the localities that came as a result. Later in the 1990s and into the 21st century the urban problems were defined as social exclusion and a lacking relation between
certain localities and the rest of society. (Hall T., 2006, p. 61) Urban regeneration can include interventions in the natural environment, the built environment, the local social networks, economy, regulatory framework and image perceived from the outside (Hall T., 2006, p. 69). In later years the actions have been carried out through the establishment of partnerships, including community, local authority, volunteers and the private sector (Hall T., 2006, p. 71).

Urban regeneration is here treated with an emphasis on its aim to achieve a better use and a higher value of space. On the subject of definitions of value and idealized outcomes, Fox Gotham, Shefner and Brumley (2001) write:

> Various motifs and themes, including rhetoric such as “growth”, “development”, “revitalization”, and the like, are not objective, fixed, and stable categories but constitute authoritative and yet contested representations of space that shape peoples’ perception of different living spaces and the people that live in them. In turn, these meanings of space shape people’s understanding of the causes of urban problems that bias and select against some urban planning and policy choices rather than others. (Fox Gotham, Shefner, & Brumley, 2001, p. 331)

So Hall as well as Fox Gotham, Shefner and Brumley point to the matter of definition, either it is of the urban problem to be solved or the image that is to be achieved. These definitions are of course related, and the process, as we understand it, is a function of these. In our study of regeneration in our chosen cases we put focus on the urban problems formulated and the process carried out to solve those problems. It is predominately the processes that are subject to comparison.

**Providing housing for low income groups and associated urban problems**

In Sweden the non-profit part of the rental sector is owned by municipal housing companies. After World War II housing policy in Sweden became a part of the social welfare and state policy. The idea was to create good dwellings for all. The housing policy was supposed to have a general character, meaning that it applied to the whole population and not any special targeted groups in society. This has resulted in a housing policy that has not been selective when it comes to tenure forms and income but has been directed towards all varieties of households. (Hedman, 2001, p. 75)

Whereas after the World War II and forward the housing policy was partly a responsibility of the state (financing and legislation) and partly a responsibility of the highly independent Swedish municipalities (planning), in the 1990s governmental changes resulted in deregulations and a minimal role of the state. The former generous subsidies were cut down and the housing politics of Sweden was in much omitted to the market forces. (Hedman, 2001, p. 76)

In USA the public housing program started in 1937 through a legislation that other than providing housing for the poor had a conceived potential to generate employment and to clear the slums. With a stop during World War II, the housing Act of 1949 reauthorized the public housing programs. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 126) Public housing was established to provide “decent and safe rental housing for eligible low-income families, the elderly, and persons with disabilities.” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 B)

The conflicting goals of providing housing for the poor and keeping down federal spending in the form of capital and operating subsidies did according to Wyly and Hammel (2001) lead to problems in
the public housing. A series of congressional amendments from 1969 onwards that aimed to deal with this dual goal led to more segregated, poorer public housing areas through deficits, poor maintenance and cuts in supportive services for residents. (Wyly & Hammel, 2001, pp. 233-234)

An urban problem developed in Sweden mostly from the suburbs that were planned under the million homes program during the 1960s and 70s. During the 1990s, many apartments in these suburbs were empty. This combined with an immigration of fugitives lead to many of these newly arrived immigrants locating in these areas. The economic losses during the 1990s, with vast unemployment hit these areas hard. The urban problems that grew in the suburbs during the 1990s were characterized by unemployment and lack of income, great problems in schools and overcrowding. This has come to affect the service in these areas negatively as well as the physical quality of the buildings. (Olsson, 2005, pp. 21-22)

There is a great need of upgrading of parts of the municipal housing stock in Sweden and a couple of efforts have been made during the last 20 years, especially directed towards the suburbs of the millions homes program and with the implied target of attracting more well-off inhabitants to move to these areas. The result of these efforts was in most cases only small and not very long lasting improvements. In the mid 1990s there was a change in the way the upgrading was carried out. Some municipal housing companies that are mentioned in relation to this are MKB in Malmö, Botkyrkabyggen in Stockholm and Förvaltnings AB Framtiden in Gothenburg. In these companies the main idea was to start out from the needs of the current inhabitants and to involve them in a more continuous process of maintenance instead of temporary projects. (Hedman, 2008, pp. 23-24)

Planning in the United States during the early 20th century, with zoning laws and other schemes, attempted to segregate land use according to class, ethnic groups and other social activities in order to facilitate investment and economic development. By the 1930s, many American inner cities experienced problems with physical deterioration, forced concentration of African American groups and loss of population and industry. (Fox Gotham, 2001, p. 5) Several attempts were made to deal with these problems. Legislations of 1949 and 1954 were aimed “To provide a decent home and suitable environment for every American family”. Over the next decades local redevelopment authorities used legal mechanisms and public subsidies to acquire residential and commercial land that was considered substandard, clear these areas and rebuild, termed urban renewal. Although the aim of the supporting legislations was to provide decent housing, housing and slums were rarely the focus and seldom benefited. More units were destroyed than were created. (Fox Gotham, 2001, pp. 8-9) In 1974 this program was ended due to vast criticism (Fox Gotham, 2001, p. 10).

The federal HOPE VI program was launched in 1992 and is USA’s largest political housing program ever. The aim is to correct segregation and unequal living conditions. The purpose is to lessen the concentration of poverty into certain areas. This is achieved through two strategies, helping the poor families to move to less troubled areas and replacing low quality areas with areas with better socioeconomic mix. HOPE VI represent a new model of public policy were the redevelopment of public housing is linked with the goal of de-concentration of poverty and to create stable inner city neighborhoods. (Fox Gotham, 2001, p. 20)

**Regeneration cases**

Three cases have been chosen for the study, two of these in Washington D.C., USA, and one in Gothenburg, Sweden. They all represent what have been considered positive examples in their
respective contexts. This means that they are legitimized in these situations, but the question is whether their proceedings are still preferred after a comparison is made with another example.

The HOPE VI program has been a part of the federal housing policy in the U.S. since 1992, and is still going on today although in lesser scale than before. The first case is one of the very early regeneration projects, the former Ellen Wilson homes that have been renamed Townhomes on Capitol Hill after regeneration. This development is located in the historic neighborhoods of Capitol Hill. It is rather special in HOPE VI, partly explained by it being part of the early years of the program. It contains no pure public housing today, but consists mainly of mixed income cooperative housing with a proportion targeted to low-income families.

Capper Carrollsburg, the second case, is located across a highway from Townhomes on Capitol Hill, also in a central location. This development is still undergoing construction, although some homes have been moved into. This will after completion be the largest HOPE VI program to date, and aims at replacing all public housing from before the regeneration with a mixed income community. We have chosen to include two projects in USA, both to gain more knowledge of the U.S. situation to complement our initial understanding that is focused more on Swedish urban situations. Also, as the HOPE VI program has developed over time, and as projects within the program can differ, two cases give us a better comprehension of these variations within HOPE VI.

The third case, located in the Swedish city of Gothenburg, is different from the other two in that it has a suburban location pretty far from the inner city. This area, Gårdsten, is also the largest of the three and has been regenerated since 1997. Rather than being part of a larger program of regeneration like the other two, its development has been the result of a municipal directive.

**Related research**

Below follow a short presentation of parts of a vast field of research. A lot has been written about topics related to our thesis. We will in a summarized manner give an introduction to research and assessments of HOPE VI, Gårdsten and the regeneration in Sweden and finally on research related to value of space since this is a concept that we make our comparisons against.

**HOPE VI**

There have been many studies on HOPE VI since it was launched. These might be of evaluating character, carried out by researchers to do assessments of either specific HOPE VI development or of the program in general. There are also a vast number of scientific articles. These touch subjects such as community based support, relocation issues, HOPE VI’s ability to create self sufficiency among public housing residents, design of the developments and many more. The program has also been noticed in Swedish literature, for example reports by the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning. (Boverket, 2008)

There has been no single evaluation of the program conducted. The Urban Institute has however received funding for several research projects in order to make assessments of the program’s results. *A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Changes* (2004) serves the purpose of answering questions about the achievements and impacts of the program and lessons for the future. This is done through a review of the existing research literature that has included discussions both on achievements and on challenges of HOPE VI. It is also based on a symposium on the strengths and
weaknesses of the program, which involved practitioners, policymakers, advocates and researchers. The research reviewed comes from Urban Institute and other research groups as well as smaller studies by local evaluators. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, pp. 4-5)

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, initiated the report *A Historic and Baseline Assessment* (1996) of HOPE VI, prepared by Abt Associates Inc. Its aim was to track interventions and outcomes of fifteen HOPE VI grantees over a minimum of ten years. It included changes in the site and neighborhoods and the families. (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996) This report was followed by interim assessments, a general one as well as one for each individual case, among them Ellen Wilson Homes. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001) (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003) These according to *A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Changes* (2004) focused mostly on sites and redevelopment plans, and less on the original resident. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 3)

The book *From despair to HOPE – Hope VI and the New Promise of Public Housing in America’s Cities* consists of articles written by public and private sector leaders involved in the shaping of the program in different ways. The book is edited by Henry Cisneros, the secretary of HUD during the time for the settlement of the program and Lora Engdahl, a writer and housing consultant. *From despair to HOPE* documents how the HOPE VI program developed, how it changed policymaking and the U.S. public housing system and what has been accomplished and what has been less beneficial about it.

**Gårdsten and Swedish regeneration**

Gårdsten has been noticed in reports by the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning. Three reports were published accounting for different aspects of the regeneration process. *From Two to 120 Bids*¹ (2004) accounted for the housing company’s strategies to lower the costs of construction as well as the rents. *A Renaissance for Self Construction*² (2004) examined the conditions for a cooperative tenant organization to keep down the costs of construction, hence rent, through own work. The third report came somewhat later. *How the Million Homes Development got a New Image*³ (2007) told about the regeneration work in the east part of Gårdsten.

One report was also published at Royal Institute of Technology, on commission by Förvaltnings AB Framtiden, the corporate group that Gårdsten is a part of. This report was a financial assessment of the regeneration of Gårdsten, *The Gårdsten Affair* (2008), and made both an assessment of the profitability focused on the housing company, and one on the surrounding society. This second part considered gains from increased employment, decreased violence and vandalism, health etcetera.

The Swedish research dealing with regeneration in general focus on questions such as participation, how to treat the heritage of the million homes program, organization, drawing up strategies for a sustainable regeneration, etcetera. The Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning are the author of many of these reports. *Resident Participation in Practice*⁴ (2010) review different groundbreaking means of resident participation that municipal housing companies do in mostly

---

¹ Our translation. Swedish: Från två till 120 anbud
² Our translation. Swedish: Renässans för självbyggeri
³ Our translation. Swedish: Så fick miljonprogrammet ett nytt ansikte
⁴ Our translation. Swedish: Boendeinflytande i Praktiken
troubled areas. *Regeneration for Sustainable Development in Different Housing Areas*\(^5\) (2005) reviews deficits and qualities in different types of modernist areas, and concludes this in strategies for a sustainable development of these areas.

**Value of space**

In her dissertation *In search of the good city. Constructions of ideals and problems in Swedish urban planning discussion*\(^6\) (2009) Moa Tunström reviews the Swedish discussion on urban planning and urban ideals, in order to make visible the constructing of urban ideals in this discussion. She does this by analyzing articles from the Swedish Journal of Planning (Plan), publications from the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning and the Urban Environment Council (Stadsmiljörådet). The analysis focuses both on the construction of urban ideals and on the urban planner role. Much of the analysis has as point of departure the modernist ideal, and the reaction against this. (Tunström, 2009, p. 5)

In another dissertation, *Mutual Benefit – Rethinking Social Inclusion* (2005), Lina Martinsson deals with new arrangements of collaboration, going from a public domination to collaboration between actors of different sectors. The dissertation aims to investigate whether these new forms of collaborations are more effective in their aim for social inclusion and integration than the traditional arrangements were. The focus is on value creation and social capital from a point of view of power relations. (Martinsson, 2005, p. 3) Martinsson’s use of social capital in relation to governance in municipal housing areas is consistent with our use of capital in value creation in regeneration of municipal and public housing.

Other researchers have used the concept of capital value in relation to the built environment. In her book *Architecture for Life – about contemporary architecture in-between the past and the future*\(^7\) (2006). Louise Nyström discusses the value of architecture from several different perspectives, among others function, time, place, politics and beauty. She gives examples of how the value of architecture can be explained through economic, social, cultural and environmental capital and how these interact. The publication has been discussed on several seminars for public authorities in Sweden.

**Aim and research questions**

Regeneration tries to obtain a better use and a higher value of space. The objective of regeneration developments is to improve the area from the perspective of the real estate owners, the residents and the city inhabitants. The neighborhoods should become a well functioning and integrated part of the city. We will investigate and compare how the projects and their actors formulate, relate to and strive for a better use and a higher value of space. Through making comparisons and analyzing these based on their different contexts conclusions about lessons for future regenerations schemes can be drawn. Depending on similarities and differences in contexts and ambitions certain activities or approaches might be transferred.

\(^5\) Our translation. Swedish: Förnyelse för hållbar utveckling i olika boendemiljöer
\(^6\) Swedish: På spaning efter den goda staden. Om konstruktion av ideal och problem i svensk stadsbyggnadssdiskussion
\(^7\) Our translation. Swedish: Arkitektur för livet – om nutidens arkitektur mellan dåtid och framtid
The main questions to be answered are:

What elements of the projects or programs strive for a higher value of space in a similar way and what does it in different ways?

What lessons for future regeneration can be learned from the comparisons?

To answer these questions, case studies will be conducted. The respective case studies will focus on the problem formulation of the area and the definition of the ideal outcome, the process of regeneration, and the outcome of the regeneration project. The questions to guide these investigations are:

In what way do the formulation of the problems and the definitions of the ideal outcomes point to specific practices of regeneration?

How does the process to obtain the defined goals work, how does it relate to the defined goals, and how does the process reflect a higher value of space?

In order to achieve the best understanding on the function of different parts of the regeneration schemes, and to understand the relation between separate parts, five themes have been identified from our material. These themes are the basis for the comparisons made.

We see regeneration as a way to accomplish a better use of space, to increase its value. By including this in the analysis we gain another perspective of what the aim of regeneration is. To view the regeneration processes in terms of the values that it strives to accomplish in addition to the direct activities, one can also recognize the intentions behind. The theory that is used in this thesis therefore give perspectives of how one through planning and design can make better use of land, in other words how one can create a better city.

**Concepts and definitions**

*Public / municipal non-profit housing*

This thesis deals with housing that is directly or indirectly owned by some form of public governmental authority. It is therefore essential to explain how the U.S. concept of public housing differs from the Swedish concept of municipal non-profit housing (allmännyttiga bostäder). The Public housing in the U.S. context is rental units owned by the local Public Housing Authorities, eligible to receive federal operating subsidy from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 B). The outspoken purpose with public housing is to provide “decent and safe rental housing for eligible low income families, the elderly, and persons with disabilities” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 E). This differs from the Swedish concept of municipal non-profit housing where the purpose is to provide good rental dwellings for all, meaning that it applies to the whole population, not any special targeted groups (Hedman, 2001, p. 74) (Hedman, 2008, p. 13).
**Regeneration**

There are many terms used in literature and research to describe the process of creating a better use and a higher value of housing areas such as urban renewal, urban redevelopment, and urban revitalization. Several are connected to certain times, places, manners or do only cover physical interventions. In the U.S. the concept of for example urban renewal often has negative connotations since it is associated with large scale demolitions of established neighbourhoods to make way for new commercial districts, housing projects and highways in the name of modernization, resulting in displacement of the poor (Gregory, Johnston, Pratt, Watts, & Whatmore, 2009, p. 790). In this thesis we will consequently use the concept of regeneration. This concept comprises elements that are crucial for our study that other concepts does not. Urban regeneration “seek either to support vulnerable communities and localities through the redistribution of resources to them on the basis of need, or to promote growth and development and through this improve the lot of those most in need” (Hall T., 2006, p. 57).

**Social mix**

In all cases investigated in this thesis there is a strive towards a larger mix of different experiences within the areas, one also talks about mixing incomes. The concept of mix can be related to segregation and integration and be divided in two; social mix and housing mix. Social mix aims at creating a mix of people from different social groups in society to increase the interaction in the social life hence increasing the social capital. Housing mix refers to interventions intending to achieve this through the mix of different types of housing and tenure forms. (Nyström, 2008, p. 31) There are different views on where it is urgent to enforce this mix, the tendency is that most efforts are directed towards one-sided areas that are poor, not one-sided areas that are well off. The research on the relation between social mix and housing mix is ambiguous and points to both positive and negative results (Nyström, 2008, p. 39). A more important factor seems to be the accessibility to education and the labor market (Nyström, 2008, p. 39).

**Delimitations**

This study concerns programs for regeneration of deteriorated, problematic publicly or municipally owned housing areas. We will study interventions on both federal/state levels and local/municipal levels when relevant for the cases. Possible private actors involved in the regeneration processes of the cases will be taken into consideration. The choice to study publicly owned housing areas is made since these could be expected to have the capacity to work in a more coherent manner and hence could be expected to show a distinct result. Also, their activities can be related to a general ambition in society. We are not comparing the Swedish and U.S. way of regenerating, as the cases are not seen as being general representations for these countries, but search for new and successful ways of improving regeneration through learning from projects of different contexts.

The geographical delimitation for the empirical part of the study is Sweden and the U.S. We will mainly touch upon the circumstances in three cases located in the larger metropolitan areas of Washington D.C. and Gothenburg which have been our main objects of study. However more general housing policies and national programs will be taken into consideration. The time perspective of the study is from the early 1990s until today. This was when the regeneration processes we study were
taking place, however we will touch upon the historical backgrounds of the cases starting after World War II. When looking into the cases we will delimit our research to how the problem of the area is formulated, how the process is taking form and what the result is. Our focus is on how regeneration is carried out in the respective situations, and not on the underlying situations themselves. We will for example not make any conclusions on lessons about the housing policies, but only compare these in order to gain perspective of the regeneration activities. The studies of these three cases are all related to how one tries to achieve a higher value in the form of Bourdieu’s concepts of capital and postmodern ideals within urban planning and design.

We make no assessment on which scheme is better, but will only compare activities in order to see how things can be done differently. Therefore we do not focus on how the outcomes have been received. We will not analyze others’ valuing or assessments of the regeneration programs. These are only of interest for us if they inform us of the problem formulation and the process. The choice has however been to include cases that in some way are considered successful in their respective contexts.

**Disposition**

Until here the topic of this thesis has been introduced. A background and a brief of the current research have been presented. The aim of the thesis along with the elaborating research questions have been stated and explained. Concepts that are essential for the thesis have then been described and defined.

The following and second chapter put our study in a global and national context and raises critical questions about regeneration. The third chapter consists of a brief review of the housing policies in the U.S. and Sweden. In the forth chapter we then introduce the theoretical concepts and principles that will be used in the analysis. First we explain the concept of how to increase the value of space through economic, cultural and social capital. Then an overview of the reactions towards modernist planning is followed by two ways to improve the land use, traditional urban form and a new planner role.

The fifth chapter explains the used methods; case study research and the more detailed data gathering methods. This chapter is then followed by two chapters presenting the result of the study; one covering the two cases in the U.S. and one covering the Swedish case. The two chapters start with brief reviews of the main regeneration approaches used in each country concerning the cases. These chapters are answering the investigation research questions presented in the introduction.

In the eighth chapter the presented result will be analyzed. The cases will be compared to each other and interpreted through the theories of increasing the value of space through different forms of capital. Here the aim of the thesis will be examined under five main themes defined from the empiric material and the main research question is answered. The thesis is then finalized through a concluding discussion in the last and ninth chapter where we summarize the comparison and conclude with lessons that can improve future regeneration.
In this chapter we will introduce the contexts of our cases of investigation. The purpose is to explain the societal conditions that the sites and the people living in these sites are subject to. We introduce the current forces of poverty and an increasing polarization, the inequalities and problems of segregation, and give a critical discussion of regeneration from the perspective of those who live in the regenerated neighborhoods. These discussions have focus on the people in these neighborhoods, who mostly view their living conditions as poor. Since we in the rest of the thesis will mainly focus our intention to the actions of regeneration and not on the residents, we put light on their situations here. We also discuss the view on different forms of tenure in USA and Sweden to give a background to the prerequisites for change in the respective sites. This discussion can also be seen as a setting for a more thorough description of the housing policy in the countries in the following chapter.

Global perspectives

In today’s western society, in the context that our regeneration sites are situated, certain forces of poverty, inequality and segregation affect the construction of urban space. To set the stage for our cases, we therefore introduce these phenomenons here as they are part of the context of our cases. The economic restructuring during the 20th century has not benefitted all. It has lead to a decrease in certain jobs like manufacturing, leading to an increase of the poor population. According to Talmadge Wright, globalism and the associated competition between cities have further resulted in a type of development that has put the middle class comfort before the low income class. (Wright, 1997, pp. 82-84) Conditions of socio economic differences are however contested. Some further claim that the evolution in contemporary society goes towards a larger polarization, where the richer are getting richer whereas the poorer are getting poorer. The theory points to the decrease in the rather well-paid manufacturing occupations, in relation to an increase in both low-paid and high-paid occupations. (Knox & Pinch, 2006, p. 84)

About the polarization, Wright points to the problem as Marcuse describes it, as one of inequality that reflects a hierarchical relationship of domination and subordination, inclusion and exclusion,
privilege and deprivation (Wright, 1997, p. 99). By other words, the problem of inequality is not that people have differing resources, but that these differences implies an unequal access and control over the forces of society. This sometimes puts some people of low income groups in a position of being subject to other’s good will. Inequalities are often also linked to geography. Spatial patterns of socio economic inequalities are by now an old phenomenon.

Segregation is an often occurring result, but the problems are not necessarily that people of different income live separate from each other. When using the word segregation, it usually implies spatial segregation characterized by social inequality. Segregation is often connected to an uneven distribution within society of resources and availability of service. An uneven quality and attractiveness of the living area of different groups is also many times related to segregation. Segregation is a serious urban problem when the groups with the least resources become directed to the worst living areas, with the least services and the least possibilities for a good living. This then also becomes a problem for the rest of society. (Boverket, 2002, pp. 1-2) In our cases, the situation prior to regeneration can very much be characterized by segregation. The residents in the neighborhoods experienced alienation from the rest of society due to either being of racial, class, or cultural minorities in the society they live in. As will be described, the residents in the U.S. cases can be said to be worse of when it comes to socio economic situation, as well as living situation. However by describing the situation of all affected residents that are connected to our sites with the concepts of inequality and segregations, one should pay attention to that they are all in difficult positions, as inequality and segregation describe their negative position in the respective societies.

Segregation might be a direct result of housing policy to provide housing for low income people. This fact will for example be touched upon in the description of U.S. public housing in chapter three. There are however other ways of solving the housing problems for the poor, attempts to provide homes for less well off citizens goes on over the globe. The British report Social Housing Tenure and Allowance: An International Overview (2001) made reviews over housing provision and housing allowance over ten countries. Support for housing cost is according to the report normally of either or two sorts: subsidies for the construction of social housing, or consumer subsidies, usually in the form of housing allowance for the residents to pay their rents. The report claims that in most countries the development over the last 15 years has been a shift from subsidies for construction to subsidies through different forms of housing allowance. Social housing is most commonly associated with low income, with Sweden and the Netherlands as exceptions. (Ditch, Alan, & Wilcox, 2001, pp. 9-10) This is a fundamental difference between the Swedish and the U.S. housing policy that would provide for less segregation problems in the Swedish society. However, the way that the Swedish society has evolved during the 20th century segregation has still become a definite problem.

There is however another side to segregation than the forces that make low income groups move to and stay in particular neighborhoods. There is also the forces related to the socio economic more affluent, where there is a tendency of those more well off to move into enclaves of like-minded. So the separation of different socio economic groups work in two directions. Also, since globalism puts pressure on cities to stand out, the attractive image of the urban landscape becomes more important. The more well off citizens become a tool to accomplish this picture and where they chose to invest their money in housing becomes a factor that shapes the city.

8 Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden and the U.S.
Critical perspectives on regeneration

This thesis deals with regeneration as a way to increase the value of space. Our focus is how this is done, on the process, and on what types of value one tries to achieved. Connected to this statement one can also immerse oneself in a discussion on the power issues associated with the increase of value, who gets to define this value, and from who’s perspective it is an increase in value. This is not the major focus of this thesis, but in this chapter we will give a brief of the discussion on value and power connected with the concept of regeneration, as a part in setting the stage for our cases.

Talmadge Wright writes:

|…|the production of space is intimately connected to dominant social imaginary. The dominant social imaginary works through the city vision embraced by the city planners and the city officials of what the “good” city should look like, who and what is to be included/excluded. (Wright, 1997, p. 6)

In the introduction we also presented Fox Gotham, Shefner and Brumley’s statement that concepts describing improvements of a site helps to promote certain planning policies before others through defining the urban problem and the ideal outcome. (Fox Gotham, Shefner, & Brumley, 2001, p. 331)

This very much applies to regeneration, and it makes regeneration a complicated concept. In the process of regeneration certain urban space is condemned and declared to be substandard, in need of improvement. In making these improvements there are a number of stakeholders with possibly different notions and different sorts of stakes in the process. Planners and policymakers hold one position, investors and actors with financial stakes hold another, and residents finally hold another. The interplay between these is a difficult one. Forces of economy, culture, race, gender, class, etcetera further complicates the picture. This chapter will briefly introduce some of the issues that are brought up in terms of the position of residents.

The complexity of the regeneration and the often debated outcomes can for example be illustrated by the different concepts used to describe the phenomenon. For us it stood clear during our interviews that the concept “urban renewal” for example not was one that one used in connection to HOPE VI. The concept of urban renewal in the United States has negative connotations. It is related to the attempt to deal with physical decay in the inner city from about the 1950s, but the methods were many times criticized as it often meant a total clearing of certain areas to replace them with something different, and even though one of the stated aims were to provide decent housing, housing and slums seldom benefited these developments. (Fox Gotham, 2001, pp. 8-9) Urban Renewal is then much associated with an inequality of power over space that negatively affected lower income groups.

The fact that regeneration often targets neighborhoods that are distressed does imply that the affected residents are often subject to an unequal division of power in the negotiations concerning the urban problem and the solution. As Talmadge Wright writes, the production of space is connected with a dominant social imaginary, working through the city vision kept by the city planners and city officials. From the perspective of the planners and actors in power, there is often a conflict between providing decent housing for low income groups, and to attract capital. For HOPE VI this has been dealt with through creating mixed income communities where investments can be attracted through the possibilities to sell houses, and where a certain amount of public housing is still kept.
Looking to the HOPE VI program the main aim is to improve the living conditions for resident who live in severely distressed public housing and to provide housing that will decrease the concentration of poor households, as this is viewed as one of the main urban problems. Early in the program plans for development usually involved a temporary relocation of residents in order to redevelop the HOPE VI site, and then to allow them to return. However, as the program has matured and the policy-makers saw the opportunities of creating mixed income communities as the best way to improve the areas, less and less former residents have been able to return. (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009, p. 193) This has caused critics to question whether the ones in need are the ones who benefit from the program. Many compare HOPE VI with the former much criticized Urban Renewal program that was displacing poor household from gentrifying neighborhoods. Others however argue that a high resident turnover is typical for public housing, and that the fact that this continues with the HOPE VI program cannot be blamed on the program. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, pp. 27-28) Also, according to many, not all residents wanted to return as they might not have positive experience of the neighborhood. The HOPE VI Panel Study, the only national study that focused on resident relocation, also concludes that in general former residents of HOPE VI sites experience better life situations than before, no matter if they return of not. (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009, p. 200)

In our observations in Washington D.C., Baltimore and Philadelphia just taking walks in different HOPE VI sites made us aware of the differences between individual projects. Location had much to do with this, but we could also experience a difference in the ambitions of the developments. Some had become middle income communities, and some still had a low income community feel to it although the built structure was of better quality.

There are definitely reasons to discuss regeneration in terms of gentrification. According to Talmadge Wright gentrification is many times viewed as a way to replace outmoded institutions and customs in a process to create a better city. Also, as gentrifiers bring the resources their vision of the type of community that they want is crucial for the success of the project. (Wright, 1997, p. 92) This also implies a conflict between socio economic groups, where the community preferred by the former resident group becomes second after that of the new affluent resident group.

The question of relocation and who will live in the regenerated areas after development is also an issue in Sweden. The permanent leases that exist in Sweden imply that housing companies cannot relocate residents to improve their housing in the same way as in the U.S. An alternative apartment need to be provided for a household if their apartment is being renovated on initiative of the housing company, and after the renovation they are naturally entitled to come back. The question is rather on the added living expenses associated with regeneration. As an example, this caused protest in Husby, a suburb of Stockholm, when the municipal housing company wanted to regenerate the area. A development involving demolition of parts of a neighborhood and renovations with increases in rents as a result in other parts of the neighborhood was resented by the residents. Residents reacted against this change as they could not afford the increase in rents and felt that they had not been included in the planning process. The protest however resulted in a dialogue being commenced on the topic of redevelopment. (Berglund, 2007) According to Hedman many municipal housing companies have since the 1990s also introduced new ways of thinking about regeneration, where the point of departure is the residents of the area, and were a comprehensive view is preferred instead of only a short term focus on the physical improvements (Hedman, 2008, p. 23).
Tenure and policy in USA and Sweden

The context in which an urban environment is developed is a sum of many different parts. According to Knox and Pinch the production of the built environment is not only a result of supply and demand, it also depends on time- and place specific social relations. These relations involve actors with different interests and functions such as landowners, investors, financiers, developers, builders, community leaders and consumers. The state and the local authorities are important agents especially as regulators of the competition among these other actors. The structure of the building provision also consists of the functional, historical, political, social and cultural linkages between structural elements within the political economy. (Knox & Pinch, 2006, pp. 120-121)

One urban dimension is the dialectic between owning and renting your home. The view of these different groups, homeowners and renters, differs in different countries. In most Western countries one can notice a growth in homeownership since the World War II. In the U.S. the proportion of owner-occupied dwellings grew from 44% in 1940 to 65% in 2000. (Knox & Pinch, 2006, p. 122) This could be compared to that of the total amount of apartment units in multifamily houses in Sweden around 67% were rental units in 2009. Around 30% were co-operative apartments. Circa 45% of the total dwellings in Sweden were single family houses. (SCB, 2010) This U.S. growth in homeownership has been stimulated by several mortgage insurance programs. Homeownership has become a key component within macroeconomic policy since it is an effective mechanism to regulate and stimulate economy. Homeownership is also seen as having a stabilizing effect both socially and politically since it encourages financial responsibility. In the U.S. the factor of giving the homeowner a financial stake in society is important but homeownership is also thought to eliminate the feeling of alienation that is expected to come when being a rental tenant. (Knox & Pinch, 2006, p. 122)

Knox and Pinch stresses the fact that this homeownership culture has caused polarization of socioeconomic groups by housing tenure resulting in residential segregation. The growing group of homeowners often comes from higher socioeconomic levels. The growth in homeownership is connected to a decline in privately rented housing, in the U.S. today between 25-35% of all households live in privately rented accommodation. (Knox & Pinch, 2006, p. 122)

Susan Popkin, researcher at the Urban Institute, describes how the Reagan administration wanted to turn a larger part of the population into homeowners and how also the Bush administration pushed for poor people to become homeowners. The reasoning behind this was for people to build assets when the houses would go up in price, and this would result in gained wealth. Popkin states that this politics hit poor people harder than others because they were able to take loans they couldn’t afford. This in turn is now driving the rents up since lots of people are returning to the rental market.

Knox and Pinch write that the public housing sector not only is a product of the demand for housing, instead it is the result of broader political and economical factors. The quality of public housing therefore depends on resources and the nature of public institutions and central and local governments. Knox and Pinch point to the fact that in Europe one can see a more symbolic distancing between social groups, whereas one in the U.S. sees a more territorial segregation. This according to Knox and Pinch is connected to the social stratification between groups in Europe whereas the borders between groups in the U.S. are more open and fluently changing. We however see a definite territorial segregation in Sweden, as many low income families live in apartments on cheap land in the suburbs. Knox and Pinch also remark that the sterility in the aesthetics used in many public
housing areas is not always comparable to the financial restraints but could be said to be a consciously built-in factor. (Knox & Pinch, 2006, pp. 127-129)

Homeownership can also be a source of conflict. Knox and Pinch describes how particular groups of homeowners starts to protect their property to enhance the exchange value and that this result in conflicts between them and other groups (Knox & Pinch, 2006, p. 125). This could be connected to the historical legacy of racially based dual-housing markets in the U.S. which Talmadge Write describes. In the 1920s the real estate practices, within a period of legal segregation, strived to create separated white and black neighborhoods to protect property values. This could still be seen today in the way that real estate, banking and lending institutions separates housing areas into “black” and “white”. This creates a lock out effect where the “black” redlined areas carrying concentrations of minorities lack investment capital and where deterioration leads to abandonment and so accelerates the decline. (Wright, 1997, p. 83)

In Sweden homeownership is today more beneficial than renting your apartment, due to advantageous tax regulations (SABO, 2010). The historical Swedish perspectives on housing do however somewhat differ from the American. The Swedish view on housing is reflected in a report from the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning where one states that housing is not to be treated as any other commodity or service:

_Housing is simply a very large part of life, which motivates that society in some way secure access to it. Housing is usually much more than an object of investment for the person who should live there. Roof over ones head and integrity in the housing, a place of one’s own, a home, a neighborhood that one is part of are all fundamental prerequisites for a life of human dignity._ (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 9)

In Sweden there has been a general understanding that the market forces are not enough to ensure the supply of housing, especially concerning to those that have fewer resources (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 9). After the war housing policy in Sweden became a part of the social welfare and state policy. The aim was to create good dwellings for all and what is special about Swedish social policy; the housing policy was supposed to have a general character, meaning that it applies to the whole population, not any special targeted groups in society. (Hedman, 2001, p. 75)

The Swedish welfare system has a foundation that making society better for all will also benefit the weakest groups (Martinsson, 2005, p. 40). The Scandinavian states have welfare systems that are special when it comes to providing a strong safety net; the minimum level of existence is ensured to the citizens. This makes the income polarization result in less severe situations than in the U.S. In Sweden, despite trends of restructuring of the welfare state since the 1990s, a larger share of the population can survive on state benefits outside the labor market than in the U.S. (Martinsson, 2005, pp. 38-39)

The attitudes towards the practice of politics and politicians differ between Sweden and the U.S, which have effects on how housing policies are shaped. In development of HOPE VI one can see how the influence from strong individuals and politicians has been an important factor in the shaping of the program. Both Bruce Katz and Henry Cisneros who were involved in the program from the early days testifies of a number of senators, public officials and urban planning practitioners that played a crucial role for how HOPE VI came to be (Cisneros, 2009) (Katz, 2009). The interviews we conducted
on site gave us the same impression. This could be connected to the political history of the U.S.
where the belief in the individual capacity is strong and where one, as is not the case in Sweden, has
ministerial government rules. Sweden is one of the few countries where ministerial government rule
is considered as something negative that increases the risk of corruption (Bäck & Larsson, 2006, pp.
177, 203, 361). The borders between politicians and officials also differ. In the U.S. many professions
that in Sweden is considered as clerks are politically appointed (Lundén, 1997, p. 145).

We have in this chapter introduced the broader contexts in which our investigated cases takes place
and which they have to be related to, both considering the global level and the national. A critical
perspective on regeneration has also been presented. These settings get to act as our point of
departure for the coming chapters.
3. Housing policy

As a background for the comparison we will below give a review for the housing policy in the respective countries investigated. The contexts of these regeneration cases are different, so in order to draw any conclusions on the lessons to be learned by other examples, this needs to be considered.

USA

Housing policy is not only about providing decent housing for people. Reviewing the state and local housing programs in the U.S. since the 1930s, Katz et al (2003) summarizes the policies into a number of goals of housing policy, such as making existing housing more affordable, help households build wealth, strengthen families and promote balanced metropolitan growth. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 6)

Even though one could easily associate housing policy in the United State with public housing, there are more to it. Also, affluent Americans benefit of federal housing policy to a greater extent than the poor do. Whereas 7 million low-income renters benefited from the federal housing subsidies in 2008 almost 155 million home owners took mortgage interest deduction on their federal income taxes. The federal government however help the housing situation for low income renters in the following ways: through supporting the construction and development of housing developments, through helping renters pay for housing on the private market, and through proving financial help for states and localities to develop their housing programs. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 7)

Historic perspective on housing

A primary goal of the housing policy has been to improve the quality of the housing stock. Land use reforms of the late 19th and early 20th century aimed at improving living conditions with overcrowded and sordid housing, endured by poor immigrants and other city dwellers. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 21) During the second half of the 20th century the conditions improved. The positive changes from the 1940s to 1960s echoes the growth of the urban population and the migration of African Americans to the northern cities. Later the change had more to do with effects of new constructions replacing substandard buildings. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 22) Overcrowding is another condition of housing
that has experienced improvement during the 20th century. In 1940 20% of the households lived in overcrowded homes according to the standard more than one person per room. By 1980 the rate had decreased to 4.5% of the households. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 25-26)

Until World War II a majority of households were renters but this then changed drastically within only two decades. In 1940 the rate of homeowners was 44% and in 1960 this had increased to 62%. Today renters account for a third of the households. This change was much due to a change in the housing finance system, shaped by federal policy. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 13,19)

**Conditions for renters versus homeowners**

There are some demographic differences among who rents and who buys. Looking to race the amount of homeowners among whites are 72% (in 2007), while 47% of Afro Americans and 50% of the Hispanic population are homeowners. Homeowners are also far more affluent than renters, and this relation is increasing in time. In 2007, the median income of homeowners was more than double that of renters. Also the chance of living in a house with moderate to severe physical deficiencies is more than twice as large if you’re a renter than if you own your house. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 20-21)

Affordability is a great concern. More than 16% of all households spend half or more of their income on housing. Among renters, this rate is 20%. If a household spends more than 30% they are considered to have high housing cost burden. More than 30% among homeowners and more than 45% of renters spend 30% or more. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 26-29) Although housing cost burden is commonly associated with renters, an increasing part of homeowners experience cost burdens (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 32). Renters are however becoming poorer, at the same time as supply of affordable and available housing is shrinking (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 36).

**Housing policy actors**

**HUD**

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, is the federal agency with responsibility of most of U.S. housing programs. It was founded in 1965. HUD oversees public housing and other project-based subsidy programs, FHA insurance programs, rental voucher programs, housing and community development block grants, housing programs serving the elderly, homeless and other populations with special needs. HUD also manages several community and economic development programs. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 45) HUD formulates their mission as follows

*HUD’s mission is to create strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality affordable homes for all. HUD is working to strengthen the housing market to bolster the economy and protect consumers; meet the need for quality affordable rental homes: utilize housing as a platform for improving quality of life; build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination; and transform the way HUD does business.* (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 D)
**Public Housing Authorities**

A Public Housing Authority, PHA, is responsible for the management and operation of its local public housing programs, and it may also operate other types of housing programs. PHAs sometimes provide other services such as homeownership opportunities, employment programs for residents, and support programs for the elderly. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 B)

PHAs vary greatly in their scale and operation. In 2008, 3,148 PHAs owned and operated public housing, an additional 995 only administered housing voucher programs. Nearly half of the PHAs manage 100 or fewer public housing units, totally representing 5% of the country’s public housing, while 12 PHAs alone account for 23% of the entire stock with 7,500 or more units. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 127)

The management of PHAs has sometimes been a problem, with lax tenant selection procedures, failure to respond to tenant complaints and to repair and maintain appliances and building systems etcetera. In some cities, Washington D.C., Newark, New Jersey and New Orleans being among them, the federal government has stepped in and put entire housing authorities in receivership, and made independent administrators bring order into the authorities. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 136)

**Providing housing for low-income residents**

**Public housing**

The public housing program started in 1937. Other than proving housing for poor, the legislation passed much due to its conceived potential to generate employment and to clear the slums. With a stop during World War II, The Housing Act of 1949 reauthorized the public housing programs and authorized the nation to build 810,000 units within 6 years. The construction of public housing picked up during the following years, although this goal was not reached until 1968. From the start of the program and into the 1980s the construction increased during each decade. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 126) The peak of the program was in 1994 when the public housing stock reached 1.4 million units, but by the 2008 it had declined with a loss of 19% (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 126). In recent years nearly HUD’s entire budget has gone toward preserving the existing stock through operating subsidies, modernization funding and the HOPE VI program. Nearly any funding has been spent on constructing additional public housing since 1996. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 47)

The purpose of public housing is to provide decent and safe rental housing for eligible low income families, the elderly, and persons with disabilities, according to HUD’s homepage. There are approximately 1.2 million households living in public housing in United States. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 E) Renters pay no more than 30% of their adjusted income in rent (Schwartz p. 105). HUD administers federal aid to local PHAs, for them to manage public housing. HUD also provides technical and professional assistance in planning, developing and managing the public housing developments. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 B)

Eligibility for public housing is based on the applicants annual gross income, whether one qualify as elderly, a person with disabilities, or as a family, have U.S. citizenship or eligible immigration statues. Applicant may not have poor rental references, so that they can be expected to have a negative effect on other tenants or the environment. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Public housing host some of the most poor and vulnerable households in the U.S. The program is designed to hold resident with very low incomes, in order not to pose a threat to the rest of the housing market. The concentration of very poor people has been considered as a source of problems for the developments. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 128)

As access to the public housing homes is dependent on the tenants' income level, the tenants may stay in their homes as long as they fulfill the conditions for the lease. Normally, tenants are required to leave if the income level succeeds 120 % of the admission limits. Local housing agencies are also allowed to move families to alternative accommodation to ensure the best use of the housing stock. By this one refers to avoiding under-occupation or overcrowding, to renovate properties or to abide to tenants requests for transfer. The tenants themselves are protected by regulations governing evictions. Grounds for evictions however are unpaid rents, drug use and criminal activity etcetera. (Ditch, Alan, & Wilcox, 2001, p. 150)

Originally, the federal government paid the cost of building the public housing projects and tenants' rents paid for the cost of operating them. Rents covered maintenance and other operating costs. Eventually though the operating costs could no longer be covered by the rents. Instead the congress responded to this problem through allocating an operating subsidy, paid to the PHA by HUD. The way the size of this operating subsidy has been determined has changed during the years, but now the subsidy is allocated to individual projects, not the entire housing authority. The size is based on the difference between rental income and total expenses. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 137-138)

Another subsidy that public housing gets from the federal government is called capital subsidies. This funding aims at making greater renovations of the housing stock through replacements of major building systems. From the start this capital was meant for the PHAs to provide for. From 1968 the federal government started a program with funding; priorities were given to different types of renovations in different years. This meant that it was not always the most pressing needs of the housing authorities that were addressed. But since the 1980s the housing authorities were given more leeway to decide what the money would go to. However, the housing authorities has had major backlog of capital needs, in parts due to lack of maintenance. The $ 2.5 million annually that congress allocates for capital improvements have been far from enough to cover the needs that exists. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 139-140)

Housing Choice Vouchers

Housing Choice Vouchers, HCV, is a federal housing program helping very low-income families, elderly and disabled to afford housing in the private market. Instead of being limited to special subsidized housing, the households themselves find their home on the private market. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 C) Local PHAs receive federal funds from HUD in order to administer the Housing Choice Voucher program. A family themselves find a suitable home which need to meet the requirements of the program in terms of health and safety. It also requires that the landlord agrees to rent under the program. The PHA then pays a housing subsidy directly to the landlord, and the family pays the difference between the actual rent and the subsidy. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 C)

Whereas public housing has decreased since the beginning of the 1990s, the voucher program has continued to grow. HOPE VI is a contributing factor for the increase, as many resident relocated from...
public housing under HOPE VI receive vouchers instead. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 180) The conditions of finding an acceptable apartment and a landlord that agrees to lease under the program means that receiving a voucher does not mean the family succeeds to use it. In a study from 2000 69 % of all families enrolled in the program succeeded to use their voucher. A tougher private renting market is a possible explanation for the decreased utility of the vouchers. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 181-183)

An advantage with the Voucher program that is often highlighted is that the program does not by its nature result in concentrated poverty in the same way as public housing traditionally has done. A far smaller degree of voucher holders live in economically distressed neighborhoods compared to residents in public housing and other project-based programs. However it has been shown that the program does not guarantee against racial segregation. Voucher holders frequently end up in minority neighborhoods. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 206)

**Low-Income Housing Tax Credit**

The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, LIHTC, is not a federal housing program, but an item in the Internal Revenue Code. Established in 1986 LIHTS provide incentives to build housing for low income tenants. The way it does this is through allowing investors in low income housing to reduce their taxes with $1 for every dollar of tax credit received. They receive the tax credit for 10 years, and the property constructed must host low income renters for at least 15 years. The amount of credit depends on cost of the housing, its location, and the proportion of units occupied by low income households. LIHTC is the largest single subsidy for low income housing. In the end of 2006 the tax credit had helped to fund more than 1.6 million housing units. It now accommodates more households than public housing. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 103)

On average 96 % of units in a house funded by LIHTC is designated for low income households. Generally, the residents of these developments tend to have a higher income level than residents in public housing or other federal housing subsidy programs, but their incomes are still lower than 60 % of area median, which is the maximum income prescribed by law. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 112-113)

Housing developers usually sell the LIHTC to private investors in order to produce equity, and use the yield to cover acquisitions, construction and other development costs. The investors then receive the tax credit and with that other tax benefits and possibly some cash flow. The equity generated by the developers then determines the need for other sources of funding and the minimum rents that one need to charge. (Schwartz A. F., 2010, pp. 105,107) With time, investors have paid more for these credits, reducing the gap of additional financing and as follows allowing for more low income tenants (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 122).
Sweden

Swedish housing policy was formed as a policy field of its own in 1946-1948 when several resolutions were made concerning building, financing and housing supply (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 11). Housing policy in Sweden works at two different levels, the central government answers for the conditions for financing and legislation while the municipal authorities, having a high degree of autonomy, are in charge of the planning, production and management of housing (Martinsson, 2005, p. 40) (Hedman, 2001, p. 76). The municipalities are responsible for setting up housing supply programs which are supposed to cover the need of new construction, rebuilding, demolition, renovation but also the need of services in the housing areas (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 84).

Municipal housing companies own the non-profit part of the rental sector and the larger part of this stock was built after World War II. After the war housing policy in Sweden became a part of the social welfare and state policy. The aim was to create good dwellings for all and the housing policy was supposed to have a general character, to apply to the whole population and not any special targeted groups in society. (Hedman, 2001, p. 75) The Swedish welfare system has as a base that making society better for all will also benefit the weakest groups (Martinsson, 2005, p. 40). One result is that Swedish housing tends to have a higher technical quality and flats are better planned than in many other countries. The approach of producing low-cost housing for low income groups was abandoned after experiments with designated housing for large families in the 1930-1940s. (Hall & Vidén, 2005, p. 323) Since then, Sweden have not had any “social housing” (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 13).

The Swedish housing policy includes one selective effort directed towards economically weaker groups (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 29). Housing allowances, which is a demand subsidy, are related to income, the housing cost, the size of the apartment and if you have children or not. Pensioners can also get a special allowance for housing expenses. (Försäkringskassan, 2011)

From 1942 to 1968 the Swedish rents were controlled. From 1968 the rent levels were related to the occupants’ utility value of the housing unit (Martinsson, 2005, p. 40), rent levels should be equal for dwellings that had the same level of standard (Hedman, 2001, p. 76). The rents were set through negotiation between the non-profit sector and the tenants organization, these rent levels also determined the rents for the private rental units (Martinsson, 2005, p. 40). Because of EU regulations this model is undergoing changes; for example the private property owners are now being allowed to take part of the negotiations (SABO, 2011). Within the Swedish rental sector there is also a security of tenure that means that you can only be evicted if you damage the property, disturb other residents or does not pay rent. (Hedman, 2001, p. 76)

In 1965 the government came up with a program aiming at building one million homes in a ten year period. There were several reasons behind this effort. Despite the efforts in housing construction after the war there was still a large lack of housing and also a need to modernize the housing stock. (Martinsson, 2005, p. 41) Another reason is connected to the fact that that Swedish housing policy has also been used to a large extent as a driver to improve the national economical situation and the labor market. This means that housing construction has been applied to affect the employment rate. As such, Swedish housing policy has been an important part of the welfare policy. It has also been an instrument with which one has been able to moderate the ups and downs of the economic cycle, especially the municipal housing companies have been an instrument to steer the development and structural changes until the beginning of the 1970s. (Hedman, 2008, pp. 14, 74-75) Another feature
was that the local municipal authorities at this time used construction of large housing estates to show ones capacity (Hall & Vidén, 2005, p. 21). The goal of one million homes was reached in 1975 and this high supply together with a reduced demand for renting flats in the early 1970s resulted in many flats turning vacant (Hall & Vidén, 2005, p. 304). The oil crisis was a contributing factor to the decrease in demand and the following years the construction of new housing stagnated (Hedman, 2008, p. 18). Many of the larger multifamily areas were built in difficult locations making them isolated from the rest of the city and this in a combination with the lack of adequate services and transport made them less attractive (Martinsson, 2005, pp. 41-42).

During the 1960s and 1970s the tax subsidization came to be crucial to achieve the goal of one million homes between 1965 and 1974. The subsidies to the home-crofters (egnahemsägarna) were a political prerequisite for the interest contributions and other subsidies that became available for multifamily housing, and to non-profit housing companies. The rental housing estate charge was in the 1980s converted to a general property tax. In the mid 1990s the main function of the interest contribution became to make the different tenant forms be treated neutrally. (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 12) One of the purposes with this was to enable for a larger mix of different kinds of households and for example make it possible for families to rent a house instead of being forced to buy it (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 87).

The housing policy means used in Sweden have been state loans, property and interest subsidies for new dwellings and rehabilitation, tax deduction for home-owners and housing allowances for certain groups in need. In the 1990s governmental changes resulted in deregulations and a decreasing role of the state in the housing policy. The former generous subsidies were cut down and the housing politics of Sweden was in much omitted to the market forces. (Hedman, 2001, p. 76) The economic risk was now the responsibility of the housing companies, not the state (Hedman, 2008, p. 20). Together with increased taxes related to house construction and maintenance and less beneficial conditions for housing loans this resulted in a further large decrease in housing construction levels, higher costs for housing for households, too little restoration and maintenance of the existing housing stock and shortage of housing for vulnerable groups (Hedman, 2001, p. 77). Cuts in housing policy have been far larger than in other sectors and housing policy was decreasing in importance from being one of the most important. (Martinsson, 2005, p. 41)

**Efforts aiming at regeneration**

Through the years different efforts and subsidies has been aiming at regenerating the existing stock, especially the housing from the million homes program (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 80). The lack of rental incomes due to the many vacancies resulted in lack of budgeting for maintenance and deteriorating buildings. The decline in revenue for the housing companies also meant problems with handling the construction loans. To ease these problems the state introduced new subsidies, now aiming at improving the living environments in these areas. Between 1982 and 1991 a special loan support was available for housing areas with permanent problems with vacancies. Between 1986 and 1989 there was a subsidy directed towards regeneration efforts in the non-profit multifamily housing where the sum the state put in had to be countered by the same sum by the municipality. (Boverket, 2007 A, p. 82)

The need for modernization, stated in a review on maintenance funds in 1982, forced forward a special program for repairing, rebuilding or extending buildings, called ROT, aiming at renovation of
275 000 units within the years 1983-1993 (Boverket, 2007 A, pp. 87, 90). Through the program a state interest support through yearly interest contributions was made available for efforts aiming at common maintenance, reparations and energy saving efforts in rental and cooperative housing. To receive the interest contribution the municipal housing companies had to set up a maintenance fund on 2 % of the capital it conducted. The program made it easier to get loans for efforts in housing areas younger than 30 years, something that was hard with the existing state housing loans.

**Today**

Today the municipal housing companies are supposed to function the same way as privately owned housing companies on the housing market. What complicates this is the fact that they still have been supposed to work on a non-profit basis. Since the 1990s the municipal housing companies have been focusing on becoming economically efficient and one part of this has been to start considering the residents as customers with demands that one have to meet up to. If the residents want to stay in the area profitability increases since it results in fewer vacancies, lower turnover rates and less vandalized property. (Martinsson, 2005, pp. 43-44) Since the 1990s the earlier very close connection between the municipalities’ economy and the economy of the municipal housing companies have been loosening. The housing companies are now acting as private corporations, still owned by the municipality and with owner directives but much more independent than before. Economic support from the municipality has also become troublesome since the EU regulation sees it as a counteracting the principles of competition. (Hedman, 2008, p. 31)

In January 2011 a new Public Municipal Housing Companies Act (Allbolagen) was introduced. It is framed to accommodate the Swedish law to the EU rules, balancing the different interests from residents, municipalities and property owners. SABO, the Swedish Association of Public Housing Companies summarized the new law:

*The main task of a municipal housing company is to for the common good conduct properties with rental units, foster the housing supply in the municipality and offer the residents influence.*

*The corporation shall operate the work according to businesslike conditions with normal required rates of return. The existing limits on the share-out will be replaced by a limit of transmissions of capital from municipal housing companies. (SABO, 2011)*

The new element in the law is a principle on businesslike conditions. Since the law is new, it is unclear what it is going to mean for the future of the municipal housing companies who until now has been acting on a non-profit basis.
4. Creating the good city

Regeneration aims at creating a better city and a higher value of space. The theory that we present in this chapter therefore gives a perspective on how one can increase the value and create the good city, the good urban space. The regeneration attempts to create better urban space relative to the situation before regeneration, so the critique against modernism is a point of departure for this development. The critique of modernism will therefore be presented, and stemming from that, what is identified as two separate paths to increase the value of space: through traditional urban form or through a new way of planning and a new planner role. Traditional urban form replaces large scale monotone structures with a more human scale traditional urban landscape. Postmodernist design in general according to Nan Ellin and Moa Tunström, and New Urbanist design in particular according to Peter Calthorpe is presented here. A new way of planning and a new planner role is the reaction against the former rational expert planner, that lead to a facilitating and communicative planner. This path is discussed through the writings of Leoni Sandercock, Patsy Healey, Moa Tunström and Bent Flyvbjerg.

Initially though the increased value will be treated though Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts of capital. Capital according to him has three forms: cultural, social and economic and one form of capital can be transformed into another. These concepts are useful as regeneration attempts to increase several values at the same time in its strive for the good city. The model helps us to tell which of these capital values different activities strive to obtain, directly or through transformation between capital.

Forms of capital as value of space

In his article *The Forms of Capital* (1986) Bourdieu introduces three types of capital which according to him all are necessary to explain the structures of the social world. These are cultural, social and economic capital. Regeneration aims at increasing the value of space and hence at increasing capital. The increase of value as we see it in regeneration projects includes increases in all these three forms of capital, and they are interconnected.
Capital, according to Bourdieu, (Bourdieu, 1986) is accumulated labor. The possession of such capital gives the possessor possibility to appropriate social energy in the form of material or living labor. This he says makes up “the games of society”. This game does not occur by chance but depends on the accumulation and transformation of capital, which makes up the social structure. The structure of the distribution of different types of capital in a given moment represents the structure of the social world in that moment. This social world is made up of a set of constraints governing its functioning in a durable way and as such determines the success of certain practices that go on in the social world. As we see it, the regeneration of the areas that we have studied has identified certain constraints in the social worlds of their inhabitants, and is aiming at reducing the difficulties that these constraints cause through regeneration processes. In this, the accumulation of social, cultural and economic capital, as well as the transformation between the three plays a part. The increased value therefore means an increase in social, cultural as well as economic capital. Also, it includes keeping the costs of transformation between the types of capital at a low level.

Cultural capital is convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital. Cultural capital can be accumulated into human body or into an object. In human form it’s a matter of self-improvements though education, training, cultivation or other. Human cultural capital can help to comprehend and appreciate cultural capital in its objectified form, to “consume” cultural capital in art or architecture etcetera. Institutionalized cultural capital is much linked to proved academic or other qualifications, through a diploma or other. In order to keep cultural capital above a bare minimum, social, economic as well as cultural capital is needed. Such as a family’s economy or the social situations can affect the accumulation of cultural capital.

Social capital is made up of social obligations, which under certain conditions is convertible into economic capital. It can be describes as membership in a group, and is linked to network of more or less direct relations between people. Social capital is collectively owned, a credential that entitles each member to credit such as social support from the group. The connections between people in the group are continuously confirmed and re-confirmed in the form of enactment, by people acting in a way that confirms their relationship. The group is defined by who is let into the group, as every member gets the role of a custodian of the limits of the group. Every new person included can alter those limits.

One’s social capital depends firstly on the size of one’s network but also on economic and cultural and symbolic capital that enables one to mobilize and benefit from this network. Education and employment can be such cultural capital, as it enables integration into society. As such, education and employment increases ones abilities to gain credit from the network that society is made up of.

Economic capital is immediately and directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights. The improvements of deteriorated buildings are a direct way to increase the value of property. But regeneration also aims at increasing the level of income of its residents, and to improve the resource base in the areas in terms of a greater source of taxes.

In discussing conversions between the different types of capital Bourdieu points out that economic capital is at the root of all other types of capital. Social and cultural capital produces their individual, specific effects only to the extent that they conceal that they have economic capital as its root. The economic capital might not always be directly visible, but it is always present. Education can be seen on its own, as cultural capital, but it can also be seen as aiming towards an increase in economic
capital. Simultaneously, economic capital might be a prerequisite to get education. Similarly, social capital might be a value in its own, striving for a feeling of inclusion and pride of one’s neighborhood. At the root of this might however be a strive for increased economic capital, in the form of for example reduced vandalism in the area. And simultaneously, economic capital might be needed to create a neighborhood that encourages a feeling of pride.

About costs of transformation of capital Bourdieu describes that a gain in one type of capital means a cost in some other, which can be compared to conservation of energy. The cost is in its end form labor time, either the labor time accumulated in other capital, or the labor time needed to transform capital from one form to another. The convertibility of capital, in terms of the costs of conversions between forms of capital, is related to the reproduction of capital and one’s position in social space. The less costly it is in terms of time and resources spent, to transform cultural capital to social capital, the more total capital is gained.

The reaction against modernist planning

The modernist movement was a reaction to what the old industrial city failed to achieve; it aimed to create healthy and humane living conditions (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 113). It was also a way of treating the large lack of housing following the baby boom and urbanization that arouse after the World War II. In their article Towards an Urban Design manifesto (1987) Allan Jacobs and Donald Appleyard criticizes what they consider as the ills of CIAM and the Garden City movement. In responding to the pre-modern industrial cities these movements helped to create cities that to them are not urban.

Both movements represent overly strong design reactions to the physical decay and social inequities of industrial cities. In responding so strongly, albeit understandingly, to crowded, lightless, airless, “utiltless,” congested buildings and cities that housed so many people, the utopians did not inquire what was good about those places, either socially or physically. Did not those physical environments reflect (and maybe even foster) values that were likely to be meaningful to people individually and collectively, such as publicness and community? (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 114)

The modernist view on design was connected with a belief in applying scientific methods to achieve rational spaces that were considered to be universally good. Urban planners where considered to act as experts, relying on quantitative data when making rational decisions. The strive for universal solutions, designing for an ideal Man, could be connected to the rational use of the machine. (Ellin, 1999, pp. 208-210) According to Ellin (1999) industrial progress was embraced by the modernist movement resulting in buildings designed in respect of the industrial production mode rather than to the surrounding urban patterns. This was also putting to display the faith in technology and linear progress that grew after World War II. (Ellin, 1999, p. 210)

As a result of the separations of functions (using zoning regulations where housing, work, recreation and transportation are organized separately) a lot of what was built after World War II was isolated towers and endless blocks of mass produced villas, both in the U.S. and in Western Europe (Ellin, 1999, p. 211). The scale of the buildings was often more related to their inward functions, the car and to be seen from a distance than to the humans supposed to use them (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p.
Already in the 1950s critique against this destruction of existing urban fabric and mass-production of housing arouse. David Ley is cited in Ellin and describes the criticism as:

*Directed against a functionalised landscape, the placelessness which is the consequence in the advanced industrial city of centralized corporate decision-making, of standardization and the loss of human scale in mass society (Ellin, 1999, p. 16)*

The exclamation of the death of the modern movement by social scientists, architects and others was according to Ellin followed by an extensive search for a design that reflected the specific local context and history but also the search for new ways of maintaining the feeling of community (Ellin, 1999, p. 18). There was also a turn toward more small-scale interventions and changing the role of the urban planner into more of a facilitator (Ellin, 1999, p. 209).

In Jacobs and Appleyard’s critique of the modern city the car is a definitive negative contributor. “Centrifugal fragmentation” is one of the problems of modern urban design, where work has been taken out of the neighborhood and shopping out of the local community. The communities have become lower in density and increasingly homogenous. The city has spread out and formed monocultural enclaves and social groups have become separated from each other. (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, pp. 114-115) In her dissertation Moa Tunström seeks the way the contemporary image of the “good city” is constructed in the contemporary Swedish urban planning discussion. She describes how the concept “suburb” in the Swedish context has gone from describing a localization, to be a symbol of destructive segregation, social problems, deteriorated living areas and the failure of the modern planning. (Tunström, 2009, p. 78)

The way modernism has turned away from the streets is a reoccurring source of criticism. Jane Jacobs also has this focus in her discussion on how safety is created in cities. She emphasizes “eyes on the streets”, the local users’ control of the street. (Jacobs J., 2004, p. 56) Eyes on the streets do not occur in the type of inward looking buildings that modernist planning created. Safety according to Jacobs also comes from a frequency of use and a variety of users (Jacobs J., 2004, p. 86). Going back to the mono-cultural enclaves described by Jacobs and Appleyard, this would then also be a source for insecurity. In her analysis of the Swedish planning discussion Tunström sees a similar description, especially in the image of the suburb as something separated from the rest of society. Segregation and social problems are connected to the suburbs. The anonymity in these “cold” and “raw” modernistic landscapes that make up many of the Swedish suburbs, with their lack of “natural meeting places”, becomes a sign of social problems. (Tunström, 2009, p. 78)

Jacobs and Appleyard also describe how the problems of modernist cities stem from the way that people lose control and relation to their cities. The fast pace of development in the hands of large scale developer leads to people having less control over their home and neighborhoods (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 114). They describe cities as meaningless places beyond the citizen’s grasp, where things happen outside of their control. This makes people withdraw to their own, private worlds. (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 115)
Traditional urban form

In the wake of modernism the critique of the modern project resulted in a reverse in urban design. Instead of continue to turn to technology and the machine when inventing the future, inspiration to create a good built environment was now being drawn from times that had already past.

In *Postmodern Urbanism* Nan Ellin distinguishes between the different reactions to modernism in architecture and design on the European continent compared to Great Britain and in North America. Ellin argues that because of the tradition in Europe of public subsidizing of large master plans in cities, the tendency here first went toward creating a new urbanity looking back to pre-industrial times. The North American reaction tended to relate more to specific buildings and traditional design. (Ellin, 1999, p. 23) Ellin recognized the following elements in postmodern urbanism:

1. Historicism, an architecture that illustrates memory and monuments, a search for traditional urbanity.
2. Contextualism, the importance of the site and place, pluralism and a search for urban identity.
3. Use of symbolism with that being its only function.
4. Human scale.
5. No zoning or mixed-use zoning.
6. Apoliticism, a lack of faith and a search for something to believe in. (Ellin, 1999, pp. 111-112)

Moa Tunström describes how ideas of reconstructing the traditional city are expressed in the Swedish urban planning discussion. Certain structures are mentioned as being particular in this process; “the street, the square, the place, the park, meeting places, city center, the block, the city district, the esplanade or the boulevard” (Tunström, 2009, p. 58). The mixed use as a replacement of the separation of functions and a more human scale is also requested as well as diversity, beautiful houses and public spaces (Tunström, 2009, p. 55). The classical structure of the traditional city with a distinct street structure in a grid is described as being important to restore, as a contrast to the more vague modernistic city. (Tunström, 2009, pp. 57,59). Tunström remarks that the use of these traditional terminology create certain values; modernist neighborhoods that are not connected to the city grid for example are not called “city districts” but “housing areas” (Tunström, 2009, p. 60). In this way the modernist way of building is described in the debate as being an exception from development of the city (Tunström, 2009, p. 66).

The urban features described above (the street, the grid, the block) are something that also Jane Jacobs described in her *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* from 1961 as being crucial for city life. She emphasized the importance of the informal meetings between people in the street and the frequent use of the street both by local people and people passing by. The informal meeting should according to Jacobs preferably lead to what she calls “public familiar relations”. This view on the city, putting emphasis on the “urbanity” or urban life could be said to aim at increasing social capital, by creating larger and more diverse social networks and trust. This, following Bourdieu’s theory on transformations between different forms of capital, could in turn also increase the economic capital of an area.

New Urbanism is one of the movements that advocate the return to the traditional city and could be used as telling example of the strive towards a “better city” within urban design. Certain parts of
The New Urbanists are described as being superior in solving the urban problems of today. The New Urbanism wants to create a dense, small-scale, multifunctional city or city district. Within New Urbanism there is a strong belief that physical interventions, urban design, can bring about a stronger community spirit. (Tunström, 2009, pp. 74-75) Within the movement there are also people that besides pure urban design focus on other measurements, such as policy making and public participation (Ellin, 1999, p. 95).

Nan Ellin describes that the characteristics of New Urbanist developments are influenced by local prewar cities, the focus on walking people and public transport in contrast to cars, straight street grids to form defined public space, intentions of creating a mix of functions and socio-economic groups. Often the New Urbanist developments has a certain design code regarding colors and material used. Others have only restrictions when it comes to public spaces and praise a more diverse aesthetics. (Ellin, 1999, pp. 94-96) But with this movement there has also according to Ellin sprung up a set of zoning orders that strive for “dignified, orderly public spaces” (Ellin, 1999, p. 99). This has according to Catharina Gabrielson a Swedish equivalent, and she argues that there is a strong connection between the designed form of New Urbanism and the economic interest of influential developers, striving to create “attractive” urban environments (Gabrielsson, 2006, s. 59).

The New Urbanists strive for a traditional urban design is connected with an aim to create a greater community feeling. Instead of the use of generic building types, the use of a variety of historic types and styles typical for a certain place would generate a sense of pride and neighborhood identity (Calthorpe, 2009, p. 53). By drawing attention to a common history and a feeling of belonging that the community inhabitants could share this could be a way of increasing the social capital of area.

Tunström mentions some critique that has been raised against New Urbanism; that the history one is trying to return to never existed, that the New Urbanists claim that the time after the world wars was when all urban problems were created (instead of acknowledging the problems of the industrial city) and that New Urbanism creates images that all communalism is good (Tunström, 2009, p. 75).

Nan Ellin presents the tendency to use an urban design that is more human in scale, compared to the larger structures used in the modernist planning. She states that offering a more humans scale creates advantages especially within the residential design through a greater mix of housing types, replacing towers and slabs with houses and apartments and changing superblocks to city blocks. (Ellin, 1999, pp. 187-188) According to Peter Calthorpe, one of the founders of the Congress of the New Urbanism, the use of a more human scale is aiming at making a city walkable and creates a feeling of safety. He argues that this is realized by orienting the buildings towards the street, using more detailed architecture but also through making clearer distinctions between what is private and public. (Calthorpe, 2009, p. 52) By creating safer urban environments one could add social capital in the form of trust between the inhabitants in a neighborhood or community.

Nan Ellin describes that the reason behind the urban design cure of making the borders between public and private distinctive again, is that postmodern urbanists often see the dissolving borders between public and private as the main origin for the growing fear for “the other”. The result has according to Ellin been that public space in postmodern design tends to be surrounded by buildings, often resembling the pre-industrial relationship between public and private. (Ellin, 1999, p. 172) In their article *Towards an Urban Design Manifesto* Adams and Appleyard describes that buildings should be arranged so that they enclose public space, as opposed to the modernist buildings that
tend to “sit in space” (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 118). Enclosed public space has according to them a higher potential of bringing people together and making them interact (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 119). Again, this could be seen as a way of increasing the social capital by facilitating that people could meet and feel safe in the city.

Within the postmodern urban design there is a strive for creating potentials for a more socio-economically mixed population. Adams and Appleyard comment that communities have become increasingly homogenous and that different social groups have become isolated from each other (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987, p. 115). Peter Calthorpe describes that by offering a variety of different types of housing a broader spectrum of households can prosper in the same area, functioning more like a traditional neighborhood and less like “projects”. This approach within New Urbanism is said to aim both at creating mixed income communities within public housing sites and at adding affordable housing to the middle-class suburbs. (Calthorpe, 2009, p. 52) Widening the spectrum of income groups within homogenous neighborhood can be seen as increasing the social capital, as the potential social network in the area expands. At the same time, by adding new types of housing to an area the economic capital could also increase.

Planning and the role of the planner

The modernist view on architecture and design had a strong rationalistic character. Urban planners where considered to act as experts, relying on quantitative data when making rational decisions. Sandercock gives a critique of the planning history in Rewriting planning history where she deals with how the view of the modernist planner has shaped the way planning history is described.

> It is assumed that planners know what is good for people and possess an expertise that ought to prevail (in a ‘rational’ society, at least) over politics. It is taken for granted that planners have agency – that what they do and think has autonomy and power. It is seen as natural and right that planning should be ‘solution-driven’, rather that attentive to the social construction of what are held to be ‘urban problems’. There is no scrutiny of the ideology, the class or gender, race or ethnic origins or biases of planners, or of the class, gender, or ethnic effects of their work. (Sandercock, 2003, p. 39)

In the post modern era however, the role of planning and the planners has changed slightly. Planners start to question their elitist role in the planning process and a more interdisciplinary approach has emerged. Critique towards urban designers came from sociologists regarding their ignorant attitude towards how users experienced place. Instead projects were to be based on involvement of the particular communities concerned. (Ellin, 1999, pp. 65-66) Moa Tunström testifies of a new planner role that questions the modernistic planner. The new way of planning focuses on the democratic process and citizen participation. The new planner has as her purpose to facilitate for the people to make their voices heard; she is no longer the technology focused expert. Also, in the new planning it is no longer the problems or the solutions that are in focus, but the process itself. (Tunström, 2009, pp. 147, 149) This can be related to the description by Sandercock above, which puts the solution firsts in modernist planning, rather that the social construction of the problems.

Ideally, this participatory planning as a path toward an increase in value is twofold. Letting the community be the point of departure for the development, and bringing the people together to
formulate their views on the problems and their wanted solutions, has a value in itself in that it could strengthen the community and increase the social capital of the people within that community. The other way that the value of space is thought to be increased is through getting a more accurate answer to the questions “what is the problem?” and “what is the best solution to this problem?” Through letting the people in a community answer these questions, one assumes to find the change that is best for the greatest number of people, and thus can give as great increase in social, cultural and economic capital as possible.

Tunström points out, however, that this is not a matter of an entirely new planner role, totally abandoning the notion of the expert. As the modernist planning and planner is blamed for the problems of urban society, the planners today take upon themselves to solve these problems. They do this with their possession of both professional knowledge and their individual qualities such as sensitivity and compassion. The errors of the old planners give today’s planners a greater legitimacy and the planner today act with even greater integrity. (Tunström, 2009, pp. 148-149, 183) There might be a risk of a very normative ideals being realized though planning. Tunström also describes how the discourse around urban ideal often is normative and attempts to create an idea of consensus and agreement of the planning ideals, as if to say “no one wants the modernist ideals” (Tunström, 2009, pp. 55, 56).

The planning ideal according to Tunström is an integrated planning process that cut borders between those who plan and those who are planned for. The importance of finding common solutions is of importance. (Tunström, 2009, p. 151) The idea of finding consensus is highlighted by communicative planning. Habermas has influenced this idea in his view that people are able to express their will and communicate this with others in a way that will lead to consensus. He advocates inclusionary argumentation, public reason that includes the views of all members and their respective knowledge, values and ability to give meaning. (Healey, 2003, p. 239)

Patsy Healey describes and advocates for the communicative planning approach in her article The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory and its Implications for Spatial Strategy Formation (2003). This approach takes the diversity of a population into account.

> It starts from the recognition that we are diverse people living in complex webs of economic and social relations, within which we develop potentially very varied ways of seeing the world, of identifying our interests and values, of reasoning about them, and of thinking about our relations with others. (Healey, 2003, p. 239)

The objective is to develop normative principles that can be used in discussions in the public realm in order to judge the discussion in question, to build relations across differences and come to a consensus. It should not only be about finding a solution that is a balance between the different views, but to through encounter find new common ideas. In this way encounters and creative discussions add value to strategies. (Healey, 2003, pp. 239-240) Returning to value as capital, this could be compared both to how social capital is accumulated through encounter, enactment of the relations between people in a group. Also the outcome adds value through finding a way for development that stems from all participators’ wishes.

In order to find a consensus in groups with diverse social and economic relations and people with different values and interest, one need first to find an arena for the discussion. Who are included,
who organizes and manages, in what type of location are examples of questions to be answered. The public realm is constructed through this arena. Also the modes of discourse need to be established. What gets discussed and how? (Healey, 2003, pp. 241-245)

Communicative planning described above according to Patsy Healey’s principles can be defined as a non-hierarchical participatory process. The New Urbanists advocates the method charrettes that is non-hierarchic participatory process aimed at making the planning issues understood by residents and make them see their possibilities to participate. (Tunström, 2009, p. 147) Dhiru Thadani, board member of the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU) describes the charrettes as a workshop that is made up of an interdisciplinary group. Together with architects you have traffic engineers, planners, housing experts, city officials who come together to design a project etcetera. This is usually done in a location connected to the area being planned, and open for the residents to come and inform themselves with the design process. The process should allow for feedback from residents while producing a proposal for development. (Thadani, 2011)

Critique against the idea of forming a consensus though communicative processes focuses on the idealism of this goal, that the idea of inclusionary argumentation does not take power structures into account. Not everyone have the same ability and resources to phrase one’s wishes. (Tunström, 2009, pp. 150-151) According to Habermas’ requirements for discourse ethics all parties affected by what is being discussed should be included in the discourse, and all participants should be given equal opportunity to present and criticize validity claims in the discourse. The participants must openly explain their goals and intentions. Existing power differences must be neutralized so that these differences have no effect on the discourse or the possibility to create consensus. (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 213) According to Flyvbjerg, what is lacking in this idea is the lack of agreement between ideal and reality. Habermas, according to Flyvbjerg explains the utopia of communicative rationality but not how this is accomplished. (Flyvbjerg, 1998, p. 215)

A question is what happen to the value of space with power relation in play in communication. There would still be connections created between the people that sit down in a group and discuss just because they come together, even though not everyone have the same resources to express their will. And even though not all have managed to come to the table there’s an established group that also non-attendees could relate to. But not all can benefit from the connections created in the same way, they cannot manage their network due to economic or cultural capital, and so the social capital they have is less. Also the idea that a “true”, best path for development is establishes since it’s the one most people need and want, might be a false one since some might not have expressed their will.
5. Research method

In this chapter we will explain what research methodology we have been using for the study. The research is conducted through a comparative study between three cases of regenerated areas. The investigation is carried out through interviews, observations and study of literature and other material. The comparison will be based on five themes that we through the research process have found to be significant for the regeneration processes.

Research design

This study aims at creating a wider understanding of regeneration processes and therefore it should be seen as having an exploratory approach. Exploratory studies are described as being a broad-ranging, purposive, systematic and prearranged. Beyond trying to explore social groups, processes and activities in a systematic way a distinct character of the exploratory researchers is that they have to put themselves in situations where discoveries can be made. (Stebbins, 2001, p. 4) In exploratory studies qualitative methods are often better suited than quantitative, this is also the case in this study (Sverke, 2003/2004, p. 24). A qualitative approach is preferable when what is being studied is complex and one needs to be observant of varieties and nuances in the material (Gustavsson, 2003/2004, p. 212). Mohd Noor gives a clarifying description in the article Case Study: A Strategic Research Methodology:

[...]{\textit{Qualitative implies an emphasis on processes and meanings that are not rigorously examined, measured (if measured at all), in terms of quantity, amount, intensity, or frequency. Thus, there are instances, particularly in the social sciences, where researchers are interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing. (Mohd Noor, 2008, p. 1602)}}

The qualitative approach does not mean that we are not at all considering any quantity data in the analysis, but that the phenomenon studied are not quantified.
We have chosen to use case study as our overall method. This is connected to the fact that what we
are studying, the regeneration process in two different contexts, are complex. Another choice that
we have made, through our research question, is to conduct a comparative case study. Using
comparative methods is to be preferred in qualitative research and it is made on many different
levels and stages; one compares existing literature and theories with the self generated data, the
cases studied are compared to cases studied by others, self generated data is compared with other
self generated data, we are also comparing our three different cases with each other (Gummesson,
2003/2004, p. 132). This is why we use an abductive approach where theory is alternately measured
against the empirics and vice versa (Gren & Hallin, 2003, p. 36). This way new interpretations can be
made and result in wider understandings.

Case study

According to Johansson (2003): “A case study is expected to capture the complexity of a single case.”
(Johansson, 2003, p. 2) Yin (1994) also states that a case study should be considered when the focus
of the study is to answer questions of “how” and “why” sort, the behavior of those included in the
study cannot be manipulated, you believe the context is relevant for the phenomenon studied and
when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are unclear. These conditions fit well with
our situation of study. We believe that the schemes of regeneration are greatly dependent of their
context, so a part of our research aims at pointing out this dependency in order to investigate how
the schemes can be compared and learn from each other.

The case that is the object of study should according to Johansson:

- be a complex functioning unit,
- be investigated in its natural context with a multitude of methods, and
- be contemporary. (Johansson, 2003, p. 2)

The cases of our study represent a contemporary phenomenon, regeneration. They are also recent
projects. Regarding the multitude of methods, triangulation, these will be accounted for below.
Studying a case with a number of methods gives a richer image of the study and a better
understanding of its phenomenon. In our study it also serves its purpose in that regeneration many
times are debated phenomenon, and we therefore see an advantage in a number of methods that
can provide information of different dimensions of the cases.

The case study usually aims at developing a concept and making it more precise. According to Yin
(1994), it is important for the case study that a phenomenon is put in focus for investigation and this
phenomenon is checked against its context. The interplay between object and context is important.
(Lundequist, 1999, p. 49) Again, we appreciate the importance of the contexts of our objects of
study. In the comparison we conduct we subsequently turn to different phenomenon or themes that
we find are important in our cases. These themes will be investigated from the context of each case,
and be compared between cases.

We have conducted a “purposeful” (Johansson, 2003, p. 8) or “information oriented” (Flyvbjerg,
2006, p. 230) selection of our cases. Johansson writes that a purposeful selection aims at finding a
case that is rich of information, critical, revelatory, unique or extreme (Johansson, 2003, p. 8).
Flyvbjerg writes, to get hold of the most information as possible from smaller samples it is wise to
chose your cases according to what information you expect them to give, an information oriented selection. He specifies this further according to the purpose of the study. (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 230) As we investigate what similar attributes different regeneration projects have in different contexts we think that “maximum variation cases” is a suitable type of selection for our study. By using this type of selection it is possible for us to “to obtain information about the significance of various circumstances for case process and outcome”. This could be done by using few cases that show a large variation at least at one aspect, such as location or form of organisation. (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 230)

The cases that we select have one thing in common in that they all in some way are considered as successful projects. They are however different in terms of location in the city, operations of regeneration, design result etcetera. Since the aim with conducting a comparative study is to find lessons on how to in the future make other more successful regeneration projects, we have chosen cases that all have successful ingredients. We are not comparing the Swedish or U.S. way of regenerating in a generalizing sense, but search for new and successful ways of improving regeneration through learning from projects of different contexts.

HOPE VI is the largest regeneration program in the United States and regenerated sites show great variations, over the country as well as within cities. Washington D.C. as the place for studying HOPE VI was chosen because the location could provide us with the access to policy makers and practitioners involved in the development of HOPE VI as well as researchers involved in evaluations of HOPE VI. Washington D.C. also holds a variety of different HOPE VI projects, as does the adjacent cities Baltimore and Philadelphia. This enabled us to visit a number of HOPE VI sites as references to the chosen ones.

The sites of Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg were chosen because of them both being considered as successful projects and that they at the same time could show differences in how regeneration processes can be carried out. The two cases got the grants at different times, Townhomes on Capitol Hill in the very early shaping of HOPE VI in 1993 and Capper Carrollsburg in 2001 and 2009, which means the latter is still ongoing. We therefore expected these cases together to give us an understanding of how the program has evolved.

Gårdsten gets to represent the Swedish way of regeneration as it is often referred to as a positive example that other can learn from. An initial study of Gårdsten also showed that it could work as a good complement to the HOPE VI studies since the residents are seen a central resource in the process. The case also shows a different attitude in the approach towards the physical part of the regeneration.

The choice to include two projects from USA and one from Sweden is related to our background with a greater prior understanding of the Swedish context. The two U.S. cases add up to describe the HOPE VI program, and are then compared against Gårdsten. The two projects in USA both give us more knowledge of the U.S. situation. Also, as the HOPE VI program has developed over time, and as projects within the program can differ, two cases give us a better comprehension of these variations.
Empiric research tools

Interviews
The choice of doing interviews as a method of data gathering implies an understanding that there is a true description of the object of study, and that this description is best given through direct interaction with informants. The type of interview that we conduct, informant interview, is described by Esaiasson et al as a method through which the researcher should be able to get the best possible image of the phenomenon studied. Informants in this case are official actors, employed or involved in the projects or programs studied. Different informants can contribute with different parts. Therefore the same questions do not need to be asked to all informants. (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson, & Wägnerud, 2007, pp. 257-258)

In choosing people to conduct interviews with, the categories of notions that one expect to find is more important than the people themselves. Therefore one often makes a strategic selection in order to map different views on the subject. (Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson, & Wägnerud, 2007, pp. 257-258) We have attempted to speak to people representing different parts of the regeneration process, different actors. In the case of Gårdsten, the main important actor is the housing company, so the selection was here limited to one person. We also had a conversation with a person who used to work at the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning prior to starting the research, which helped us approach other material on Gårdsten in a more informed way.

For selection we also relied on so called gatekeepers, which are a common way of procedure in informant interviews (Valentin, 2007). In the case of Gårdsten our contact who formerly worked with the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning directed us toward the person we interviewed at the housing company. In Washington D.C., we had contact established with one of our interviewees before the visit who put us into contact with other people who he knew as knowledgeable of the subject.

Our interviews were semi-structured. We started our interviews with describing our aim, and gave a brief of the subjects that we wished the interview to cover. We had a prepared template for the interview question, but depending on the information that was given by the interviewees we allowed ourselves to part from the template and change or exclude some questions.

Observations
Observations are common in qualitative studies (Sverke, 2003/2004, p. 49). To get a deeper understanding of the areas investigated we have used field observations as one of the data-gathering techniques. There are several kinds of observation methods, the one we have used is called direct observation which means that we have been present and registered what was going on at the time, but with no intention to interfere (Gummesson, 2003/2004, p. 129).

During our observations we have focused on the design and the physical outlay of the areas. We have observed how the area connects with neighboring areas, what the street grid look like, how the buildings relate to the streets and green and public areas. We have also considered the supply of services in the areas. To some extent we also considered traces from the people using the areas, although we did not do any studies on the people moving in the area at the time for our observations. Bryman states that when doing direct observations, there is a risk of a reactive observer effect, meaning that the investigation itself can influence the object that is being studied.
(Bryman, 2002, p. 185). Since we, as mentioned, did not study people but physical objects, we believe that the risk for us having affected the object is minor.

In addition to the field studies conducted at the sites of our cases, we also visited a number of HOPE VI sites in Washington D.C., Baltimore and Philadelphia to get a reference picture and a larger understanding of the range of differences within the program. To make the most out of our observations we made notes on site and took pictures. Another feature was that we wrote diaries at the end of every day of observation, something that has been helpful for our later understandings of the gathered data. As Gillham describes it: "If you write up your observations as soon as possible they will be easier to recall and also more accurately recorded." (Gillham, 2000, p. 48)

**Material**

To get a coherent understanding and base for interpretation we have used official documents, books, reports and articles that touch upon the regeneration process in relation to the cases. These have been chosen from an information oriented perspective where we have been striving to find documents that are relevant in relation to our research question. A few sources have been of extra importance since they have been parts of the national decision making and discussion on guidelines when it comes to regeneration. Documents from governmental bodies in both Sweden and the U.S. have been used. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is the American federal governmental body that manages public housing policies and their official material and guidelines on public housing and HOPE VI have been studied. The Swedish National Board on Housing, Building and Planning is another important source; their reports have been an important base for our understanding of the Swedish housing policies and the development of municipal non-profit housing. They produce a lot of material on planning issues and often function as a conclusive body for different planning projects and policies. As such, they hold insight and have great influence over the discourse on Swedish planning and hence regeneration. The Urban Institute, a major research authority in the U.S., have written reports and evaluations of HOPE VI projects, these have been useful for getting information on the programs benefits and drawbacks. Other material used consists of scientific peer reviewed articles, books, reports, websites and assessments.

**Analysis**

Gumnesson describes the analysis and the interpretation as being the weakest part of all research. High requirements are put on awareness, transparence and being systematic. The purpose of the analysis is to make sense out of the gathered data and to transform these into an understandable reasoning and conclusion. Gumnesson gives some guidance on how to manage and deal with diffuse and large amounts of data, as is often the situation in case study research. According to him the qualitative case study research is characterized by the fact that:

\[\ldots\text{data gathering, analysis and interpretation partly happens simultaneously and sometimes you come to a conclusion during the literature study and field work. (Gumnesson, 2003/2004, p. 132)}\]

Gumnesson mentions that the advantage of case study research is that the data often is very rich and to keep what is essential he suggest the method of condensing the material; making it dense. This he describes is connected to transferring descriptive data to more abstract conceptual thinking
and further on linking it to theory (Gummesson, 2003/2004, p. 132). In this study the analysis is based on the gathered data from our three case studies which is then related to the research question through the housing policy contexts presented in chapter three and the concepts of economic, cultural and social capital and the post modern urban planning and design principles described in chapter four.

Denscombe describes that the researcher often search the material for certain ideas or phenomenon to put into different categories, a process that is called “open encoding”. In the early stage of analysis the researcher can use existing theories and personal anticipations as guidance when deciding on the categories. During the process these early categories then develop and take a more refined form, this is something that happens gradually while going through the notes from observations, interviews and texts written in the early stage of the research. This has in this study been done through an early study of the existing literature on the topic and using this knowledge in combination with our initial understanding to preliminary place our findings in different groups. These have then been refined while we started to go through the material and form the result into text, some have been excluded and new ones have been added.

The next step is to find common themes and re-appearing patterns or differences. This is preferably made several times to improve the analysis. (Denscombe, 1998, pp. 247-249) When the results were put together we started to compare the different cases with each other, on a general level, and on a more detailed level where the different themes found where to make out the base. The results of the comparisons where then again connected back to our theoretical framework.

Assessment of methods used

Quality of the research
It is not easy to conduct assessments of qualitative research that depend on context and creativity of the researcher. Reliability and validity does not have the same meaning as for quantitative research. The researcher’s role has great significance, and subjectivity in our opinions contribute to these sorts of studies. For our assessment we will make use of four concepts that Baxter and Eyles (1997) describe: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility is a matter of whether the investigated phenomenons are described in a credible way. Baxter and Eyles explain it as the “the degree to which a description of human experience is such that those having the experience would recognize it immediately and those outside the experience can understand it” (Baxter & Eyles, 1997, p. 512). This can among other things be accomplished though a careful selection of interviewees in order to get a correct image of the reality. As mentioned we relied on gatekeeper for our selection. In one way that could mean that we had little control over the selection process, but on the other hand those gatekeepers were very knowledgeable of the phenomenon studied and were able to put us into contact with interviewees who together provided a correct and full image of the cases. Another way to achieve credibility is through triangulation, the use of different methods. This we have used and this has also contributed to the credibility of our study.

Transferability speaks of the degree of which the study might be used on other contexts outside the area of study (Baxter & Eyles, 1997, p. 515). The point of departure of our study is that regeneration
is context dependent. We take context into careful consideration, and the purpose of the study is rather to lift the elements of regeneration that might have an effect out of their context and through this find lessons for the future. In other words, the character of our study itself provides for transferability being considered.

Dependability is minimizing unconventional readings of the material. The variations of the material should be explained by the sources (Baxter & Eyles, 1997, p. 512). One might also speak of regularity of readings. Our careful treatment of the material, to record and transcribe the interviews and take notes from our observations should account for dependability of the readings. Also, since we are two people conducting this research we have had the benefit to compare our understanding and interpretations of the material. Also, a use of a theoretic framework like ours provide for the readings of the material not to drift away.

Lastly, confirmability is the degree to which the result of the research relies on the informants and the conditions of the research, and not on the motifs of the researcher (Baxter & Eyles, 1997, p. 517). To ensure confirmability we wrote down our initial understanding of the regeneration processes in the respective countries in the beginning of our study. On this topic we will discuss our role as researchers below.

**Our role as researchers**

As we conduct qualitative research, where the context as well as our creativity and subjective interpretations play important part, it is crucial to take our role, prejudice and possible bias into consideration. For this reason we wrote down our prejudices about the differences in approach in the different countries, so that we could go back and assess our bias. This proved to be helpful, as we could evaluate our research on the basis of these and noted that our result differs in some aspects and confirmed our initial understanding in others.

The fact that we live in, and have our planning education from Sweden also implies that we might have bias towards this context. Our knowledge of the planning situation in Sweden is also greater, which might affect our understanding. This possible bias is something that we have been aware of during our whole research process, and something that we have discussed frequently between one another. This awareness has helped to minimize the effects of the bias, as has our method of analysis where we have studies one theme at a time and carefully compared them on the basis of their contexts (such as housing policy).

**Place and time**

Proximity to the objects of study in terms of space has been assured through actual visits and observations of the cases studied. As described above, we conducted observations on all sites. In the case of HOPE VI we also observed other sites that had received the funding, in order to gain a greater understanding of the variations of the developements of the program.

Proximity in terms of time must be discussed in different manners. The projects of study are in different stages of completion so they show different stages of results. This has affected our ability to comprehend all results of the regeneration in society, but it has not had greater influence on our comparison as it is based mainly on the process of regeneration. The process is going on or is finished. They are all also fairly recent, so in our reading we do not need to immerse ourselves into another timeframe.
Sources
We have let our main understanding of the cases rely on the interviews that we have conducted. The people that we interviewed are all now or have been actively engaged in the program or projects that we study. They all have documented credibility, as they all have represented the phenomenon in different situations before, in other interviews or are part of organizations that are active in the processes. We also put great trust into our gatekeepers’ ability to provide is with knowledgeable informants, and our overall impression from the interviews is that they have been able to give us great understanding of the topic. We are however aware that as informants, representing the projects or programs in different ways they might also possess a degree of bias in that they would like to give us a certain image of the cases. However, as we are able to compare information given between interviews and with other sources, we find that overall we can rely on the information gathered though these interviews.

Especially in the case of HOPE VI we have relied on some official documents. These have been different descriptions, information and notices from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, such as Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs). The use of these has been helpful to gain an understanding of the rules and directives that the housing authorities need to follow in order to receive the funding. It has aided our understanding of the principles of the program. As this information has come from the same source that decides on the awards, we perceive their credibility and relevance to be high.

To increase our understanding of different elements and characteristics of the program and projects we have relied on assessments, reports, books and articles that discuss the projects. Above all HOPE VI is a program that has been widely debated, so it is natural that literature on the subject provides different views, and many times debate a specific standpoint. This is also the case in literature on Gårdsten, where many times the project is described in a very flattering light. The aim of our study has however not been to make any evaluation of the success of any of the cases, so we haven’t then let ourselves be influenced by any views presented in the literature. We have sought to provide ourselves with as full a picture as possible of the different cases, and for this we find our sources to be reliable. The mix of sources have benefited this reliability, that we are able to confirm information from different sources, from the use of sources from major research organizations like the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning and the U.S. Urban Institute to independent writers.
6. HOPE VI

Since 1993 the HOPE VI program has been a part of HUD’s efforts to transform and upgrade severely distressed public housing. Key elements for HOPE VI are:

- Improving the physical shape of the buildings.
- Empower residents through self-sufficiency and comprehensive services.
- De-concentrating poverty by placing public housing in non-poor areas and by promoting mixed-income communities.
- Leverage support and resources through partnership with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations and private businesses. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 A)

HOPE VI is a competitive grant program. About $6 billion have been granted and the available are published in each year’s Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 A). Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) apply to HUD for funding. A number of threshold criteria determine whether the application is eligible. The NOFA gives clear and detailed instructions on what is required for a HOPE VI fund. It gives information on how different parts of the program will be rated, some schemes achieving higher scores than others.

HOPE VI History

Answering to the nationwide problem of public housing, congress in 1989 established the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing. The purpose of the commission was to develop a National Action Plan for eliminating severely distressed public housing until year 2000. Their final report was presented in 1992. The report estimated 6% of the nation’s public housing to be severely distressed, corresponding to 86,000 units. If no measures were taken the number of units that would be distressed would increase further. Three conditions were found that were common for most of these distressed developments: residents lived in despair and needed high levels of social and supportive services, buildings were physically deteriorated and surrounding communities were
economically and socially distressed (National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, 1992, p. 2)

High vacancy rates, high levels of crime, a need of maintenance and a need of greater resident security were common problems. These conditions lead to difficulties in management. Former revitalization schemes had according to the report focused mainly on the physical conditions of the site on expense of the human condition. (National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, 1992, p. 3) The commission recommended revitalization in three different areas:

- Physical improvements
- Improvements in management
- Social and community services directed towards the needs of the residents. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 A)

There had not been any similar programs earlier. As Susan Popkin at the Urban Institute explains:

> Because they were under federal law not allowed to tear down public housing without replacing it and they didn’t have the money to do that so HOPE VI was really an attempt to address what people in the U.S. saw as a failure of our welfare and housing system. (Popkin S., 2011)

First called the Urban Revitalization Demonstration, HOPE VI was incorporated under Fiscal Year 1993 appropriations law. The program was sponsored by the senators Barbara Mikulski and Christopher Bond. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 13) Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from 1992 was Henry Cisneros. During his tenure HUD experienced a greater focus on transformation of public housing. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 14)

Elinor Bacon was the Deputy Assistant Secretary for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of Public Housing Investments, administrating HOPE VI during the second four years of the program (E.R. Bacon Development, 2011). She describes the first few years of the program as years of vast transformation. The programs had not been subject to the federal laws and regulations, which meant that the first few years and the innovations of individual people helped to shape the program. The mix of people involved also contributed to the way the HOPE VI program developed these first years, with people of very different backgrounds, attorneys, social workers, politicians, developers etcetera. The department then spent the following years codifying the program and bringing structure and control. (Bacon, 2011)

A Decade of HOPE: Research Findings and Policy Challenges summarizes the first years of the program as follows:

> Over the course of the 1990s, the HOPE VI program evolved from an initiative focused on reconstruction and resident empowerment to one animated by broader goals of economic integration and poverty deconcentration, “new urbanism,” and inner-city revitalization. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 14)

The Obama administration have now put forward a new program, called Choice, that is supposed to build on what HOPE VI delivered (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 B). The
goal is to turn high poverty neighborhoods into sustainable communities by combining efforts addressed to housing with other services, schools, access to jobs, public assets and transportation with a strong emphasis on the educational opportunities (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 B).

**Principles guiding the design**

The early HOPE VI program focused on replacing badly distressed public housing with new and better public housing. During the programs first years of running, this changed into a focus on creating mixed income communities. (Baron, 2009) This turn also created a new attitude towards the quality and design of public housing areas.

The design principles of HOPE VI stems from a critique towards the modernist architecture used in post-war U.S. public housing projects. Cheryl O’Neill, principal of Torti Gallas and Partners, an architectural firm involved in several HOPE VI projects, describes the earlier design of public housing as being high rises or garden apartment complexes, typically on larger blocks, so called superblocks, breaking up the historic grid of the cities and therefore becoming disconnected and isolated. Often there was no feeling of security and they had poorly defined defensible spaces with common corridors and few entrances that many residents shared. (O’Neill, 2011 A) She explained that the only way to address the problems created often is to tear down these developments. She continues:

> [... often the complaint you hear from public housing residents is that they felt stigmatized by living in the projects and a big important goal, especially in the early years was to eliminate that sense of isolation and create places that were integrated with the larger traditions of the city so they just looked like regular neighborhood instead of public housing neighborhoods. (O’Neill, 2011 A)

The public housing areas were in many cases very deteriorated because of inadequate design and construction not being suited for the high levels of wear and tear. Poor management and maintenance due to lack of funding, added to the decay. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 19)

The evolution of the HOPE VI program occurred at the same time as the appearance of the New Urbanist movement (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 16). Dhiru Thadani, a board member of the Congress of New Urbanism, claims that HOPE VI and influencing government policy probably is the biggest achievement of the New Urbanist movement (Thadani, 2011). New Urbanist design principles became an ingredient of HOPE VI under Henry Cisneros. Increasingly, specific physical design principles got into the criteria for grant awards; creating walkable streets, defensible space and mixed use communities. Other New Urbanist ideas like attracting mixed income households and using charettes to include resident participation were also put into the programs. (O’Neill, 2011 A) The 2010 NOFA Program Requirements states that it is compulsory to consult national architectural and planning organizations, such as the Congress for the New Urbanism, when choosing your design team and to assess the quality of the design (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, p. 30).

New Urbanism deals with urban design on three scales; the regional, the neighborhood and the building. The HOPE VI program started to adopt New Urban design principles mainly on the scales of
the neighborhood and the building. Four principles on the neighborhood scale were included; diversity, human scale, restoration and continuity. (Calthorpe, 2009, pp. 52-53) The principle of diversity aims at creating mixed use and mixed income communities by mixing different kinds of housing types, commercial activities, public spaces and social services within the same neighborhood. The principle addressing human scale includes walkability and safeness by orienting buildings towards the street, using more details in the architecture, making distinctions between public and private space and to see to it that important services are accessible. The restoration principle strives for preservation and reconstruction of positive historic features, both social and physical. This is achieved by rebuilding historic types of housing, civic buildings and pay attention to public space. Continuity applies to both the street network and open public spaces, by using these to connect public housing to other neighborhoods, and the design of the buildings, by using local traditional architecture. (Calthorpe, 2009, pp. 52-53)

On the scale of the building, the New Urbanist emphasis lies on the traditional design connected to the history of a place. Typical elements of traditional American housing that can be seen in HOPE VI projects are the steps that connect the entrance of a building direct to the street and the defined private space of a small courtyard on the back. These elements are thought to create a feeling of being secure in the neighborhood, but also to add to a certain identity among the residents. Using varied and unique versions of housing types and building material would also make the residents feel proud about their specific area and is a feature that many times are visible in HOPE VI. A typical way to accomplish this could be to use a scale and material of the houses that was traditionally used in the area but vary the architectural details. (Calthorpe, 2009, pp. 53-54)

To make urban environments safe and secure one brought the idea of “defensible space” into the program. By using physical design principles, like having a frequency of entrances facing the street, one was hoping to get a natural amount of public human activity on the streets, making them safer. Another criterion was to clearly separate what is public and private open space. A private space can more easily be controlled by a resident. This is put in contrast to the garden apartments of earlier public housing, where the open space with no sense of belonging could lead to lack of people looking after it and nobody policing it, causing a insecure place in particular in connection with social problems and drug traffic. (O'Neill, 2011 A)

The HOPE VI goal of creating a mixed income community is partly addressed through design principles. The 2010 NOFA Program Requirements declare that public housing units should be integrated and not stand out in the community. (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, p. 30)

**Funding and financing**

According to Popkin et. al. (2004) the annual HOPE VI funds had then ranged from $ 300 million to $ 625 million per year. However, the grantees were expected to leverage their HOPE VI funds with other funds. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 24) The leverage is connected to the objective of mixed income. During the first years of implementation the HOPE VI program generated several reforms of the U.S. public housing finance system. This was often initiated by requests from ongoing redevelopment projects were one experienced difficulties to create mixed income communities with existing regulations (Baron, 2009, p. 40). The importance of
creating mixed income communities, instead of replacing distressed public housing with upgraded public housing, was pointed out by developer Richard D. Baron.

To create incentives for a continued investment and enhanced quality of life, Baron proposed that public housing units should be developed within new mixed income communities (Baron, 2009, p. 31). Mixing public housing with market rate units would according to him also give incentives to manage and maintain the development and make households with increasing incomes to stay within the community (Baron, 2009, p. 43). To realize this would require enabling public housing authorities to use federal HUD funds together with both other public funds but also private resources (Baron, 2009, pp. 31-32). The problem was to find a way to give private investors a balanced level of risk and at the same time protecting federal investment by making sure that the public housing units stay public (Baron, 2009, p. 43).

HUD revised regulations to make it possible for private entities to own and manage mixed income communities and at the same time make sure that public housing requirements were followed (Baron, 2009, p. 38). The one-to-one replacement law was suspended in 1995. The housing authorities could in many cases not afford it and there were difficulties to find sites for replacement public housing when creating mixed-income developments by reducing the number of public housing units (Baron, 2009, p. 39).

From the 1996 NOFA the HOPE VI projects were motivated to use mixed income strategies. The leverage could be private-sector debt, private-sector equity (raised through the federal housing low income housing tax credit), other federal grants, local capital funds or philanthropic resources. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 17) Regulations to record the number of public housing units funded with HOPE VI and requirements to make them remain public housing units for at least forty years was secured through “Declaration of Restrictive Covenants” (Baron, 2009, p. 38).

Besides HOPE VI, the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 has helped to change public housing in recent years. The aim of much of this legislation is to reduce the concentration of very low income families (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 149). The mixed finance approach in public housing developments and HOPE VI was formally established by this legislation, where also an increase in the Total Development Costs Policy (TDC) was made. The earlier TDC policy limited the amount of public funding spent on a public housing project and was related to a standard of quality, it was therefore an obstacle to developers that wanted to attract a population of mixed income. (Baron, 2009, p. 40)

Management and maintenance

To enable better design and management the developing costs per public housing units in a HOPE VI program is allowed to be higher that normally in public housing (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 144). These costs are assumed to pay off over times both in terms of better living conditions and in lowered management costs. Basically better design and construction should reduce vandalism and not be as damaged from wear and tear. This has had some confirmation in interim evaluations of HOPE VI projects, as revitalized sites seem to remain in good physical condition. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 21)
Public housing used to be subject to many regulations by the federal government with rules and statutes that affected management and administration. With HOPE VI these regulations loosened, and instead HUD encouraged a more entrepreneurial, market-driven management. HUD streamlined the rules governing how public housing should be managed, and eliminated a number of handbooks and guidelines. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 16) The mixed income development put pressure on management, so that higher income groups would be attracted to the developments and stay over time (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 26). PHAs were encouraged to experiment in the management of public housing. The public/private partnerships that were a part of development also became a part of management and on-site management got subcontracted to private firms. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 16)

**Participation and social programs**

The negative social results of the poor physical environments were many times racial and economic segregation, inadequate public services such as school, police, sanitation, unemployment and crime. The people that lived in the severely distressed public housing were most often very poor women and children of minority groups, predominately African-American (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 8). The Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing in their final report published in 1992 emphasizes the residents and the social conditions in their definition of Severely Distressed Public Housing and in their recommendations for revitalization.

HOPE VI became a program that emphasized the human condition of revitalization. Originally the legislation appointed 20 % of the grants to cover community service programs and supportive services. These could include literacy training, job training, day care and youth activities. These types of social service programs will be covered further below. Later the amount of the funding dedicated to social services was reduced, but the attention that HUD put on these services was still increased. (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 33) NOFA 2010 states that the applicants must show that public housing residents have been involved at the beginning and during the planning process, or the application will not be considered for funding. (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, p. 11)

Cheryl O’Neill, Principal at Torti Gallas and Partners who have designed many HOPE VI developments describes how their planning processes often have started through charrettes were the residents are involved. Residents usually have the most say in the design in the beginning, in the conceptual design phase. They are also involved in deciding the criteria for returning to the regenerated sites. (O’Neill, 2011 A)

As in many other planning processes it is difficult to make people participate. Cheryl O’Neill confirms this, and points to the fact that many times the people that are involved have challenged lives which make resident participation an even more difficult element of the planning processes. Often, also, trust is an issue. David Cortiella, engaged by the DCHA to be the Chief Development Officer for Capper Carrollsburg, points to the residents distrust towards the government as an issue that affect the planning processes.
Relocation and displacement is an often discussed issue of HOPE VI. The way that the revitalization is done, often tearing down the public housing and developing new communities, residents get relocated elsewhere. A threshold criterion for a PHA’s HOPE VI funding application is to have a Relocation Plan. This plan should aim at minimizing the permanent displacement of the residents. The possibility to return to a revitalized HOPE VI site is conditioned through screening criteria such as employment, drug testing and criminal background (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 35). A Community Social Service Program (CSSP) aims to provide the residents with the possibility to accomplish the criteria to return and is therefore also a crucial part of the program. (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, p. 30)

Housing Choice Vouchers are provided to enable poor people to move to better neighborhoods. These vouchers are administered locally by PHAs and are often given to residents being relocated from HOPE VI sites. This is also another way to achieve mixed income. The voucher lets the family who receives it choose their home, although the home must meet some minimum standard of health and safety. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2011 C) A problem with Housing Choice Vouchers however can be that in cities like Washington D.C. where the housing market is strained and apartments are expensive, landlords are less likely to accept vouchers as there are more attractive tenants available (Popkin S. , 2011).

There is an uncertainty of the number of residents that do return to revitalized HOPE VI sites. According to A Decade of HOPE, Research Findings and Policy Challenges published in 2004 by the Urban Institute, approximately 49,000 residents had been relocated from HOPE VI development. The precise number that returned is unknown, “although early analysis suggests that relatively few will return to the revitalized HOPE VI developments.” (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 27) Often HOPE VI revitalization takes time, something that HOPE VI has been criticized for since that might make residents decide not to return at all (Schwartz A. F., 2010, p. 148).

HUD states that one of their major priorities is to help public housing residents become financially self sufficient so that they will be less dependent on governmental housing assistance. Today up to 15 % of the HOPE VI grant can go to CSS program. This amount can then be leveraged with other HUD funds, or other federal, state, local, PHA or private sector donations. (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, pp. 25-26) Activities may include education, employment training, programs for different kinds of apprenticeships, family budgeting, and credit management etcetera. (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, pp. 8-9) The grantees are however given own responsibility and flexibility to themselves design the programs based on the needs in their affected neighborhood. A so called needs assessment should be carried out to define the needs of the original residents in the area. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2000, p. 1) Bessie Swann is Executive Director at Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation (WCCDC) who has run several CSS program in the Washington D.C. area. An elements of the CSS program that she points out as crucial is that the program is developed in collaboration with the residents.

The PHA should enable all residents to participate in the program whether or not they intend to return to the HOPE VI neighborhood (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2000, p. 1).The grantee is responsible for tracking the residents after relocation to provide the CSS (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, p. 26). It is however not mandatory for the
residents to participate (Swann, 2011). The CSS program must last as long as the grant period, and should be planned so that the services are sustainable after the grant period ends (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A, p. 25).

Another important part according to Bessie Swann is the independence that CSSP providers such as WCCDC hold from the housing authority, being their contractor and not being employed by the PHA. Especially if one like WCCDC manages to leverage the HOPE VI funds, it is possible to address the needs as they arise without being affected by the same governmental rules and regulations as the PHA. Also trust is an issue. As Bessie Swann explains it residents often distrust the PHA which would make it difficult for them to run the CSS.

A contributing factor to poverty that has gotten more attention the lasts years is health. Since 2008 every HOPE VI grantee must include a health component in their CSSP (Swann, 2011). The NOFA 2010 recommends applicants to coordinate CSS providers with health care providers. With Every Heartbeat is Life initiative, which is an educational resource of the U.S. National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLB), is a recommended partner.
Townhomes on Capitol Hill

Origins and urban problems
The former Ellen Wilson homes, now Townhomes on Capitol Hill, is located in an historic neighborhood. The first developments in the area came about after the civil war, in the late 19th century. Capitol Hill then consisted of town- and row houses but also alley shanties that housed refugees from slavery. The Ellen Wilson site was dominated by these shanties. Washington D.C. started to revitalize the city in the beginning of the 20th century, and the first U.S. housing authority, the Alley Dwelling Authority, decided that this part of the area should become public housing. (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. 4-4)

Ellen Wilson was originally built to house white tenants only. At the same time two other public housing projects (Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings) were developed with the aim to house black tenants. (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. 4-4) An expressway separated Ellen Wilson and the two other developments in the early 1970s (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 2). Marilyn Melkonian, president for Telesis, the developer of the Townhomes on Capitol Hill, underlines that segregation was built into the old development.

All of the public housing was built in a segregated pattern. There was housing for whites and there was housing for blacks when it was originally built. Then over the years it became integrated but actually racially segregated by choice and other factors. Namely where the housing had been built was still a segregative decision. If it was segregated it pretty much stayed segregated. (Melkonian, 2011)
Thirteen two-story buildings were built 1941, contrasting to the overall pattern in the neighborhood in the layout by being orientated inwards toward the courtyard. In the rest of the Capitol Hill neighborhood the dominating pattern is row houses that have entrances towards the street. Also the material of the Ellen Wilson houses, concrete blocks and bricks, differed from the rest of the neighborhood. (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. b-17)

While the neighborhood of Capitol Hill as a whole during the 1960s was becoming popular and had a mixed population, the Ellen Wilson area was now dominated by low-income African Americans. The result was that the site was being isolated both from the neighborhood it was a part of and the neighboring public housing areas on the other side of the freeway. (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. b-17) Conditions on the site became worse over time and by the mid-1980s the residents were described as “really hostages...living in hell on earth” (Zielenbach & Voith, 2010, p. 105). The Ellen Wilson public housing was officially closed in 1988. Marilyn Melkonian describes how the site then became occupied by homeless people and later by an organized group of homeless Vietnam veterans. The neighboring community by then saw the site, with its derelict buildings and the connected crime, as a safety hazard and a problem. (Melkonian, 2011)

**Regeneration approach**

The revitalization of Ellen Wilson was initiated by the local community residents in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. A Community Development Corporation (CDC) called The Ellen Wilson Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation was created in 1991, including community residents and some former Ellen Wilson residents, ministers, architects, a real estate agent, an accountant, representatives from nonprofit social service agencies and an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner. The CDC worked out a development plan and, as HOPE VI was launched in 1993, together with the D.C. Housing Authority (DCHA, then called Department of Public and Assisted Housing) applied for HOPE VI funding in May 1993. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 3)

The Ellen Wilson Neighborhood Revitalization Corporation put up goals to be achieved through the HOPE VI plan. These goals included creating “an economically integrated community that reflects the strengths of self-sufficient housing development through homeownership”, specifically through mixed-income cooperative homeownership, independence from long-term operating subsidies or other forms of public assistance, the creation of an important neighborhood resource that brings community services and social services to the greater Capitol Hill neighborhood and the replacement of distressed and vacant public housing with a privately managed development that blends naturally into the Capitol Hill historic district. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 4)

In the Capitol Hill neighborhood there were some diverging opinions about the nature of the revitalization. Marilyn Melkonian describes the situation:

> They [some neighbors] didn’t want black people, they didn’t want poor people, they didn’t want anybody that didn’t look like themselves. And act like themselves. But there was a wonderful and very strong community group that wanted the opposite, that wanted to see public housing. (Melkonian, 2011)

The opposition prolonged the process several times, causing delayed approvals for zoning and historic preservations (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 5). Neighborhood organizations thought that the process toward revitalization of the site took too long since the Ellen Wilson site was officially closed.
Some also thought that they had not been adequately included in developing the plans (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. 4-19).

As the HOPE VI grant was awarded, the DCHA let the CDC select the development team for the site (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 3). Telesis Corporation who had experience of working with affordable housing was chosen as the developer and Weinstein Associates as the architects. The Corcoran Jennison Companies was hired as the builder. According to Marilyn Melkonian the role of the CDC was critical:

*I mean you have to admire what this community cooperation did. It was all citizens. None of them was fulltime job or anything, complete volunteers. It’s sort of like [...|were you have all different perspectives being involved and making decisions on what’s the best thing to do. That’s what this CDC did and they brought in partners.* (Melkonian, 2011)

The HOPE VI grant for Ellen Wilson was awarded in November 1993. Because the DCHA had severe management problems at the time, HUD made the approval on the condition that an external administrator, McHenry/TAG Inc. was overlooking the process (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 3). Together with an additional grant that was awarded in 1995 (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 4) the total HOPE VI funding was $25 million (Telesis Corporation, 2011). In addition to this other financing sources were a $3,8 million loan from Citibank for the construction of market rate townhomes, $500,000 grant from the Surplus Cash-Cooperative, $260,000 from sale proceeds from the townhomes and $250,000 from DCHA and others (Telesis Corporation, 2011).
The costs of the mixed income cooperative townhouses were almost covered with the funding from HOPE VI. A big part, about 90%, of the grant was used for the infrastructural preparations and constructions. The remaining $878,000 was reserved for future operating costs in the cooperation, the cost for re-purchasing memberships when units change occupants etcetera. (Holm & Amendolia, 2001, p. 6)

Marilyn Melkonian points out that the Ellen Wilson project only had so called capital subsidies, not operational costs. Instead of receiving annual contributions like traditional public housing, the operational costs were to be carried out by the co-op. She argues that even though the cost per unit was high, this made Ellen Wilson less expensive than other public housing projects:

Ellen Wilson does not get that payment [operational subsidies], so when you project it out, what would the federal government have to pay for the ACC payments over 40 years and looked at the present value of that it was much less expensive than traditional public housing. So it really saved the government money, in the sense that the government part of the capital cost and typically pay operation subsidies when you compare that to only capital costs and no operational subsidies. (Melkonian, 2011)

The main objective with the revitalization of Ellen Wilson was to reverse the negative trend the site had had on the neighboring community (Holm & Amendolia, 2001, p. 3). According to Marilyn Melkonian the main strategy was to design the new project so it would fit into the surrounding neighborhood, both architecturally and culturally, by resembling the local historic and traditional types of buildings. Melkonian also points to the importance of making it “attractive” by design:

You have to work at that and not everybody cares that much to do it. But I believe that that’s an important part of attracting mixed income and better looking communities so that people of different walks of life are drawn to it. (Melkonian, 2011)

The revitalization of the former Ellen Wilson site begun with the demolition of the old structures in April 1996, 8 years after they had officially been closed and three years after the HOPE VI grant had been awarded (Holm & Amendolia, 2001). The reason for this delay was the partly the troubles of DCHA and partly the local opposition among some groups in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. In 1995, DCHA (then DCPA) was put into receivership and by court put under administrator David Gilmore who became responsible for the public housing in Washington D.C. (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. b-17). The infrastructural work and the construction of the townhouses began in June 1997 (Holm & Amendolia, 2001). The first cooperative units were ready in 1999 (Holm & Amendolia, 2001) and the market rate townhomes were completed in 2003 (Telesis Corporation, 2011). The community center was finished in 2005 (Telesis Corporation, 2011).

As mentioned above, the CDC has been an important actor in the revitalization process of the former Ellen Wilson site. The mandate of the CDC is also reflected in the way the residents were included in the addressing the social problems at the site. In cooperation with the Youth Policy Institute the CDC in 1995 created a Community Advisory Committee (CAC) as a forum for community decision making, consisting of representatives from churches, service providers, civic groups and neighborhood residents from both the public housing areas Arthur Capper/Carrollsburg south of the freeway and homeowners from Capitol Hill. The Community Advisory Committee has been organized in working groups around different priority areas such as health, public safety, quality of life and economic
development. The conclusions from these working groups have been the foundations for decisions on the social programs in the community. (Slingerland, 1999)

The goals that the CDC put up for the revitalization program for Ellen Wilson called for community and social services to be established in the neighborhood (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 4). The first step was to identify activities that would get the $1.9 million HOPE VI funding that was set aside for CSS. To do this, the needs in the neighborhood were assessed, local residents were trained to take part in the management process and town hall meetings were held (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 42). Two activities were decided on: to set up a job apprenticeship program and to locate job development and budget counseling in the area.

The job apprenticeship program was done by offering both basic education and practical job skills. To be accepted on the program participants had to have the ability to read equivalent to sixth grade level. When many applicants failed to meet this criterion the CDC set up a special reading program to enable more residents to take part of the job apprenticeship program. Participants came from the area close to the Ellen Wilson site, from the Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings site on the other side of the highway and some were former Ellen Wilson residents. At the same time as the program was carried out, a neighborhood drug rehabilitation program was going on in the area, some participants came from this program. Two groups of 20-25 participants carried out the job apprentice program. The job development and budget counseling was operated by an employee stationed at an office at the site. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, pp. 42-43)
Outcome of regeneration

The Townhomes on Capitol Hill, former Ellen Wilson, was completed in 2003 (the community center in 2005) (Telesis Corporation, 2011). The appearance of the new development differs greatly from the old public housing structure. The design of the new buildings are taking up the style of the adjacent Victorian neighborhood, in the architectural details, in the used materials and by having the entrances face the street instead of looking into a common courtyard (The Growth Management Institute, 2005). Some also have back entrances facing a private yard. The design of the facades of the new townhomes is varied and the architect was inspired by the different building styles of the neighborhood, both in color and building materials (decorative brick, brownstone, stucco, and siding). The new site plan pick up the street pattern from the surrounding neighborhood and ties into it, making the two connect. There is one new public road and one new public alley added. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 8) The Townhomes on Capitol Hill now merge into the surroundings, fulfilling one of the original goals with the revitalization.

The site plan includes 134 mixed income cooperative townhomes and 13 market rate, fee simple homeownership units (where the owner has bought both the house and the lot that it stands on). The number of cooperative units is the same as the original Ellen Wilson public housing units. There are five different building types that are used at the site. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, pp. 10-12) The community center houses the management office for the co-ops, meeting rooms and exercise rooms (Melkonian, 2011). The 4,000 square foot community center is designed to both reflect its public function and the historic character of the Capitol Hill area (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 13). There are
no commercial facilities at the site (Telesis Corporation, 2011). There are several bus stops and a metro station within walking distance.

A cooperative organization, the Capitol Hill Cooperative Housing Association (CHCHA) including all residents in the cooperative units, have overall responsibility for governance and management of the property. The cooperation is now self-governing although the DCHA is responsible for the regulatory and operation agreement. The co-operation does not own the houses, but lease both building and land from the DCHA through a 99-year ground lease. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 15) (D.C. Housing Authority, 2008 B)

The goal of achieving mixed income is addressed by mixing cooperative units with market rate homeowner townhomes. The cooperative units are distributed between different groups of income, called income bands, related to the average median income (AMI). 25 % of the units are assigned to people who earn 0 to 25 % of the AMI, 25 % are assigned for 26 to 50 % of AMI and 25 % are assigned to 51 to 80 % of AMI. The remaining 25 % are assigned to people who earn 81 to 115 % of average median income. (Telesis Corporation, 2011) The market rate units are blended into the mixed income units and architecturally integrated. The units of the different income bands are not fixed but “floating” within the development (Melkonian, 2011).

*Being a member of the cooperation means that you buy a share when you move in and sell it back into the cooperation when you move. The cooperation then resells them to new residents, that have to fit into one of the income band to keep the balance. If you have put money into physical improvements of your building you get the cost back when you sell your shares. One of the benefits of being a member of the cooperation include a small equity appreciation.* (Melkonian, 2011)

![Figure 5. Site plan of Townhomes on Capitol Hill. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001) (Adapted by the authors)](image)
From 1996 HUD required that CSS plans focused on employment and increased earnings. A study made by HUD in 2002 shows that no specific plans to reach the supportive service goals ever were outlined at former Ellen Wilson. The CSS funding measured modest 7 % of all HOPE VI funding and almost all of it was spent already during the first year of occupancy. (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003, pp. 90-92)

Since the Ellen Wilson site was vacant since 5 years when the HOPE VI grant was awarded it is hard to measure the demographic changes (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003, p. 35). However, the white population in the Townhomes on Capitol Hill was 30 % in 2002 (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003, p. 30). This is to be compared to being dominated by African American before being evacuated in 1988 (Fosburg, Pokin, & Locke, 1996, pp. b-17). 14 % of the residents living at the revitalized site in 2002 were former Ellen Wilson residents returning (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003, p. 51). The income difference between a household of three at 30 % and 50 % of median was $ 15,650 in 2002 and according to a study made for HUD it was meeting the definitions of being a mixed income development (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003, pp. 41-42). 54 % of the people living in the cooperative units had an earned income whereas this number was 96 in the market rate units (Holin, Burton, Locke, & Cortes, 2003, p. 44). Compared to surrounding neighborhoods on Capitol Hill, the residents in the beginning of the 21th century were younger, had lower income and were to a larger degree African American (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 27).
Capper Carrollsburg

Origins and urban problems

|...|Arthur Capper's six-story elevator buildings are also bleak and sterile examples of public housing architectural design. The open spaces in this area of the development accentuate the anonymous character of the buildings in which small, poorly lit entranceways are gauntlets through which one passes to stenchfilled hallways. (William Brill Associates, Inc., 1977, p. 10)

David Cortiella, the Chief Development Officer for Capper Carrollsburg development at D.C. Housing Authority, DCHA, describes the old principles of building public housing as a way of keeping people “out of sight, out of mind”.

This side of the highway to the river, it was poor people and after hours shops and lots of prostitutes, drugs, crime. |...|They opened a lot of night clubs, after hour clubs, a lot of gay clubs. So anything that the society didn’t want they threw it over here, and let it go on here.
Very dangerous until about ten years ago. And no one wanted to do any development in this area. (Cortiella, 2011)

The 1977 report make a spatial analysis from a security point of view and find a lot of space that they define as unassigned, leaving few clues to their proper and accepted use. Design conflicts and areas of limited surveillance are also pointed out. (William Brill Associates, Inc., 1977, p. 26) Further the access to the buildings is uncontrolled due to broken doors and locks. (William Brill Associates, Inc., 1977, p. 33) The report indicates low social cohesion and distrust and a feeling of vulnerability among its residents. The rate of crime and residents being victimized were substantially higher than in Washington D.C. in general, and the residents experienced fear and worry.

**Regeneration approach**

The D.C. Housing Authority (DCHA) initiated the planning process of the development and prepared an application for the HOPE VI funding. The local architecture firm Torti Gallas and Partners were commissioned by DCHA to do a planning and development options study for Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings. The purpose of this study was to determine how distressed the area was, to compare the site with the greater market area and to develop a Master Revitalization Plan which was to be included in an application for a HOPE VI grant. (Torti Gallas and Partners, 2011)

The development took place as a partnership between the DCHA, Mid City Urban LLC, Forest City Residential Group, and EYA Associates, Inc. Mid City Urban had local expertise and did a lot of affordable housing while Force City were the greater company with experience of doing more high rises and residential. The row houses were all developed by EYA Associates, Inc. (O‘Neill, 2011 A) The social service component, the CSS, was conducted by Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation. (Cortiella, 2011)

DCHA was awarded a HOPE VI grant for the Capper Carrollsburg site in 2001. In the presentation of 2001s HOPE VI award winners HUD describes the proposed development of the site. 780 units were to be torn down, to be replaced by 1,150 units on site and 412 units off site. According to the award statement the location of the site and the adjacent development in the Navy Yard and the Southeast Federal Center called for 600,000 square feet of office space and 20,000 to 40,000 of retail space. HUD appreciated that 1,565 families would benefit from the provision of relocating and of the CSS proposed in the program. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001 B, p. 2)

David Cortiella describes the initiation of the process as top down, as it was initiated by the housing authority. The residents were however brought into the process in an early stage. (Cortiella, 2011) A planning committee was formed consisting of among others residents, representatives of the nearby Navy and Marine Corps and Southeast Federal Center, several agencies of the District Government such as the Deputy Mayor’s Office of Planning and Economic Development (D.C. Housing Authority, 2008 A). The architects and the residents did charrettes and discussed what people wanted in terms of design, resident criteria and what types of social programs etcetera. (Cortiella, 2011) Expect for the residents in the public housing of Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings residents from neighboring Capitol Hill participated in the discussions. These were not content with the public housing coming back, as well as with some buildings in their opinion being too high. (O‘Neill, 2011 A)

The HOPE VI grant that DCHA received in October 2001 was on $ 34.9 million. This amount was then leveraged with public and private money to obtain $ 750 million dollars through the private
developers and other sources. (D.C. Housing Authority, 2008 A) The development that is going on in the nearby areas has no doubt aided the possibility to find leverage for the development. Today this entire area of the city is undergoing development. This in turn can be expected to be an important factor that caused HUD to approve a grant for this site as it improves the possibility to leverage as the developers will be able to sell houses. (O'Neill, 2011 A)

The $34.9 million that the housing authority received in the HOPE VI grant are theoretically the amount that one is to use for the building of the public housing units. However, David Cortiella explains that money has been difficult to make last with the costs of tearing down the buildings, relocating the residents etcetera. Leveraging was needed. The building of the public housing row houses has instead been financed by letting the home owners of the market rate row houses buy the house as well as the lot that their house stand on, fee simple sale. So DCHA has sold the land of the market rate houses to the developer, who then sells it to the home owners. In addition to this one sold the tax credit and was in this was able to make enough money to construct the public housing units. (Cortiella, 2011) In 2009 DCHA also received additional funding from HUD for the public infrastructure that will enable phase two of the development to move further. (D.C. Housing Authority, 2009 B)

The site is bordered by larger streets in both north and south direction. North there is the South East Freeway, a highway that effectively cut off the area from the northern neighborhoods in Capitol Hill. In the south there is M street, a four line city street with several large high rise buildings. This is where among others the U.S. Department of Transportation is located. East of the site the Marine has built their Marine Barracks. (O'Neill, 2011 A) There are two metro stations in walking distance to the site, and bus lines connected to both the north and south of the area.

The master plan of the Capper Carrollsburg site includes both mid- and high rise apartment buildings and low rise row houses. Torti Gallas and Partners aimed at creating a high density, as M street with a lot of new development was nearby. So a number of new apartment buildings were situated along M street and what is to be Canal Park in the west part of the site. These would have retail on the ground floor, offices and residential units. The internal parts of the fabric would consist of mostly row house residential buildings, of the kind that you would find on nearby Capitol Hill. One was able to keep most of the structure of the streets in the master plan. Some blocks were too big for the type of row houses that one planned for, which lead to the creation of two new streets. (O'Neill, 2011 A)

The aim has been to have a third of the residents living in public housing, one third in workforce housing and one third in market rate housing. There was also a mandate from the former residents that the 707 public housing units that were in the area before the development should be brought back to the site. (O'Neill, 2011 A) Torti Gallas and Partners program for the residential houses are divided as follow according to tenure:

- 695 Public Housing Units + 60 existing that are kept untouched.
- 50 Section 8 Home Ownership Units
- 840 Moderate /Market Rate Units (O'Neill, 2011 B)

Except for resident buildings there will also be social services provided in a community center, located in east part of the site, on the same site where the former community center stood.
A school from before the development is kept in its original location. The development will also include office and retail space. (O’Neill, 2011 A)

Demolition of the site began in 2004 (Green, 2010). The Capper Carrollsburg site is still undergoing development but some parts of the residential quarters are completed and residents have moved in. The sequence of construction has been influenced by demands from elderly residents. As they requested not to move more than once, the first building that was constructed was the senior building, after which demolition of the area began. (O’Neill, 2011 A) The first phase of the row houses, consisting of 160 units by which 37 were public housing, has been completed and the opening was in summer of 2009 (D.C. Housing Authority, 2009 A). Recently one has started phase two of the row house construction. This phase is a total of 163 units by which 47 will be public housing. (Cortiella, 2011) The construction of the apartment building along Canal Park is still in the future.

As EYA Associates, Inc. is building all of the row houses over the site, one has been able to achieve an integration of public housing units and other units that are quite unusual. Normally the funding for the public housing and the funding for the market rate units come in different streams, which means you are not able to build these at the same time. So this hinders the type of integration on tenure that one has been able to achieve in Capper Carrollsburg where one could mix the type of unit rather freely. (O’Neill, 2011 A) Except for the integration of public housing and market rate housing the appearance of the houses has been an issue. The aim has been that the facades of the row houses containing public housing look the same as the market rate houses. To bring up the density however, the public housing units are not quite single family homes as are the market units. What
seems to be two units of single family houses is instead a multi family house containing three separate apartments. (O’Neill, 2011 A)

Out of the labor contracts created in the construction of the site DCHA and EYA Associates, Inc. have committed more than 40% to local and small businesses, to contribute to the local economy (D.C. Housing Authority, 2009 A). In addition DCHA has committed to provide at least 1,130 jobs over a three year period for public housing residents. Also the Navy Yard development is expected to create additional job opportunities. (D.C. Housing Authority, 2008 A)

The CSS program in Capper Carrollsburg was conducted by Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation (WCCDC). Over 700 residents from Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings participated in the CSS program (Swann, 2011). Until 2008, there was a site office at the Capper Carrollsburg site where the services were provided. Elelta Agonafer, a program manager at Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation tells about some of the programs in Capper Carrollsburg:

|...|we worked with several different families, |...|, we had done job placement, we had actually full time job developer that worked with the residents, whom provided services. We had monthly work shops were people could attend workshops such as financial literacy. | (Agonafer, 2011) |

The need assessment that was done in the beginning of the CSSP also showed that there were a lot of resident with diabetes, heart disease, high blood pressure, obesity and other risk factors that often contributed to people not being able to keep their jobs, and hence to their economic situation. For this reason a health component was included in the CSSP. WCCDC is an example of organizations
that have partnered with *With Every Heartbeat is Life*. *With Every Heartbeat is Life* is a ten week program where residents are taught about common cardiovascular diseases and how to change one’s lifestyle to get control over this disease. (Butler, 2011) Training to become a home owner is another part of the CSS program. In Capper Carrollsburg one however experienced some problems where residents who prepared to buy the subsidized home ownership houses. The prices were raised in the middle of construction, so that many who were enrolled in that program is now instead working to buy houses in other regenerated public housing areas. (Swann, 2011)

**Outcome of regeneration**

As the development is not yet completed the results are yet to be seen. But already residents have moved into parts of the housing, and the construction continues with more houses being built. The market rate row houses in the first phase that stood completed in 2009 sold for higher prices than had been expected. In the first calculations by the developer, a price of $ 350,000 was set as a minimum selling price. Instead the houses sold for $ 750,000 to $ 900,000. (Cortiella, 2011) Design wise, the look of the houses has aimed to resemble the characteristic of Capitol Hill. Cheryl O’Neill describes Capitol Hill as diverse, as houses there have been built only a few at a time, and have during the years been repainted and transformed. This is the impression that EYA Associates, Inc. has aimed to achieve. The area should look like a community that has grown over time. (O’Neill, 2011 A)

![Site plan of Capper Carrollsburg. (EYA Associates) (Adapted by the authors)](image-url)
The Howard University Center of Urban Progress (HUCUP) has made evaluations of the CSSP at Capper Carrollsburg. This work has resulted in several reports, and in 2010 they published a third intermediate report covering the period January 16 to August 31 2009. During this period 19 people were subtracted from their caseload as they were considered to be self sufficient and no longer in need of WCCDC:s assistance. Out of these, 17 returned to the new development. The two who did not return had indicated that they had no interest in returning. However out of the 17 who returned no one became a home owner, which according to the report has been explained by the too high house prices in Capper Carrollsburg. (Green, 2010, p. 37) 56 senior citizens returned after their senior building had been constructed (Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation, 2009).

In the end of March 2011 new census numbers for Washington D.C. were released, showing the change of population in the near southeast area where Capper Carrollsburg is located. Looking to the increase in residents from year 2000 to 2010, it has increased from 1,954 to 2,757 people. The African American population has decreased from 95 % in 2000 to 31 % in 2010. Also the age structure of the area has changed. In 2000 31 % were under the age of 18 and in 2010 the number was 5 %. These changes in population can be viewed against the fact that in 2000 most residents in the area were public housing residents in Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings, while it ten years later is a mixed income area with houses and condominiums sold for high prices. (Dupree, 2011)

---

9 According to WCCDC, totally 18 people returned. (Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation, 2009)
7. Gårdsten

The regeneration of Gårdsten was not a part of any national or municipal program for regeneration of distressed neighborhoods. Although the problems in Gårdsten before the regeneration was common for many suburban areas in Sweden, the way that the municipality and corporate group decided that Gårdsten should be developed was through “unconventional” means. The primary focus was to work from the residents’ needs with a new organization form. MKB in Malmö is another housing company which together with Gårdsten is often used as positive examples of this new way of working. They have helped to shape the discussion and the knowledge on how to regenerate Swedish troubled areas, especially the million homes program neighborhoods. Therefore this chapter of the Swedish regeneration has no single program to present as in the case of HOPE VI. We will instead present the development towards a common contemporary Swedish approach to housing and regeneration.

Development of an approach to regeneration

In the 1990s the conditions of the municipal housing companies changed. As mentioned in chapter three, the crisis in the 1990s resulted in deregulations and a decreasing role of the state in the housing policy. The advantages that the municipal housing companies had had relative to the private rental housing companies were canceled. They were now to experience equal conditions and be subject to the same market forces. They were no longer to be emphasized as an important housing policy instrument. The same conditions and rules of state subsidies, tax regulations and financing were now applied to all. (Hedman, 2008, p. 20)

There was also a change in approach to regeneration. During the 1980s the approach was often to carry out so called “turn around” projects, with the purpose to attract new residents to the neighborhoods through major physical additions and changes. These were often expensive and had little or short term effect. In the 1990s the approach changed to rather take the current residents as a point of departure for the regeneration. In regeneration one should consider their needs, whishes, and active participation and have this as a base for the changes. One should have as point of
departure the issues that the residents themselves expressed as important, even if these were not the usual issues for a housing company. The aim was also not to work through temporary projects but to include improvements in the daily continuous administration of the neighborhoods. (Hedman, 2008, pp. 23-24)

This change was noticed in the activities of a number of housing companies. In some a new approach towards the residents emerged, with new methods and new organizations as a result. These seemed to have positive effects on segregation and vulnerable neighborhoods. The Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning presents the housing companies MKB from Malmö, Botkyrkabyggen from Botkyrka in Stockholm and Gårdstensbostäder from Gothenburg as pioneering positive examples of this new role. (Boverket, 2002 A) The housing companies have generally gone through a change in organization. This has meant a change from a hierarchical group of technology specialized employees, to a smaller, flat organization with their focus towards the residents. In the three housing companies mentioned, one has introduced so called “house managers” with responsibilities over a certain amount of apartments. These have a lot of contact with the residents. Another function of the housing companies might be to work as a bridge between the residents and the general society. They have the opportunity to establish an informal relation with the residents, contrasting to the impersonal system that the society in general consists of. The municipal authorities could benefit from the linkage that the housing companies and their “house managers” provide. (Boverket, 2002 A) (Boverket, 2002 B)

MKB, Botkyrkabyggen and Gårdstensbostäder express the importance of getting clear owner directives from the municipality as well as pronounced goals. Clear directives combined with independence give the company a good base to work from. Having control of one’s own budget, having a businesslike way of working and a stable economy are essential to reach the established goals. The housing companies do not want a political steering where the municipality interferes in the everyday activities. Such interference is viewed as a threat towards being sensitive of what an acute situation might demand and acting on that, in order to have a long term perspective with social and socioeconomic considerations. (Boverket, 2002 B) (Hedman, 2008, p. 24)

The approach towards the design within the regeneration processes in the Swedish million homes program is two folded. One tendency is to still keep and respect the modernist aesthetics, due to cultural heritage values and social aspects, and because these areas hold several good qualities. The habit is to renovate the buildings rather than to tear them down. The other tendency is to change what has been considered problematic with post modernistic design principles. Tearing down housing areas or buildings solely as a solution to social problems is according to the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning not common in Sweden. When demolishing buildings this is most often due to problems with vacant units. (Boverket, 2005, p. 42) When it comes to regeneration in Sweden there is also a discussion pointing to the areas being places where several generations grew up, and to whom they represent “home”. This is another reason to why it has been considered important not to make a total break with history when regenerating. (Hanson, 2007, p. 169) The Swedish Legislation of Planning and Building also states that changes in the built environment has to be done with respect to the original characteristics of the building and the aesthetic, historic and cultural values but also with respect to the people living there (Vidén, 2001, p. 16).
The identified problems in the design of the million homes program areas are often connected to the modernist design and a result of the industrial production method used when they were built. The ways of solving these problems often carry post-modernistic characteristics. The geographical isolation caused by traffic separation and large infrastructural solutions is proposed to be addressed through better integrated traffic structures and by densifying the areas. Integrating car traffic in former strict pedestrian areas is thought to bring safety through larger movement of people and accessibility. (Boverket, 2005, pp. 72-73) Densifying over dimensioned traffic- and parking areas would make areas feel safer and make better use of the land (Boverket, 2005, p. 78).

**Attempts towards a gathered approach**

The Metropolitan Initiative was initiated to work with the problems of segregation in the metropolitan regions of Sweden. Two general goals were established for the metropolitan areas: to create prerequisites for long term financial growth, and to break the social, ethnic and discriminating segregation. (Boverket, 2010 B, p. 33) A part of this metropolitan policy was local development deals, set with some municipalities across Sweden in 1999. The municipalities are Gothenburg, Malmö and Stockholm, and four municipalities in the Stockholm region: Botkyrka, Haninge, Huddinge and Södertälje. (Gustafsson & Rossing, 2005, pp. 7, 9) One of the neighborhoods included was Gårdsten.

One of the main conclusions from the Metropolitan Initiative is that social segregation cannot only be solved through area-specific means, it must be combined with structural approaches aimed at decreasing the socio-economic polarizations in society (Boverket, 2005, p. 91). The main focus in the Metropolitan Initiative was on employment, education and local democracy. According to the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning the policy lacks a focus on linking urban districts together, as well as any other attempts to change the neighborhoods conditions through physical means. Accordingly the initiative ignored the perspective of city revitalization. (Boverket, 2010 B, p. 35)

In order to gather knowledge from experiences and create directives for a future regeneration projects there has been a number of conferences, workshops etcetera that focus on this topic. One example was the Council for Constructing Excellence (Rådet för Byggkvalitet, BQR) who ran a project for the regeneration of the million homes program. The council’s final report was published in 2008 and among other things published twelve points for a successful regeneration. The twelve points were developed during two workshops where one had Gårdsten as a point of departure. Among these points to be considered in regeneration are clear owner directives from the municipalities, having a comprehensive view based on knowledge, rethink organization and create a clear vision to communicate with residents and others, mobilization of residents and to develop pride among them. The final report also stresses output control and having a long term perspective of physical changes and economy. (Rutström, 2008, p. 76)
Gårdsten

Origins and urban problems
The Gårdsten area was built during 1963-1973 and comprised 3,000 multifamily dwellings and 200 villas (Olsson, 2005, p. 29). The design of the area was influenced by the planning fashion at the time and built at the same time as several similar housing areas in Gothenburg (Gunilla Svensson Arkitektkontor, 2002). It was physically isolated from other neighborhoods based on so called "neighborhood planning", and the different traffic means were separated having one circular road, smaller feeder roads and traffic free courtyards and paths for pedestrians (Olsson, 2005, p. 29). The rational and industrial construction methods also put their traces in the area. The east side of Gårdsten consisted of two parallel lines of buildings, one side with three stories and the other with eight, stretching up to one kilometer. The housing in the west side of Gårdsten were gathered around 11 large square courtyards, with one side dominated by one sex story building and the others with three story buildings. The north side of the area was developed with three story high slab blocks. (Olsson, 2005, p. 29) The original architecture of Gårdsten was typical of the time when it was built. The large dimensions, for example the one kilometer long stretch of eight story buildings, the oversized parking lots and wide through fare lanes has been described as brutal. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 3)

In the 1980s the housing in the north part was converted to cooperative apartments. This was a result of an effort to make the area more diverse in terms of forms of tenure and population. The eastern parts of the area were going through a minor renovation during the 1980s with the attempt to make the appearance of the buildings less repetitive. (Olsson, 2005, pp. 29-30)
In the late 1990s the problems with maintenance had become obvious, the houses were deteriorating. A large part of the housing stock was vacant, people moved out from the area. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 3) Katarina Ahlqvist, chief executive of Gårdstensbostäder, states that the area was considered to be one of the most segregated in Sweden at the time. There was a high crime rate and a high rate of relocation and circulation among tenants. The area had become a transit zone where people moved in and then quickly moved out, which created a feeling of instability and uncomfort. At one point over 800 apartments were vacant. (Ahlqvist, 2011) In an investigation of segregated areas made by the state Gården was pointed out as a vulnerable and lacking resources. The schools were troubled, the unemployment rate and the number of people depending on income support was high. Gården, having many vacant apartments, had become the home of large group of refugees during the early 1990s. These residents had problems getting into the labor market. This and the problems with renting out the apartments made the resources in the area low. (Olsson, 2005, p. 30)

According to Gunilla Svensson Architect Office, who made an investigation of the problems of the area in 2002, the shortfalls of the physical design of the area was lack of orientation and vague distinctions between public and private spaces (both indoor and outdoor). The west, east and north parts of the area are isolated from each other, making it hard to orientate oneself within the area. The area is also not physically integrated with the rest of the city or the neighboring areas. On the other hand, the apartments were often well planned and functional. (Gunilla Svensson Arkitektkontor, 2002)

**Regeneration approach**

The problems in Gården (unemployment and low incomes, school related problems and overcrowding) were common for many Swedish suburban areas in the 1990s. Gothenburg municipality developed a strategy that had at its core that the municipally owned housing companies should drive developments of areas. This statement was based on the facts that these housing companies had been a part of creating the problems that had arisen. This change involved new organizational forms, physical developments, increased responsibilities of the housing companies, new interactions between housing company and residents. (Olsson, 2005, p. 22)

The development of Gården and the housing company is described in the book *The Future City District Development* (2005, Framtidens stadsdelsutveckling) produced by the company group that the housing company is part of. Discussions regarding the future of Gården dealt with whether one should tear the whole area down or go forward. The west side of the area was in need of renovations that would cost 225 million kronor. One however noticed an interest in the area among its residents, which lead to renovation rather than demolition. (Olsson, 2005, p. 30) The decision then arose to do something completely different than before.

*So then one decided, in the political discussion, in the leading politics as well as in the board of the corporate group, that in this case, in our area, a whole new company should be formed. This would have as its mission to manage an unconventional regeneration work. And “unconventional” was an important concept so to speak, as one to a large extent should go outside the box. Obviously what is legislated goes, but think new, think differently. And think what more can we do that we haven’t done? And the unconventional regeneration work should be based on a comprehensive view. And it should be forward-looking. And should be*
done, and this was much emphasized, it should be done together with the residents. And on terms that would make the residents participate. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

Previously the rental units in Gårdsten had been owned by two housing companies, Bostad AB Poseidon and Bostadsbolaget, both owned by the municipality. In 1996 their collective housing stock was merged into one single company that became the owner of all rental housing in Gårdsten, Gårdstensbostäder. In 2002 Gårdstensbostäder bought up the remaining 700 cooperative units. The property value was written down to 0 kronor and the company got a budget of 150 million kronor to start (Olsson, 2005, pp. 30-31). The company made a careful problem assessment and mapped social as well as physical problems in the area (Hanson, 2007, p. 166).

Gårdstensbostäder is incorporated into the municipally owned group of housing companies Förvaltnings AB Framtiden (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 11). As Katarina Ahlqvist describes it, the company has its sovereignty and can manage their activities rather freely, but as it is also a part both in a larger corporate group and in the municipality, there follows possibilities as well as requirements (Ahlqvist, 2011).

Gårdstensbostäder is a flat, decentralized organization with a structure that allows for fast decisions. Nine house managers work close to the residents, right under the executive director. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 12) The house managers have a similar function as a caretaker and have their own offices close to the residents. They have to a great extent contributed to mobilizing residents for participating in the regeneration. (Hanson, 2007, p. 167) Other than the chairman the board of the company consists of residents. This means that residents can be involved in decisions on all levels. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

Gårdstensbostäder is the major actor in the regeneration of Gårdsten. A second one is the residents. The mission from Gothenburg municipality was clear when the Gårdstensbostäder was created in 1996. The area was to be developed, and the method was resident participation. (Hanson, 2007, p. 166) When Katarina Ahlqvist speaks of resident participation she emphasizes the importance of the questions one asks. To find what questions would make residents participate one need to figure out two things: it has to be important so that people want to participate, and it has to be for real. These questions have changed over the course of the regeneration work and the years after. As resident mobilization is still an essential part of Gårdstensbostäder’s mission, one continuously need to find the question that are most important in that phase, and one needs to show that one is serious in making the residents participate. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

Architects and contractors have been obliged to take residents into concern in their work. Residents will be part in working groups together with professionals such as architects, also including board members and employees at Gårdstensbostäder. The mission of the architects is to follow the material produced in these collaborations, making sure that the residents views are included (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 22). Another thing that Katarina Ahlqvist stresses is that feedback is given to the residents, so that they can see how their views are regarded and taken into consideration.

In What is there to learn from the Gårdsten example? (2007, Vad finns att lära av exemplet Gårdsten?) The author Hans Ingvar Hanson lists a number of ways to mobilize residents that turned out to be successful in Gårdsten. One should give thorough information in the starting phase of development; establish personal contact to make residents aware of their ability to influence. Exhibitions with models create increased understanding of the changes. In Gårdsten one also held
workshops with many participants and walking tours when residents could point out what they liked or didn't like. Continuous information during the regeneration was also provided, through the monthly newsletter and several meetings. (Hanson, 2007, p. 171) Another way of mobilizing people have been through snowballing participation, either through engaging young people, who then can bring along their friends, or other driving spirits in the group that can engage more residents. Ahlqvist also stresses the importance of communication, and the house managers who will come into contact with residents. The fact that the employees of Gårdstensbostäder master many of the residents’ mother tongues is of course beneficial in this case. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

The larger reconstructions have been made in phases, and between these phases there have been periods of summary and feedback from the residents. The development have been carried out on different levels, and the participatory aspects benefited from that residents could see changes in their everyday environments while the development and construction was taking place. For example, construction started at the same time as Gårdstensbostäder made efforts to improve the commercial services with shops and restaurants. (Hanson, 2007, pp. 167-169)

The physical revitalization of Gårdsten has taken place in four different phases, the first two in the western part of the area, the third in the eastern and a forth one is ongoing right now in the north. The existing qualities of the original architecture were acknowledged in the early process of reconstruction. This was the reason to why one chose to keep the basic modernistic aesthetics of the area. (Samuelsson, 2001)
Figure 12. Site plan Gärdsten. (Gunilla Svensson Arkitektkontor, 2002) (Adapted by the authors)
The first phase considered ten houses in three blocks comprising 255 units in three six story buildings with access balconies and seven three story buildings in the western part of Gårdsten (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 14) (Olsson, 2005, p. 33). Within the revitalization program all of the apartments were renovated, including stairwells and common areas. The external colors were changed and the roofs were insulated. Energy consumption was also addressed through solar panels, glass encrusted balconies, the construction of green houses and the introduction of individually measured use of water, electricity and heating. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 14) This special attention paid to energy saving measures was partly the result of the given opportunity to get sponsored from an ongoing solar heat project within EU, called “Shine”. The renovated houses was renamed “Solar Buildings” because of this. (Olsson, 2005, p. 33). One important change in the redesign of the buildings was creating new public indoor meeting places. The original buildings were standing on concrete pillars, resulting in windy and dark outdoor spaces. These were built into the buildings and filled with functions; a common laundry area, an indoor green house and compost facilities. On request from the residents the walls were made of glass, giving the possibility of overview of the garden. (Olsson, 2005, p. 34)

In phase two, three blocks with eleven buildings comprising 243 units were renovated using the similar concept as in phase one. A senior building was renovated at the same time. The construction contracts were divided between 52 different developers. (Boverket, 2007 B, pp. 15-17, 38)

Contracting several developers has according to Gårdstens-bostäder made it possible to keep the costs down and control more in detail how to carry out the technical solutions. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 29)

The eastern part of Gårdsten was dealt with in phase three, starting in 2000 when the first sketches were made. In 2001 the construction works begun with tearing down two buildings, which caused some minor opposition among the residents. The goals set up in 2002 considering this phase was to create a good environment, decrease the housing costs and decrease the energy and resource consumption. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 17) The biggest problem of the eastern parts was considered to be the scale of the buildings, eight stories high and 1,000 meters long. To give the area a more
human scale and create new public meeting places, the buildings were broken up into smaller sections and two houses were torn down. The gables of some of the houses were changed into terraces where the tenants have their own patios. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 17) The buildings were given new lighter colors, contrasting to the original darker brownstone facades. Direct requests from the residents to put common laundry areas in ground level, adding common overnight rooms for visiting relatives and friends and to build a gym was realized. The old entrances were redesigned to facilitate overviews of the common courtyards. New entrances were added towards the parking lots.

The fourth phase of the redevelopment is ongoing. The northern area consisting of about 200 units in three story high buildings is getting the facades renovated with brighter colors and improved balconies. The stairwells, the entrances and the common laundry areas have already been renovated, and all the doorways have gotten electronic locks. An adjacent local sports field/playground was inaugurated in April 2010. (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 D)

Located in between the west and the east part of Gårdsten is a small green valley. This was originally a well functioning green open space and an important meeting place. In the late 1990s it was deteriorated due to bad maintenance and was perceived as unsafe by the residents. In the year 2000 it was restored through the participation of residents, Gårdstensbostäder and the municipal park management. Ball fields and playgrounds have been improved and a skateboarding ramp and a miniature golf course have been added. (Olsson, 2005, p. 37) The center in the east part of Gårdsten has also been transformed. The main service building consisted of small shops gathered around a narrow passage. The revitalization meant that the passage was widened and a small indoor square was designed. In connection with the transformation several new shops opened, among them a larger grocery store. (Olsson, 2005, p. 36)

The renovation of Solar Building 1 and 2 was partially financed by the EU project called ”Shine”. The benefit targeted the increased costs that the energy saving measures cost the project. For Solar Building 1 the amount was 4 million kronor, out of an increased cost that was measured to 18 million. (Boverket, 2004, p. 14) As the regeneration in Gårdsten is a part of the overall activities of the housing company, so has the financing been covered in their budget. Deficits of the budgets during their first years of operation have however been covered by the corporate group that they are a part of, Förvaltnings AB Framtiden. (Ahlqvist, 2011) (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 F)

Gårdstensbostäder have a mission to create a sustainable living environment. One part deals with hands on solutions such as using solar panels, efficient insulation and circulation of hot air and a local wind power station (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 C). Some of the materials of the buildings that were torn down were for example taken care of and reused as road material, other parts (roof cover, windows, doors etcetera) were sold on the second hand market. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 20) Another part deals with life style changes and informing residents of how they can contribute to a better environment. This for example includes individual measurement of water, electricity and heating, composting and waste sorting, types of facilities that were added in the renovation of the buildings. (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 C) Two people are employed to inform residents of sustainability. They visit them in their apartments and tell about how to decrease resource use through for example the individual measuring of water, electricity etcetera. (Ahlqvist, 2011) The investment in and focus on environmentally friendly buildings have also paid off through several prizes that the regeneration has won, among them World Habitat Award 2005 and Sea’s Solar Energy Prize 2003 (Gårdstensbostäder,
The effort of creating groundbreaking sustainable solutions has also influenced the confidence among the residents. Gårdsten has been visited both by newspapers and study groups of different professions but it has also become a more attractive neighborhood to live in for people from outside Gårdsten (Olsson, 2005, p. 33).

The business concept of Gårdstensbostäder includes increased property value, attractive renovated buildings that attract not only the current tenants but also people from outside the area. This is design wise tackled by creating “beautiful houses” and with measures concerning individual energy consumption that could also contribute to lowered living costs. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 12) This, together with Gårdstensbostäder’s renting policy created in 2001, where certain demands are put on income etcetera (Gårdstensbostäder, 2010), aim to make the area less segregated and bring more resources (Ahlgvist, 2011). The policy among other things states:

Applications and fellow applicants should have income from own work, CSN-loans/allowance for higher education, retirement or in some cases unemployment funds, which is enough to pay rent. Welfare payments or corresponding economic support is in this case not equivalent to income. (Gårdstensbostäder, 2010)

The aim with this policy is to gain a resident stock with more diverse experiences. This applies both to diverse cultural experiences, life experiences, ages and sexes, as well as having people who have the experience of work. Gårdsten has had and still have a large amount of unemployment. 46 % of the residents are employed. The municipality of Gothenburg has as an aim to increase integration, as it is Sweden’s most segregated city with many areas such as Gårdsten that are weak of resources. Within the corporate group Framtiden and the municipality there is a strive to mediate apartments to all groups within the whole city so that not all people with low income reside in suburban areas such as Gårdsten. There is however also a collaboration to create housing opportunities for homeless, where Gårdstensbostäder as well as other common housing companies in Gothenburg takes responsibility to lodge former homeless residents. (Ahlgvist, 2011)

A part of the “unconventional” regeneration work has been the way Gårdstensbostäder has taken upon them to carry out task that are not common for housing companies. In this, they have both themselves provided services and pressed others, such as the municipal district administration, to provide services (Rutström, 2008, p. 31). One of the stressing problems in Gårdsten, both before the development began and still today, is unemployment. Gårdstensbostäder has created their own job agency to help people find employment. When contracting developers they have included social demands in their contracts, for example that a number of jobs should go to the residents. This has provided both internships and longer employments, and in total this job creating activity has resulted in about 1,500 job opportunities. (Ahlgvist, 2011) Other ways that Gårdstensbostäder has contributed to getting people employed is through the development of the local labor market through supporting businesses to locate in Gårdsten (Olsson, 2005, p. 39). In the start of the process no store wanted to locate in Gårdsten, so Gårdstensbostäder started one themselves, which in time lead to other establishments.

Gårdstensbostäder runs vocational training in the area. Both retail- and building schools have educated residents and lead to employment, and residents have gone though training to create their own businesses. Part of the training is targeted towards young people. There is a school for
restaurant training for young people who don’t take part in the regular upper secondary education, run together with the municipality district. Other programs targeting young people are social events such as sailing schools and ski trips, as well as movie clubs and music schools. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

Gothenburg and Gårdsten has been a part of the national government’s Metropolitan Initiative. This is a part of the Swedish metropolitan policy adopted by the parliament in 1998. As a part of this initiative municipal governments, among them Gothenburg, has signed local development agreements, targeting local areas in the city. Gårdsten is among these and has received funding for development programs targeting social issues such as school, language training, work, democracy and safety. (Gustafsson & Rossing, 2005, pp. 7, 15) Katarina Ahlqvist comments on the influence of the Metropolitan Initiate in Gårdsten, that these kinds of temporary projects can be important to set lights on problems, but in order to gain any long lasting change these projects need to go over to a continuity. To be successful one need to be persistent. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

**Outcome of the regeneration**

An extract from the Vision 2014, the vision strategy of Gårdstensbostäder paints a picture of the area in 2014:

*A city district with active residents. A neighborhood where people take responsibility for the environment they live in. A place where diversity don’t only mean that many different ways of thinking and lifestyles, different nationalities, religions, ages and experiences are represented,*
but that these coexist and work together to create a long term sound and safe environment. A neighborhood where the new generation, the children and youngsters of the area, believe in the future. (Boverket, 2007 B, p. 11)

2,734 rental units owned by Gårdstensbostäder today dominate the program of the site. (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 B). Other forms of tenure that are not owned by Gårdstensbostäder are 253 cooperative units and 336 villas (year 2009) (Göteborgs Stad, 2010). There are three schools in the area, on municipal and one private and a vocational school. In the center in the east part of the area there are several shops and a few restaurants. Gårdsten has no health care facilities but the inhabitants have to go to Angered, a neighboring area to attend these services. (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 A)

Katarina Ahlqvist speaks of social construction, and stresses that this is a process, not something that can be finished. The social construction has lasted, is lasting and will last. Society is continuously changing, and someone dealing with community building must relate to a changing society. For example the processes of mobilizing participation must be maintained. In this lies the need to find the new “important questions”. When Gårdstensbostäder was to formulate ones vision strategy for the following five years this was again done together with the residents. The way one did that was to 2007 start a “vision train”.

*And when we started rolling this vision train the symbolism with the train was this, that in order to engage and make people take part or have people join in to influence, it is very important that it is zestful. Because if it’s fun, and that again, it’s important and for real, then people will come. But as soon as the means stagnate, then one looses it again.* (Ahlqvist, 2011)

One held “future workshops” and organized these as cafés where residents and employees could meet and discuss. The results of these workshops were presented to the residents in an exhibition where the residents could leave their feedback, and in 2009 the board decided on the vision strategy, Vision 2014. As a follow up, Gårdstensbostäder have and will continue to present what is being done in the area, in relation to the vision statement, though exhibitions and activities. Gårdstensbostäder has a monthly newsletter that is sent out to their residents. This brings continuous information on what is going on in the area. Also, each Wednesday one organizes meeting with residents to sustain dialogues with the residents. All employees at Gårdstensbostäder work evenings on Wednesdays to participate in these meetings. (Ahlqvist, 2011)

In 2008 Hans Lind and Stellan Lundström at the Royal Institute of Technology published an economic report on the profitability of the regeneration of Gårdsten. The report take into account two aspects of profitability, both the direct effects on the balance sheet of Gårdstensbostäder and the economic effects that follow from a better functioning community. Both these aspects are weighed in to calculate whether the regeneration has been profitable. While in the traditional economic aspect, the measures are non-profitable since the money spent exceeds the increase in market value, looking to the economic effects in society the measures have been beneficial. When adding these two profitability measures together, the overall conclusion is that the regeneration project has been profitable. (Lind & Lundström, 2008, pp. 5-6)
### Social effect of regeneration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Economic gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth effect</td>
<td>6 million kronor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased crime rate</td>
<td>4 million kronor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of employment</td>
<td>24 million kronor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased resource use</td>
<td>2 million kronor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersion effects</td>
<td>2 million kronor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38 million kronor</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, the regeneration project Gårdsten has gained a lot of attention nationally and internationally and have been awarded several times during the years. 2005 it was awarded with World Habitat Award during the celebration of World Habitat Day in Jakarta Indonesia. The motivation from the jury stressed the participation in the regeneration project. In 2006 Gårdstensbostäder was awarded the Swedish award the Major Prize for the Enhancement of the Social Structure (Stora Samhällsbyggarpriiset). The award was given to Gårdsten because of the developments in the east of the area and the decision was based on the quality of the buildings, the collaborations between people and the process of the regeneration. (Gårdstensbostäder, 2011 E)

Gårdsten has in many aspects seen a positive development during the last decade. Before the development started many apartments stood empty, at its most 1,000 apartments were empty. Today none of the apartments are empty and there is a degree of relocation on 13 %, which according to Katarina Ahlqvist is a low degree and in level with the relocation in the corporate group. Another positive development has been the business location in the area, which has lead to 60 entrepreneurs in Gårdsten today. (Ahlqvist, 2011) Gårdsten is however still a socially fragile area. In spite of efforts to make residents employable and find jobs, 51.7 % of people in the ages 25-65 were gainfully employed in 2008, to be compared to 75.8 % in the whole of Gothenburg. 16.6 % of the families got economic support in 2009, compared to 5.3 % in the whole of Gothenburg (Samhällsanalys och Statistik, Göteborgs stadskansli, 2010, pp. 9-10). According to Katarina Ahlqvist the mean income has decreased from 101,000 kronor before 2008 to 93,000 kronor.

Gårdstensbostäder is a dominating actor in the Gårdsten area, owning all housing except for a smaller housing cooperative and some row houses, all premises and the center. The physical regeneration has lead to a more attractive and structurally diverse area. Conflicts have occurred between Gårdstensbostäder and municipal entities. The Social Bureau considers their rental policy to be too strict and conflicts with the municipal district authority has occurred and which might have resulted in decreased service due to less cooperation. There also remain some structural problems within the area, with the separation between the east and west of Gårdsten, as well as to the outside as the Gårdsten hill is isolated from its surroundings. (Olsson, 2005, pp. 46-47)
8. Comparing the cases

The empiric material presented above has aimed to investigate in what way the formulation of the problems and the definitions of the ideal outcomes point to specific practices of regeneration, and how the processes to obtain the defined goals work and how the processes reflect a higher value of space. We have found five themes that are visible in all cases, of strategies that aim at increasing the value of space in these areas. In the following chapter, we will on the basis of these themes make a comparison between the cases, to see how they work with these strategies in different, or similar, ways.

Some general facts

There are some fundamental differences between the cases studied. The analysis therefore begins with some general comparison: location, the year the original developments were constructed, the conditions of the developments before regeneration, the period when they were regenerated and number of units after the regeneration.

Figure 16. Location of the two sites in Washington D.C.  
Figure 15. Location of the site in Gothenburg.
### Built year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ellen Wilson</th>
<th>Arthur Capper, Carrollsburg Dwellings</th>
<th>Gården</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1963-1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Condition before the regeneration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ellen Wilson</th>
<th>Arthur Capper, Carrollsburg Dwellings</th>
<th>Gården</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed down and vacant, occupied by homeless people, Connected to crime, Problems with safety.</td>
<td>Low social cohesion, distrust, Safety problems, Crime with prostitution, drugs, Poor unassigned space, High degree of unemployment, Social segregation.</td>
<td>Large degree of vacant units, Crime and vandalism, High degree of unemployment, Social segregation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regeneration period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Townhomes on Capitol Hill</th>
<th>Capper Carrollsburg</th>
<th>Gården</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991: CDC was created.</td>
<td>2001: was awarded HOPE VI grant.</td>
<td>1996: Gårdenstensbostäder was created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005: completion of community center.</td>
<td>Construction is still going on.</td>
<td>Reconstruction of North Gårdenstren is ongoing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types of actors involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Townhomes on Capitol Hill</th>
<th>Capper Carrollsburg</th>
<th>Gårdenstren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding: HUD, D.C. Housing Authority, Capitol Hill Cooperative Housing Association (CHCA) (leases)</td>
<td>Funding: HUD, D.C. Housing Authority (public housing), private home owners</td>
<td>Funding: Corporate group Förvaltnings AB Framtiden, Owner: Gårdenstensbostäder,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner: D.C. Housing Authority, Capitol Hill Cooperative Housing Association (CHCA) (leases)</td>
<td>Owner: D.C. Housing Authority, private home owners</td>
<td>Owner: Gårdenstensbostäder,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator and planning: Ellen Wilson Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation (CDC)</td>
<td>Initiative and planning: D.C. Housing Authority, Developers: EYA Associates Inc, Mid City Urban LLC, Forest City Residential Group</td>
<td>Developers: Gårdenstensbostäder, Architects: Christer Nordström Arkitekter, Liljewall Arkitekter, QPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer: Telesis Corporation,</td>
<td>Developers: EYA Associates Inc, Mid City Urban LLC, Forest City Residential Group</td>
<td>Social program: Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social program, CSSP: Ellen Wilson Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation (CDC)</td>
<td>Social program: Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>Social program: CSSP:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of units after regeneration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Townhomes on Capitol Hill</th>
<th>Capper Carrollsburg</th>
<th>Gårdenstren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>About 1600 (in program)</td>
<td>2734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organization of regeneration

The way that the regeneration processes have been organized has been an important factor in the cases. Organization can here be said both to be a means of regeneration and a result, as will be explained. There are some fundamental differences in how one has been able to organize the processes, and how the different actors can work together, much due to political systems. But there are also similarities in how one chooses to work.

How do involved actors work together?

The hierarchy between the different levels of government differs between the Swedish and American approaches in the cases investigated in this study. In Sweden the state is not a driving force and instead the municipalities work as the organizers of regeneration. In the US the federal level becomes a gatekeeper and the local authorities become something of an instrument of theirs. There are several reasons for these differences.

In the U.S. the state has traditionally been the owner of the public housing estates, both buildings and land. Today they partly still own the land. In Sweden the municipalities own the estates and the non-profit housing stock. In U.S. the goals and the principles of the program are decided on federal level, by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is the body that set up the criteria and requirements that the local Public Housing Authorities have to reach to get the grant. The money from the grant is also obtained from federal level. The Swedish state does not offer any large scale subsidies, the municipalities are unusually autonomous in their relation to the state and the legal responsibility for housing supply lies on them, therefore it now also becomes their task to solve the funding.

Even if the program is decided on federal level, the organizational hierarchy within the processes of HOPE VI is however both vertical and horizontal. The award is connected with the requirement to leverage money from other actors, to increase the amount one get from HUD. This way the public housing authorities that used to have the deciding power over the public housing development, now are forced to split this power and negotiate with all other actors involved, such as developers and other stakeholders. The social services part of the program is also carried out by an external part. In several cases there is also a local CDC (Community Development Cooperation) that takes part in the regeneration process. In the Townhomes on Capitol Hill case, the CDC was also the initiating party, pushing the DCHA to apply for a grant. The CDC and the developer took over the whole process in Capitol Hill. This can be seen as a horizontal way of organizing the regeneration process. This was not the case in Capper Carrollsburg were the process was initiated top down by the housing authority.

In the Gårdsten process, the municipal housing company Gårdstensbostäder is the dominant actor, only governed by owner directives from the municipality; with an emphasis on helping people to improve their situation. The clear owner directives in combination with having control over ones budget, having a stable economy and working in a businesslike way made the housing company able to be independent from the municipality. In terms of working in a businesslike manner Gårdstensbostäder were for example able to keep the costs down by contracting several developers, something that until then was an unusual way of working for municipal companies. The Gothenburg municipality is the initiator of the regeneration process and the funding is mostly coming from the municipal corporate group that Gårdstensbostäder is a part of. During their first years of existence
their work and the regeneration process got financial support from the corporate group. In general, except for basing their activities on their owner directives and the goal of integration, Gårdenstensbostäder is free to set up goals and principles of the regeneration. Gårdenstensbostäder then hire the contractors and arrange the meetings with the residents. They control the pace and the strategies of regeneration. A crucial part of Gårdenstensbostäder’s approach is that the social part of the regeneration process is carried out by the housing company itself, for example through setting up an employment office.

Since Gårdenstensbostäder is the dominating actor in the regeneration and the one that hires the contractors their organization can be seen as less horizontal than the process in Capper Carrollsburg since the DCHA have to negotiate with other actors to leverage the funding. On the other hand the organization in Gårdenstensbostäder becomes more horizontal in the way that they work close to the residents and invite them to participate in the regeneration and other projects. In the U.S. cases there is a large focus on the other financial and constructing actors, in Gårdenstensbostäder the housing company seems to have identified the residents as the most important co-actor. Then again, the initiative comes from them which might create an unequal power relation, even though the objective is the opposite.

**What are the goals of this type of organization and management?**

One of the key elements for the HOPE VI program has been to leverage support and resources through partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations and private businesses. Through introducing new forms of tenure within the former public housing rental areas, attract a more mixed income population, one also focuses on raising the economic capital value. The higher value of the market rate townhomes and affordable housing within the area would also enforce a better management and maintenance.

Another feature is the way one handles the maintenance task. In the Townhomes on Capitol Hill case, the grant hold only capital subsidies, no money would be allocated for operational costs for maintenance. One prefers to delegate this to private actors since one considers these being more efficient than if the DCHA, a public actor, would do it. This can be viewed in relation to how maintenance is run in Gårdenstens, where it becomes a way to strengthen the relation, the social capital, between housing company and residents by Gårdenstensbostäder doing it themselves. This will be explained further below. It seems like the goals of the U.S. organization is to increase the economic return from the money put into the regeneration process. This higher economic return however comes with a sanction. By selling their land and through being forced to negotiate to leverage support the DCHA can be said to have given away some of their power.

In Gårdenstens the key element is to mobilize the residents to participate in the regeneration process. The focus on residents is also evident in the goal not to change the resident groups in the neighborhood but to work with them. One way this is obtained is how the residents are represented in the board of the company. Another is to all the time find burning issues to work with which engages the residents. Moreover the maintenance task is performed by so called house managers. They have their offices in the area and works close to the residents, but directly under the executive director, linking the housing company further to the residents and the neighborhood. Having them present in the neighborhood make the housing company visible, and since they work directly under the executive director the time for decision making and enforcement is short when some matter need to be taken care of. These features are characteristics of that the goal of Gårdenstensbostäder
aim to build trust among the residents, which can be termed social capital. This can also improve the economic capital in turn, so the end goal is not only social capital. With support from one’s network, one can both ensure that decisions of physical regeneration is more anchored and reflect the wills of those who use it, which lessens the risk that one spend money on things that are not asked for, and might also lessen the wear of the real estate over time.

The organizational goals of the regeneration process seem to differ in the Swedish and the U.S. cases and have also resulted in different ownership structures. The U.S. goal of increasing the economic return has resulted in a strategy of public private partnerships and to distribute the property between several owners. The Swedish goal of increasing the trust among the residents and to gain more social capital besides economic gains was thought to need a comprehensive grip, and have lead to the creation of one dominating actor, Gårdstensbostäder, out of the former two municipal housing companies.

*What are the time perspectives?*

One factor within the regeneration process that differs between the Swedish and the U.S. cases is the time perspective of the local authorities’ involvement. Gårdstensbostäder states that the process never ends even if the regeneration process is over, instead it is important to continue to find new questions to work with that the residents think are important and care for. They use the phrase “social construction” to show that they as a housing company take a larger responsibility than such usually do. What is important is the continuity, which is shown by the smaller impact the temporary Metropolitan Initiative had on the area were certain projects were run over a limited number of years. As Katarina Ahlqvist puts it, sometimes it is needed to highlight a certain problem but to get a relevant result these efforts need to be a part of the continuously ongoing work for change.

The time perspective of the involvement of the DCHA differs between the two HOPE VI cases investigated in this study. In New Townhomes in Capitol Hill an elected and self-governing board is taking care of the governance functions of the property, while the DCHA still is responsible for the enforcement of the regulatory and operating agreement. In Capper Carrollsburg the DCHA still owns public housing units and is the project manager of the regeneration program. When the process is finished the DCHA will not carry any programs in the area, and return to be regular land lords of the public housing units in the area. These differences between Gårdsten and Washington D.C. might be linked to the physical regeneration component. In HOPE VI the original development is torn down and the residents are relocated. The activity in the site on the housing authority’s part is nothing like what it was before regeneration. When the buildings are constructed and the residents have moved in, the regeneration is finished. It has a clearer end date than in Gårdsten, where the regeneration goes on, little by little, as part of the housing company’s overall activity. Residents still remain in the area so other than regeneration Gårdstensbostäder need to carry out their normal activities. This means their activities gradually change over the years according to needs, and the process is not given an end date in the same way as in the HOPE VI cases.

*What impact has the regeneration process had on the internal organization of the actors?*

Both in the U.S. and in Sweden the need of regeneration of the studied housing areas generate large changes within the organizations of the local housing authorities. In the early 1990s the Public Housing Authorities in the U.S. were in bad shape, the DCHA was taken into receivership in 1995 and
put under an administrator. They then got supervision from HUD and changed a lot of the staff members (Popkin S., 2011). Prior to HOPE VI there had been no capacity within the PHAs to partner with private investors, and also no trust between the two (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson, & Turner, 2004, p. 25). Through HOPE VI the local housing authorities had to become more efficient and as mentioned above, the requirement to come up with leverage from private investors forced them to enter into public private partnerships resulting in a lot of negotiation work.

In Gärdsten the organizational changes were made on initiative from the municipality and the two different housing companies acting in the area before the regeneration. As a reaction to the problems going on in the Gärdsten area and to gain forces the two housing companies merged into one new. All the new staff that was employed was hired in respect to the new owner directives. This starting from scratch had an advantage when it came to internal functioning, and the ability for the group to work in an efficient way, as they would not get stuck in old habits to the extent that one would in an existing company that tried to change strategy. To be able to reach the goal of mobilizing the residents the intention with this new housing company was to start fresh with new unconventional methods. Instead of focusing on the traditional administrative activities the company now had to come up with new ways to work with creating quality of life. This way of reorganizing could be seen in other housing companies in Sweden at the same time. Instead of consisting of a hierarchically organized technology specialized groups of experts one now strived for a flat group of employees working close to the residents. The housing companies would now work as a link between society and the residents. Another feature of being more flexible was that it opened up for more businesslike methods when Gärdstensbostäder was hiring contractors.

In both Sweden and the U.S. there has been a change in the way the local housing authorities organizes themselves when it comes to regeneration. Gärdstensbostäder has become more autonomous in their relation to the municipality. The DCHA has instead been more supervised from HUD. Both the Swedish and the U.S. housing authorities has become more businesslike in the way they carry out the projects.

In both countries this change is seen as a very important and positive one. Susan Popkin at the Urban Institute says that the change that the housing authorities in USA have gone through has been one of the greatest accomplishments of the HOPE VI program. Before, some housing companies would for example not be able to keep the lights on in their public housing developments, and now they carry out complex negotiations and direct regeneration programs. So the benefits of HOPE VI have had positive spill-over effects in public housing developments that are not directly affected by the grants, through better maintenance. The change in Gärdsten, though the creation of a new company with a new way of working is also given great attention in the Swedish regeneration discussion. The praise they get is for the way that they include residents and how they have managed to work in businesslike ways in a horizontal organization. Some have even said that the success of Gärdstensbostäder can be explained by the fact that they started from scratch with clear directives to improve the area, but according to Katarina Ahlqvist this is far from enough. One continuously needs to find new ways of working with the residents.

How is the critique towards modernism shown in the organization?

The tendency of a changed view on planning in the post modern era, where the power of single planners is split between several actors, could be traced in the regeneration processes in both the
U.S. and in Sweden. In Sweden Gårdstensbostäder organized a flat group of employees that directs itself towards the residents, considering them being the experts of their living environment. Putting the residents in the center of the process and letting them point out what the problem of the area is and what the best solution to that problem would be, shows that Gårdstensbostäder does not view itself as the expert. In the U.S. cases, the public housing authority goes from being the owner and dominant actor, to splitting the responsibility and power with private actors.

This communicative approach of planning can be seen as working to increase the value of space in two ways. First, by letting the community be the point of departure for the development, and bringing the people together to formulate their views on the problems and their wanted solutions, the community strengthens and the social capital increases. We think the social capital both benefits the resident group, and is positive for the housing company itself. Gaining “credit” through mobilizing ones network for support can work both within the residents group of Gårdsten, through the residents getting support from Gårdstensbostäder and though Gårdstensbostäder getting support from the residents. The second way one could increase value of space is through getting a more accurate answer to the questions “what is the problem?”, and “what is the best solution to this problem?” If the answers to these questions come from the residents, and the greater and more representative this group of residents is, the likelihood that the development goes in a direction that is best for the whole community increases. There is however a problem of power structures in communicative planning. The idea of finding the best development for everyone is idealistic, as some members might not be able to raise their voices.

What has been mentioned as typical for post modern urban planners, using their individual qualities such as sensitivity or compassion could be compared to the way Gårdstensbostäder use the concept of unconventional methods. They have found new ways of working with regeneration and administration of Swedish municipal housing. These ways may not have been used before and therefore the outcome can be uncertain or normative even though residents are included in much of the process. Gårdstensbostäder aims at letting the voices of “the weak” get heard, their mission has failed if they don’t. Through mobilizing the residents in different ways, and in their search for important questions, they try to make more and new residents to participate, and to make the ones who already do keep taking part. This can be seen as a sign of a housing company trying to take power structures into consideration.

In the U.S. the HOPE VI requirements of making the residents participate in the process and the feature of the New Urbanist charettes points in the same direction, towards more inclusive planning. But here one also lets private interests play a large role in the negotiation on how to create mixed income housing areas. This could also be seen as opening for normative ideals connected with profit gained being realized through the regeneration process. In the Townhomes on Capitol Hill power structures of argumentation can play a role since the process was started by people that were not going to live in the new housing area, but lived in the vicinity. These were mainly middle class residents had put themselves in a power position though their initiate.

**Conclusion**

There is a difference between how responsibility and power is organized on a governmental level in Sweden and in the U.S. In Sweden the state is not a driving force, instead the municipalities work as the organizers of regeneration. In the U.S. the federal level becomes a gatekeeper though the
Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, and the local authorities such as housing authorities become something of an instrument of theirs. HUD sets up the goals and principles of the HOPE VI programs. The Swedish state does not offer any larger subsidies comparable to HOPE VI grants. The municipalities are unusually autonomous in their relation to the state. The legal responsibility for housing supply lies on them, and therefore it now also becomes their task to solve the funding for such things as regeneration. In the Gårdsten process, the municipal housing company Gårdstensbostäder is the dominant actor, their activities are only governed by owner directives from the municipality with an emphasis on achieving integration. In HOPE VI, as leveraging is a condition to receive the grants, the housing authorities need to negotiate with investors and other actors, and so give away some of the deciding power and responsibility it had before.

The tendency toward a new role of the planner in the post modernist era can be recognized in the cases studied. This is a move from an expert planner to a more negotiating one, bringing in more disciplines and more participants in the planning process. In Gårdsten, the housing company has a flat organization, which is directed toward the residents. The residents are identified as important actors in the regeneration and as experts of their environment. In HOPE VI, and especially represented by Capper Carrollsburg here, there is also some focus on residents, but mostly this new planning procedure is seen in the negotiation between different actors in the regeneration process. In all cases the planning organ, here the housing company- or authority, has disclaimed some of their influence over the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. cases</th>
<th>Swedish case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong federal influence through HUD, local authorities function as an “instrument”.</td>
<td>No state subsidies, the municipality is responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several actors, leverage and private funding mandatory.</td>
<td>Gårdstensbostäder only focusing on Gårdsten area, also the dominating actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New organization has more businesslike administration. Let go of old habits.</td>
<td>New organization has more businesslike administration. Let go of old habits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development through participation

Resident participation can be said to be an answer to what one perceive as the problem with the modernist way of planning, either as a direct reaction towards the physical or as a strive for the value of democracy itself. Participation is included in different extents in all three cases, but the initiative comes from different actors which affects the way it is carried out.

**What is the reason for participation?**

Public participation has almost become a matter of course in planning projects, but there are differences in how it is carried out, the motivation for including residents, how it is initiated etcetera. From a value of space point of view, bringing in Bourdieu’s forms of capital, public participation can achieve increased value in several ways. It can achieve an increased social capital, by bringing people together and enabling them to create networks, with relations that they can mobilize for their own advantage. Also, there might be an idea of finding a path for development that will please the most people possible, and in that way achieve the most capital possible, social, cultural and economic. But
for the major actor, it might also only be something that that needs to be done, an essential component in the planning process that needs to be carried out but is not given any greater attention in order to influence the development.

There are some differences between our cases in how the resident participation component was initiated. In Gårdsten, it was a major part of the whole regeneration process and was included in the directives given by the municipality as the housing company was created. There was a focus on the neighborhood as it was, and on the residents that lived there, instead of creating a new type of area. Therefore the residents’ opinions were essential, and the planning was to take place from the perspective of the residents. The resident participation was a part of the “unconventional means” that characterized the strategy of Gårdstensbostäder. The importance of resident participation can be linked to how Hedman (2008) describes the discussion that started in the 1990s, on how to renovate the Swedish distressed suburbs. Instead of making major changes in order to attract new resident, as one had done previously in the 1980s, the strategy was to plan for the people who lived there and to put focus on the value that they saw in the area.

In HOPE VI there are criteria to include resident participation in the planning process. The Final Report of The Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, published in 1992, stressed that the human condition needed to be included in regeneration, which influenced the HOPE VI program. The NOFA, Notice of Funding Availability includes participation as a requirement to receive the HOPE VI grant. NOFA 2010 has it as a threshold criterion, without which the application will not be considered. Also earlier NOFAs states that you need to show that you have held and will continue to hold meetings with residents and “involve them in a meaningful way in the process of planning the revitalization and preparing the application.” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001 A, p. 26) So inclusion of resident has been a directive that the owner of the site got, both in Gårdsten and in the HOPE VI cases.

The regeneration of former Ellen Wilson took place early in the HOPE VI program and is for this reason not a typical example, but here the whole process was initiated by the public. Residents of nearby neighborhoods got together and planned the process, hired architects and developers and made the DCHA send in an application for HOPE VI funding. A Community Development Corporation (CDC) called The Ellen Wilson Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation was created in 1991, including community residents and some former Ellen Wilson residents, ministers, architects, a real estate agent, an accountant, representatives from nonprofit social service agencies and an Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner. So in this case, as the process was initiated bottom up, resident participation became a natural part. More commonly however the housing authority initiates the process top down as in Capper Carrollsburg. Resident participation has been a component in both our HOPE VI cases, but on differing conditions.

How are the people mobilized?

The HOPE VI rating factors from 2010 states that the application should show how one will include residents in the development process in a meaningful way; that you have to train people and work with capacity building (U.S. Department Of Housing and Urban Development, 2010 A). In the NOFA 2001 it is stated that you have to inform residents of among other things: relocation procedures and options, what is going to be built, what services is going to be obtainable and criteria for re-occupancy. Notices of these training sessions have to be sent to all affected residents. You have to
have at least three public meetings with residents, including young people and these meetings have to be accessible by disabled. This meeting has to be advertised in the newspaper. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2001 B)

As described above the CDC that started the process Townhomes on Capitol hill were the residents living in the community that surrounded the lot, people had an interest in a reversing the tendency of deterioration and crime that was going on in the abandoned buildings. Opposing opinions were raised from other groups in the neighborhood that was not arguing that they had not been included in the process. A Community Advisory Committee was created by the CDC with the intention to function as a decision making forum for the community. This group consisted of service providers, civic groups, church representatives, and residents from both the adjacent areas Capper Carrollsburg and homeowners on Capitol Hill.

In Capper Carrollsburg the mobilization of the residents was initiated by the DCHA. The residents were however invited to take part of the process in an early stage, through charrettes where discussion on the early conceptual design, resident criteria and social programs took place. Residents came from both Capper Carrollsburg but also from the neighboring Capitol Hill.

One instrument of mobilization in Gårdsten was to find what questions was important for the residents, during different phases different questions are lifted as a way to reach diverse parts of the resident groups. Another part was to convince the residents that Gårdstensbostäder was serious in making the residents participate, by giving concrete feedback to their input. The fact that the resident activities go on continuously both beside and as a part of the regeneration process adds to create trust among the residents. One also have been trying to reach the residents through snowballing; by making the people that are engaged bring their friends and tell others to come. Another outreaching effort used is the house managers, by being in personal contact with the residents.

The way one mobilizes the residents to take part of the regeneration process differ according to who is the dominant actor in the area. The HOPE VI NOFA put some requirements on participation, however it looks different in two U.S. cases we studied. In the Townhomes on Capitol Hill there is one group of residents that mobilizes themselves, while other groups that are not that organized seems to have less to say. Residents from the neighboring public housing areas are taking part of the process but it is unclear to what extent. In Capper Carrollsburg the process and the mobilization of residents are applied in a top down manner, where typical consultation meetings are held and those who have an interest can join. The Gårdsten case shows an emphasis on trying to recruit as many as possible, by raising diverse questions, still it is hard to get all residents into the process. A large difference between the cases is the types of resident groups involved. In Townhomes on Capitol Hill the dominant group is the homeowners living next to the area that is regenerated. In Capper Carrollsburg the population mostly consists of public housing residents. In Gårdsten the residents are in many cases unemployed and have another background and mother tongue than Swedish. These are factors that influence the possibility to mobilize residents.
What methods are used?

The methods of participation also differ between the cases. In Gårdsten, what characterizes the whole regeneration strategy is that the housing company works in an unconventional way. Also, as participation is such an important component in the company’s continuous work, one challenge is to make people keep participating. Therefore the method of participation is important, besides keeping it “important” and “for real”. One also must keep it fun and zestful. One should develop the methods used, so that it keeps being interesting. Gårdstensbostäder started to hold meetings in the early stage and hold exhibitions with models and advertise in the housing company’s monthly “Gårdsten” newsletter. The forums for participation were workshops and walking tours etcetera. Early in the development one carried out charettes like workshops, where working groups were split up in order to formulate suggestions for the renovation. One also carried out visits to people’s homes to discuss with them there, and had a model standing in an exhibition locale, accompanied by a board were people could give comments (Olsson, 2005, pp. 33-35). Later on in the development, in recent years when new questions needed to be answered, one held new workshops in the forms of cafés, in order to make the residents help formulate a vision plan for the following years. One did this under the concept “vision train”, which got to symbolize a development forward with many people’s experiences and views included. This was a way to make in zestful, to keep people to participate.

Something that Katarina Ahlqvist stresses, and which also is brought up as an important feature in the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning report on participation (2010) is feedback. In order to maintain the participation the residents need to be invited for new meetings and shown what has happened to the work that they put in. What has been done to fulfill their expressed needs, or for what reasons have they not been fulfilled? For the recent vision train project exhibitions were held prior to the vision plan being established by the board, and each year new exhibitions will be held in order to show what is being done in the area.

The charette form has also been used in the HOPE VI projects, as one of the New Urbanist principles included in the program. Cheryl O’Neill with Torti Gallas and Partners explained how charettes were held early on in the process. Two to three day charettes with residents and larger stakeholders are often held before the grant is awarded. David Cortiella with the DCHA also told how even though the regeneration in the case of Capper Carrollsburg was initiated top down workshops were held and committees were formed in order to make the process more democratic. Later on in the HOPE VI processes, one usually keep having information meeting to keep residents updated with the development, but the possibility for influencing is usually over at this point. The purpose then is more to keep the residents engaged in the area, even though they now live somewhere else.

When Townhomes on Capitol Hill was planned this was initiated by a community group, neighbors from Capitol Hill. This group ran the planning process, stated the goals, recruited other actors etcetera. They organized themselves in working groups covering different priority areas, the conclusions from these groups then laid the ground for the social programs set up in the area. In a similar way, the board of Gårdstensbostäder is made up mainly by residents. This means that a certain group of residents are given a possibility to affect the development to a higher degree than other residents, in a similar way as in Townhomes on Capitol Hill.

In Townhomes on Capitol Hill there is also a continuous process of participation and interaction among the residents, as a cooperative group now manages the neighborhood. The residents that
now live in the houses therefore come together in regular meetings for the management of the area. They form committees that deal with certain issues, such as budget, landscaping and recreation etcetera. (Melkonian, 2011) So there is a continuous element of participation like in Gårdsten, although this type of participation is not a part of the HOPE VI requirements.

What do people get to influence?

As residents are brought into the process continuously in the Gårdsten case the type of questions they get to decide on varies. As Katarina Ahlqvist stresses, to keep the residents to take part one need to find the questions that are important for them, so the objective of resident participation in itself decide what questions they might influence. Early on in the regeneration process residents participated to influence the direct design of the neighborhood. The visual design as well as functional details and issues of safety and health were addressed. Later on, residents came in to determine the future strategy of the housing company, through helping to formulate their vision plan. There is also some direct decision making carried out by the resident group, through their representatives on the housing company board. This group has for example decided on rental policy for the housing company, which aims at creating a more mixed community with residents of different experiences.

Generally in HOPE VI residents are included in the beginning of the process so the matters to influence include the strategy of the planning. Often it has to do with deciding on design questions, on a conceptual level. Residents are also often included in deciding on threshold criteria for moving back into the area. The regenerated projects usually have a tougher policy on who gets to rent these new public housing units, and these types of questions are a direct way for the residents to improve the living situation in the area.

As mentioned the cooperative structure of the Townhomes on Capitol Hill allows for decisions on matters of maintenance. However this example is un-typical for HOPE VI sites, and usually the participation in HOPE VI awarded public housing is restricted to the regeneration process, and as mentioned early in the process.

What other actors participate and are there imbalances in power?

In all studied regeneration processes there are other actors except the residents that have influence. There are interests from both the local municipal actors and private investors to be taken into consideration as well as technical details to be fulfilled. There are also budget restrictions that put limits to what one can achieve.

In Townhomes on Capitol Hill case it is the CDC that initiates and to some extent constitutes the resident participation. It consists of public housing residents from south of the highway, homeowners from the surrounding area north of the highway and professionals. The two latter parts generally hold a higher level of education and hence might be more able to get their voice heard. Holding higher economic and cultural capital could be seen as having a higher potential to mobilize one’s social capital toward one’s goal. Looking at the record of meetings held there seems to be a strong will from the two groups to approach and understand each other which could point to a communicatory way of participation. The people of the CDC are also those who set up the criteria for the future residents.
In Capper Carrollsburg the public housing residents, of which many has a low level of reading ability, are to discuss and argue with government officials, developers and architects, something which can point to an imbalance in power. Many times people living in public housing have other overriding problems in their life which might make their will to participate small. This could in turn make the process lack their experience. On the other hand they are given the possibility to take part early in the regeneration process and of taking parts in forums such as charrettes which has as a goal to make the residents aware of their possibilities to participate. There were also residents from the Capitol Hill neighborhood present at these meetings. In both of the US examples there has been a feature of people making their voice heard that were not living in the area that was to be regenerated.

In Gårdsten there is a strong approach from the housing company to try to encourage the residents to take part in the different activities. One has tried to create situations where all people in a diverse population should be able to feel the importance of participation. The interest of the housing company is described to be gaining approval and anchor the changes among the residents, the more the effect of their effort would last. Even if there are other actors than the residents, such as developers and architects it was written in the contract that they should listen to the residents. This shows an understanding of the difficulties with power structures being influencing the process. On the other hand, Gårdstensbostäder is the one initiating the resident participation and in the end decides on the forms it will take which show that it is harder to avoid or address imbalance in power structures even if one wants to.

One important factor is that there are residents sitting in some sort of deciding board in two of three cases, Gårdsten and Townhomes on Capitol Hill. That could point to a high level of adaptation to their needs. A group of residents does however always consist of many different life experiences and opinions. The people that are taking an active part in the process may not present some diverging interests that then get lost in the process.

The Swedish participation process seems to aim at both increasing the social value through letting people come together and increase the value of space through trying to find a change that suits as many as possible by answering the question "what is the problem". Since the resident meetings in Capper Carrollsburg was initiated from above (the DCHA) and there does not seem to have been any extra measures made to reach residents that did not come on their own initiative to the meetings their resident participation seems to be the least communicatory among the cases studies.

In both Capper Carrollsburg and Gårdsten there is a strong influence of some kind of “planner organ”, the DCHA and Gårdstensbostäder. In Townhomes at Capitol Hill, the community formulates itself about the regeneration process and then involves the DCHA. This could be related to having citizens of higher socio economic status within this community board. Such differences in socio economic status is often pointed to in criticism of communicative planning, as something that might affect the possibility to participate.

How has participation affected the outcome of the regeneration?

As mentioned in the beginning of this analytic chapter there are different ways that resident participation can bring increased value of space, by achieving social capital or to help find a good direction for development (achieving social, cultural as well as economic capital). Related to these cases we see both social results and results on the way the developments have taken shape.
In Gårdsten there are definite physical results of the participation process. The residents were included in discussion of how the buildings should be renovated, and the architects and other actors were obliged by the housing company to take the residents’ views into close consideration. Functional details of the new constructions that were direct results of the participating residents’ opinions were for example how laundry rooms were moved from basements to ground level as they were considered to be unsafe. However there are limits to what extent laymen can take part of a design process, at one point the designer has to make her own decisions which has naturally also been the case in Gårdsten and the other studies neighborhoods.

Also in Townhomes on Capitol Hill the physical design has resulted from the resident’s participation as the community committee has laid out the strategy for regeneration and the goals to be reached. In the case of Townhomes on Capitol Hill residents also continue to have influence of the neighborhood through the cooperative board, although this is a new group of residents and not those who were involved earlier in the process.

Generally in HOPE VI projects it seems to be difficult to point to specific details of the regenerated areas that were functions of public participation, but it is clear that people are allowed to participate. Both workshops and information meeting generally take place. The impression that we’ve gotten when it comes to participation is that it often results in rather general design concepts. The more precise design come from the architects adaptations of the design criteria of the HOPE VI program, but naturally often with public views in mind.

When it comes to a social result of the participatory planning, this is most evident in Gårdsten. As resident participation is such an important part of the housing company’s activities that should continue over time, the result is also establishing a relationship between housing company and residents that encourages future participation. This can definitely be described as a way of creating social capital in the area. Through inviting residents to participate relationships are created, networks that can be mobilized when one need to. In other words, the established relations make it easier to mobilize residents for participation at a later stage in the process. But naturally this social capital needs to be maintained over time. One should take into consideration that the problems initially were more difficult in the U.S. cases, which obstruct the possibilities to make people influence.

When it comes to the other objective of public participation, to find the best way for development that suits the greatest number of people it is not as easy to evaluate the result. All three neighborhoods are considered as successful in terms of the physical environment. However, since there in general in the U.S cases are not the same groups that carried out the participation that now resides in the houses, one couldn’t really see whether the participation has resulted in their best environment. In HOPE VI, generally the new development doesn’t fit the former group of residents, in terms of needs and ability to reside there. In Gårdsten there is in general the same resident group before and after regeneration, at least a group of a similar socio-economic composition. The participating groups who influenced development therefore seem more likely to match the needs of the residents the developments affects. Still, we don’t have the answer on the question whether this environment created is their best one.
Conclusion

In the investigated cases we can see a tendency that the way the process was initiated correlates with how the resident participation component is performed. In Sweden the process was initiated by the municipality by creating a brand new housing company that were to focus on the problematic within this particular area. The resident participation process was therefore also launched by the dominant actor Gårdstensbostäder but with a clear aim to emanate from and reach as many residents as possible through extensive and varied measurements, most importantly continuously trying to find topics to work with that engaged the residents. In the U.S. cases there is a requirement through HOPE VI of including the residents in the regeneration process. The regeneration of the Townhomes on Capitol Hill was initiated by a community group that later brought the local authorities in. The resident participation, and the process, is therefore much influenced by this group who existed of both residents from the adjacent homeowner dominated community and the public housing areas across the high way. The process in Capper Carrollsburg was initiated by the DCHA and the resident participation is also colored by this, the efforts mainly being informing residents through meetings and letting them influence mainly on an early stage.

Direct results from the participation processes are seen in some of the cases. In Gårdsten functional issues have been influenced by the resident participation. In Townhomes on Capitol Hill the committee among others consisting of residents was forming the regeneration strategy. The impression when it comes to participation in the HOPE VI cases is that it mainly is more general conceptual design that the residents are able to influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. cases</th>
<th>Swedish case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of the regeneration. Early in the process. Ends when physical regeneration finishes.</td>
<td>Method of regeneration. From the start. A continuing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charettes, workshops, information meetings.</td>
<td>Charettes, information meetings, walking tours, workshops, “vision train”, etcetera. Methods to maintain participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents influence conceptual design, conditions for moving back.</td>
<td>Residents influence the design, function, strategies and activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical regeneration

There are major differences in the physical regeneration in the different cases. One question has been whether or not to tear down the original buildings. The point of departure has been the critique toward the modernist features of the original design, but how one has chosen to continue from there differs.

How was the situation before?

The buildings in the regenerated areas were built between 1941 and 1973, former Ellen Wilson Homes being the oldest. Gårdsten in Gothenburg is a large area, and the construction took place between 1963 and 1973. The scale of the buildings was rather different but they all echoed a modernist architecture. Ellen Wilson homes consisted of thirteen two-story buildings. The Capper
Carrollsburg site which was made up of Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings with both larger scale high rises on super blocks and smaller buildings better suited to the size of the blocks and accomplished better permeability. Gårdsten had mostly large scale housing, one line of buildings stretching along most of the north-south stretch of the area.

Former Ellen Wilson homes were located in an historical area of Washington D.C., leading to the physical impression of it standing out from the rest of the neighborhood. It was also isolated from the nearby Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwelling on its south by a freeway. Gårdsten is located on a hill in a suburb of Gothenburg, experiencing isolation from the rest of the city.

Former Ellen Wilson Homes were closed a few years before it was demolished, and was then home to homeless people. The derelict buildings were a safety hazard and connected to crime. Crime was also a major problem in Capper Carrollsburg. David Cortiella describes it as a place where everything that the city didn’t want was located, with prostitutes, drugs, after hour shops etcetera. The physical state of the buildings were also poor, both when it came to deterioration and the design features that created unassigned spaces and space of poor security. Crime and vandalism were also common problems in Gårdsten, being describes as “one of the worst areas in Sweden”. Another problem was vacant buildings, and a large degree of relocation and turnover. The unemployment rate and the number of people depending on income support were high. The buildings were also deteriorating although less than in the American examples.

The areas of both countries were subject to associations of segregation and otherness, the American examples much due to its physical appearance, which made it clear that these were public housing. The poor social environment was seen on the design of the space. The million homes program in Sweden, of which Gårdsten is a part, also often has a negative connotation. The location, common in many of these areas as well as Gårdsten also adds to it, being far from the rest of the city. The negative connotation to the program is much due to this fact, that the neighborhoods are alienated from the city. Many of the homes constructed under the million homes program are in central location, and it has never been difficulties to find tenants for these centrally located apartment buildings, in contrast to the peripheral ones. (Hall & Vidén, 2005, p. 322) The apartments in Gårdsten have often been homes for immigrant families that have experiences difficulties finding employment and in other ways becoming integrated in society.

Demolish or renovate?

In Gårdsten, the discussion prior to the regeneration was on whether or not to demolish the buildings. One of the reasons why they remained was that there was a clear will expressed by the residents to keep them. This is often the Swedish way of regeneration. When one demolish it is often due to vacant units, renovation is instead most often the option. Even though the physical appearances of the million homes program are often talked about in negative term, there is also a discussion that highlights the value these areas have for some people. These are areas where many Swedes have grown up and therefore they hold qualities in the eyes of many. Such was the case in Gårdsten, and it influenced both that the buildings remained, and the physical appearance, as will be discussed below.
In the HOPE VI program regeneration sites almost exclusively gets demolished. The benefit with the HOPE VI program that many times is expressed is that the Public Housing Authorities finally got money to demolish the old buildings. Before, it was regulated that every demolished unit of public housing had to be replaced by another unit. As the PHAs could usually not afford to construct any new public housing units, nor was any demolished. Instead one tried to renovate the buildings, but due to wear and tear and vandalism it was difficult to get any significant changes in the quality of the buildings. The HOPE VI grant gave funds for both demolition and construction, and the law that committed the PHAs to replace torn down public housing was in time abolished.

Another contributing factor to buildings in HOPE VI being demolished is that one wanted to make up with the negative associations connected to the public housing areas. The stigma connected with the physical appearance could only be dealt with if the look of the buildings were changed significantly. The only way to improve the value was in many of these neighborhoods to start from scratch.

Comparing the sites in the different countries it also seems as if the qualities of the buildings differed. The American buildings were both older than the ones in Gothenburg, but also the wear generally seems to have been less in Gårdsten. In Gårdsten there had also been previous renovations in some of the apartment buildings.

What or who decides how it would look?

As the physical regeneration and the new design of the sites in Gårdsten is much due to a will to keep what is valuable environments for many residents, it is in USA a matter of completely changing the look of what is considered as negative environments. The new constructions at Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg in no way resemble what was there before. The new design follows design principles of the New Urbanist movement that influenced the design principles of the program, and is executed by the architects. There were however opportunities for residents to influence the design, at least on a conceptual level. In Gårdsten, the residents been even more influential, and have been part of the design process to an even greater extent. The design is much dependent on the functions, and what the residents have expressed that they need. The architects involved have been bound to accommodate to the residents expressed wishes.

What was the sequence of the development?

The construction at the sites in Washington D.C. has generally started from clean sheets. With the exception of the home for elderly at Capper Carrollsburg, the constructions have started with tearing down the former public housing, and then one has started to develop the sites, one phase at a time. In Capper Carrollsburg, parts of the area are completed and people have moved in, while the next phase is under construction. In Gothenburg, the renovation has focused on a smaller area at a time. Between each of these phases there have been periods of summing up and getting feedback. This has been a way to make sure that the values of the sites are kept.

---

10 The NOFA 2010 express the purpose of the HOPE VI funds to “Improve the living environment for public housing residents of severely distressed public housing projects through the demolition, rehabilitation, reconfiguration, or replacement of obsolete public housing projects (or portions thereof);”, so the sites does not have to be demolished even though this is most commonly the case.
How does it look now?

There are vast differences in the sizes of the sites. Townhomes on Capitol Hill has 147 units; Capper Carrollsburg is expected to hold around 1,600 units, and Gårdsten consist of around 2,700 units. Both Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg agree with the surrounding neighborhoods in that the street grid of Capitol Hill continues in these sites. The entire site of Townhomes on Capitol Hill and most of Capper Carrollsburg is made up of row housing facing the streets. The row houses of Capper Carrollsburg have their backsides facing an alley, where most houses have their garage entrances. Townhomes on Capitol Hill have parking places situated on the inside of their block, connected to the back of the houses. At the edges of the site Capper Carrollsburg also has higher apartment buildings with housing as well as office and retail space. A public park is planned in connection to the site.

The layout of Gårdsten is still that of a modernist neighborhood district, with apartment buildings of three to eight stories. Gårdsten is made up of three parts of rather differing characteristics. Buildings centered around courtyards in the west, buildings stretching north to south in the east, and buildings aligned to create yards between them in the north. The major road circles the whole of Gårdsten, and smaller feeder roads make their way into the area. The movement within the area is mostly on pedestrian and bicycle paths.

What were the principles of the design?

As mentioned above, the design principles of New Urbanism has influenced many of the HOPE VI sites, as is the case in Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg. Important concepts are permeability and creating a walkable city where people can move around easily. Safety is also present in the design, with “eyes on the streets”, the entrances of the buildings facing the streets and defensible space where it is clear what is public and what is private. The two areas as mentioned consist mainly of town houses connected to the streets grid, with entrances facing the streets and the walkable sidewalk. This is opposed to the previous look of the neighborhoods, where large buildings on even larger blocks were facing inwards and leaving much space unattended and undefined.

The connection to history and tradition is another feature in our American cases. The areas are designed to resemble the rest of the streets in the nearby neighborhoods. Capitol Hill is distinguished by townhouses, of different colors and looks as the areas have developed over time with new houses being built a few at a time. This impression has been aimed for in both Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg. This emphasis of tradition is a way to connect to a common history and does according to the New Urbanist principles contribute to a greater feeling of community, pride and a belonging to a common tradition.

In Gårdsten the changes are less distinct, and the design principles are less consistent. As mentioned, function has decided much of the look, as has a will to keep the impression of the buildings. Sustainability has also been a dominating feature. Partly due to EU funding one was able to renovate the first regenerated building to make them resource saving and sustainable. This very much decided the design of the buildings, other than function asked for by residents.
As discussed initially in this paper, the design in recent decades has very much been post modernistic, echoing a critique against the design principles in modernism. The sites that constitute our cases all are modernistic in their design, and the problems of the sites have many times been connected to this design. The poor quality of the spaces is expressed as reasons for poor safety, vandalism, a feeling of stigma etcetera, and the new design is an answer to this poor standard. This is very much evident in the U.S. examples. One has completely redesigned the sites, tearing down old buildings and using design principles that are direct answers to criticized modernist architecture. In Gårdsten this is not as evident as the current design of the building still speaks of modernist idiom. However, also in Gårdsten one has pointed out problems associated with the former design and tried to answer to them. For example one has torn down sequences of the very long building in the east of the area, in order to create a more human scale. It is now made up of several, smaller buildings. One can also reckon a principle of defensible space in the way the western parts of the area have changed. The six story buildings dividing the courtyards are elevated, standing on pillars. Before, this created dark outdoor spaces and passages under the whole building. This was being limited through the regeneration, where the outdoor space has been built into the buildings creating clearer borders between the courtyards. The areas are now filled with functions such as laundry rooms and greenhouses, providing common areas where social networks (social capital) can arise. This in turn leads also to greater trust among the residents which in time can lead to a safer environment. Also, since both the windows of the greenhouses and the apartments face the yard, one can keep an eye on what’s going on. There are “eyes on the streets”.

What does the look say about the people who live there?

The regenerations of the sites are all answers to social problems. This is also shown in design, and the new appearance of the sites is a sign of the improved social situations. In Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg one has attempted to eliminate the stigma associated with the residents in public housing and created homes that in spite of being public housing speak of a higher economic value. The houses appear to be homes for middle class residents. The mandate that public housing units constructed in the HOPE VI program should not stand out from the rest of the development opposes the previous principle that one should be able to tell which houses are public housing for them not to be a threat to the private renting market. This new mandate is very much adhered to in Townhomes on Capitol Hill as well as Capper Carrollsburg. In Townhomes on Capitol Hill there are no longer any actual public housing units as the site is now managed by a cooperative, but the low income units are floating in the area and there are therefore no difference between these and the market rate housing. In Capper Carrollsburg, the facades of the public housing units are the same as the market rate units and the workforce units. But here, due to a need for density the public housing are stacked, although they appear to be row houses. The reason for this is to not create a stigma.

While the buildings in the sites in Washington D.C. express a feeling of middle class housing, Gårdsten still holds the impression of million homes program neighborhood with municipal housing, although of better quality than before. This difference is also a difference with the value expressed. One could say that the HOPE VI sites express a greater increase in economic capital even when one look at the homes that are suited for low income residents. There is an actual increase in economic capital for all three sites, but in the public housing of the HOPE VI there is also a symbolic increase of economic capital.
**How and why is sustainability incorporated?**

In Gårdsten sustainability plays a part in function, design and creating pride among the residents, other than the direct resource saving positive effects. The way the Solar Buildings are designed, energy consumption is addressed through solar panels, glass encrusted balconies, the construction of green houses and the introduction of individually measured use of water, electricity and heating. This has lead to a decreased resource use among the residents, leading to both energy and money saving. The way that sustainability is addressed, making it a part of new groundbreaking design, something very visible and a pride for the neighborhoods, is also expected to inspire the individual residents in their lives, to live a more sustainable life.

Sustainability in the HOPE VI sites can be connected to the New Urbanist design principles. Through creating more human scale neighborhoods, through a permeable street grid and through a mix of functions one can create a more walkable city. Through also providing public transport a greater sustainability can be achieved. Both the walkable feature and the public transport add to the sustainability of the sites in Washington D.C. The streets are permeable, sidewalks invite to walking, and the metro and buses are nearby. While Townhomes on Capitol Hill are only housing, Capper Carrollsburg have office and retail space in the edges of the site. Also, both neighborhoods are close to service in the nearby areas.

These types of sustainable features that encourage people to leave their cars are not as evident in Gårdsten, much due to its original plan that has been kept and the location on the area, far from Gothenburg town and isolated from other areas. The center that has been developed in the area adds to a mix of function. The different traffic means are still separated having one circular road, smaller feeder roads and traffic free courtyards and paths for pedestrians and the different parts of the area are still structurally separated with a valley between. There are buses going to nearby Angered where one can take the tram to Gothenburg town, and Gårdstensbostäder has managed to get a direct bus in the mornings and afternoons. The location and structure of the area does not encourage people to leave their cars. Although, looking beyond the design and to the actual behavior of the residents, one can expect, due to behavior associated with income level that the residents in Gårdsten use less resources per capita than the residents in Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg. Mean income level can be expected to correlate to resource use, as stated by Karin Bradley in her research on justice in sustainability in Stockholm and Sheffield. (Bradley, 2009, p. 254)

**What conditions affects the site?**

When discussing the physical design and regeneration of these different sites one should pay attention to the different physical conditions, as this can be expected to influence the look. The areas are rather different, for example in their location. One important feature in Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg has been to through design connect these new areas to the rest of the city grid. This is possible much due to the location. Both areas are centrally located, Capper Carrollsburg in an area of the city that is now becoming a part of central Washington D.C. through vast development. Also the street grid of Capitol Hill welcomes these new neighborhoods to make use of this grid and let it be another connecting feature of the sites. As such, these two neighborhoods become better integrated with the rest of the city. Gårdsten however was built on a hill, separated from other city districts according to principles of neighborhoods planning. It is also far from the central city and surrounded by major roads. These conditions do not encourage
connecting Gårdsten to other neighborhoods, and the focus has fallen on improving the area on the inside. The location of Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg are clearly beneficial. There are also examples of HOPE VI sites in Washington D.C. that are located in the suburbs, and there the changes have not been as great. Social problems still occur, and the physical regeneration has not succeeded to create an area with the same mix of incomes as has been possible in the central sites.

**Conclusion**

The areas studied have different prerequisites when it comes to age, surrounding neighborhoods and geographical location. In all cases one experienced problems with deterioration, the case of former Ellen Wilson standing out, being vacant and abandoned. The most common denominator was the negative connotations associated with in the American cases mainly the design of the areas, in the Swedish case associated with the isolated location. The approach to demolition differ between the Swedish and the U.S. cases, where one in the U.S. claims that tearing down is the only way to change the image of the areas while one in Sweden hold on to existing qualities and the value the areas have in the eyes of the inhabitants. This could also be connected to the different levels of deterioration, the situation being much worse in the U.S. cases, since the Swedish areas both were built later and had gone through several renovations before. The design of the regenerated areas is in the U.S. cases much inspired by New Urbanist design principles where some elements of resident participation exist. The new design is much a reaction to the modernist design. In the Gårdsten case, the modernist design is still evident and the changes are much influenced by the residents and mostly follow function but there are also features that can be associated with postmodernist ideas addressing safety issues and variety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. cases</th>
<th>Swedish case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolish.</td>
<td>Renovate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to make a visual break with the negative connotations.</td>
<td>Depart from existing design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show a critique of the modernistic design.</td>
<td>Show a critique of the modernistic design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Urbanism.</td>
<td>Function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City location.</td>
<td>Suburban location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvements through social programs**

All the cases studied have had a human component in their regeneration through social programs and other ways of improving the skills of the residents. The end goal of these strategies is for the residents to become more self-sufficient and gain economic capital. Who carries out this human component is an influencing factor in the possibility to act and to make a difference, as is structural differences.
Why include social programs in the regeneration?

Social programs are mandated in the HOPE VI program. The Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing in their final report published in 1992 emphasizes the residents and the social conditions in their definition of Severely Distressed Public Housing and in their recommendations for revitalization. They concluded that the human condition of revitalization schemes had been neglected. NOFA 2010 states that 15% of the HOPE VI grant can be used for social services, and this can be leveraged with other funds. The guidance of how to conduct social service programs states that no matter if residents plan to return to the site or not, they should be offered social service packages aimed at helping them to improve their life skills and capacities and secure self sufficiency. By other words, social services in the form of a CSS program (Community and Supportive Services program) are a condition to receive funds to regenerate a site under the HOPE VI program.

In the case of Gårdsten the occurrence of social programs can be linked to the mission that the housing company got when it was formed, to revitalize Gårdsten through “unconventional means”, and to step outside the normal tasks of a housing company in order to create a positive living environment. This directive was given from the municipality of Gothenburg, who had identified segregation as a problem and expressed a mission to work against that in the whole municipality. The revitalization was also to be done with the residents as starting-point. What they expressed as needs and wants has been considered, and the housing company has the benefit of being rather autonomous in their activities so that they can be flexible and adapt their work after what the residents need. So the social programs have become a part of the housing company’s continuous regeneration work. The company has taken a responsibility for the common good outside the traditional mission of a public housing company.

Who provides the social programs?

Gårdstensbostäder is the dominating actor in Gårdsten, with a responsibility of the entire housing stock, and the unconventional means has meant that they also take responsibility over social services programs that are provided for the residents. They manage some of the programs themselves and some in collaboration with others. A school in the area is for example collaboration between Gårdstensbostäder and municipal authorities. The benefit of this is that they have a comprehensive view of the area, what is going on, what are the problems, what services are needed and how can they organize their activities in order to make them effective. They build up a relationship with residents, which can be beneficial both in social as well as physical aspects of regeneration and the continuous administration. They build trust among the residents and social capital is gained on both ends.

Trust is also an issue that affect who carry out the CSS programs in HOPE VI sites such as Capper Carrollsburg. Here it is rather a lack of trust toward the PHA, which can be related to them not leading the service programs themselves. The relationship between residents and DCHA as with public housing residents and PHAs and government in general is colored by a history of distrust. This is one contributing factor to the CSSP being contracted to another organization, Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation, WCCDC, with a history of conducting social services in HOPE VI sites.
WCCDC are based in a community in a southern suburb, where the organization rose from the needs in that neighborhood as it was being revitalized. The corporation now employs professional trained case managers to provide the service needed. During the CSS program of Capper Carrollsburg they had a local office at the construction site where the program was centered. Parts of the programs they conduct themselves, while others are done in collaborations with other actors. For example a program aiming at improving health in the area was carried out in collaboration with U.S. National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLB) in educational program called the *With Every Heartbeat is Life* initiative. In Townhomes in Capitol Hill the Community Development Corporation, CDC, has done parts of the counseling work themselves, and have contracted people from outside or non-profit groups to hold educations. (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 43).

**How were the social programs organized?**

As mentioned the CSSP is a separate part of the HOPE VI regeneration programs. In the case of Capper Carrollsburg it ran for the duration of five years, the time that the physical revitalization was originally scheduled for. This differs from the way that the social work in Gårdsten has been organized. As mentioned Gårdsten operate these activities, and they have a comprehensive view on the needs of the area. As they are overlooking most activities in Gårdsten they are able to integrate the social program with the physical regeneration. Activities that encourage people’s capacity improvement can run parallel to the renovations in the area, and can even be planned so that the separate schemes benefit from each other. This will be elaborated on below. When it comes to the time perspective, the programs come and go as the need arises, and there is as it seems now no end date for these.

Bessie Swann, the executive director of WCCDC emphasizes the benefit of letting an autonomous organization handling the CSS. It is important, according to her experience that the CSS is run by a group that is independent from the housing authority. Because they are their contractor and not employed by the PHA, and because they as in the case of WCCDC are able to leverage the HOPE VI money with other funds and show to be an important actor in that sense, they can manage their actions themselves. They are able to address the needs as they see them without being affected by the same governmental rules and regulations as the PHA.

This is a definite difference from how the social programs in Gårdsten are run. Here instead one stresses the benefits that the housing company runs the program, as they get a comprehensive view over the needs in the area. A possible parallel could be drawn to Townhomes on Capitol Hill, where the CDC was the group that managed the CSS. As this site was regenerated at an early stage of HOPE VI, and there were fewer rules at this time, this is in many ways not a typical program. But here are similarities between the role of Gårdstensbostäder and that of the CDC in Townhomes on Capitol Hill, as they both drove the process of regeneration and took care of the social programs that they saw a need for. Both these has taken in other actors that help in this matter, to hold education etcetera.

**What types of social programs were carried out?**

In the HOPE VI program, the grantees are given own responsibility and flexibility to design the programs themselves based on the needs in their affected neighborhood. A needs assessment should be carried out to define the needs of the original residents in the area. The overall aim of the program is to turn people from being depended on assistance to being self sufficient. The design of
the program depends on how the CSS actor thinks this might be done. There are a number of areas that might be addressed in a CSS. The CSS program of Capper Carrollsburg focuses on social and economic development through the areas Housing, Education, Employment, Health & Social Services, Financial Literacy, and Small Business Training (Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation, 2009, p. 3).

The CDC in Townhomes on Capitol Hill formed a Community Advisory Committee as a forum for community decision making. Working groups in this committee held discussions from which one among other things drew conclusion on what types of social programs were needed. Needs assessments were made and two activities were decided upon; to set up a job apprenticeship program and to locate job development and budget counseling in the area. From the job apprentice program there was also raised a need for a reading program as several residents showed to be illiterate.

Needs assessments were also made in Gårdsten, and the conclusion was that the major problem was unemployment. One of the most direct ways of working with this has been creating a job agency, run by the housing company. To support this one has demanded contracted developers to employ residents in a number of positions, for example in construction. This has provided both internships and longer employments. One has also run work training education within different areas, and restaurant schools for youths that don’t participate in ordinary upper secondary education. Another problem that has been addressed was to give young people in the area something to do. The restaurant school is one way of targeting this, but there have also been social activities such as sailing schools and ski trips.

One could say that the social goods that the housing company in Gårdsten has done to make their residents more self sufficient is not only brought through social programs. As one develops the whole area, and has also worked to bring services to the area and improve local businesses, one has helped to create a local labor market. This is a clear benefit of the comprehensive view that they have on the neighborhood and the regeneration. The social programs have been supported by the development of the area. Work training education is supported by providing construction jobs among the contractors and a local center with possibilities for education. The education in the restaurant school is supported by the housing company contracting them for conferences held in the area. Also, by conducting these social programs and backing those up with visual physical improvement residents are able to see the changes that are occurring.

In the comparison what sort of services has been carried out, one should take into consideration that the sites do not have the same needs. It seems like the services in the sites in Washington D.C. have been targeting more fundamental needs like education, job training and financial literacy. Education and job training have been important elements in Gårdsten as well, but here one has been able to support these with more “fun” programs like different sorts of leisure for youths. The financial aspect does of course play in here to. The programs in Capper Carrollsburg for example are dependent on a fixed budget, which have been difficult to keep. In Gårdsten on the other hand the investments in the social programs are part of the company’s entire operation and can be viewed in the relation to other costs and gains.
Who participated in the programs?

HUD’s directions on how to conduct CSS states that the service should be provided for all residents, whether or not they intend to return to the HOPE VI neighborhood after regeneration. The services should be offered to all families that live in the area before regeneration, as well as needy families that move in to neighborhood after regeneration. The grantee is also responsible for tracking the residents who have relocated from the site, in order to offer them the services. It is however not mandatory for the residents to participate.

The participants in the CSS in Townhomes on Capitol Hill came from areas close to the former Ellen Wilson site, from the public housing in then Arthur Capper and Carrollsburg Dwellings. Some were also former resident that used to live in Ellen Wilson before it got torn down in 1988. A rather small group participated in the programs (20-25 people in an education program), but this number is proportional to the size of the neighborhood (Holin & Amendolia, 2001, p. 43).

In Capper Carrollsburg there was an original caseload of 655 people. After a number of subtractions due to people declining, not needing service or that they couldn’t be located after relocation, plus some cumulative additions mostly due to young people reaching the appropriate age, 188 people received the services. Out of these, the majority was original residents as only four of them moved in to the area after the HOPE VI grant had been awarded. (Wheeler Creek Community Development Corporation, 2009, p. 2).

From what it seems Gårdstensbostäder has not actively recruited participants for their social programs. Their educations and job seeking businesses seem rather to be services provided that the residents can candidate to participate in. On a related topic however, Gårdstensbostäder has carried out a number of measures to mobilize residents to participate and influence the development of their area. Among other things two people are employed to knock doors and inform how to live sustainably, so there is clearly an active strive to make residents aware on what is going on in the area, and to inform them on the services available.

Can the effects of the programs be said to be sustainable or not?

There are different ways in which one could try to measure the success of the programs that in these cases have aimed at making residents self sufficient. The job agency in Gårdsten has been able to mediate approximately 1,500 job opportunities and several small businesses have started as a result of training managed by the housing company. However, looking to the whole neighborhood only around 50 % of the residents are gainfully employed. In the case of Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg the overall employment rate in the area have improved, but these residents are, with a few exceptions, not the same ones who live in the neighborhoods as before the regeneration. In the case of Capper Carrollsburg, 56 seniors and 18 other former residents have moved back into the area after regeneration. The 18 former residents have all taken part in the CSS program provided by WCCDC and has by other words become self sufficient with assistance of that program. The construction is however still going on, so this number might well increase over the next few years. Also, the profit gained by the participating families might not only be measured by the number of residents returning. Susan Popkin on Urban Institute who have made research and evaluations on HOPE VI, expressed the impression that in general former residents of sites that had undergone
HOPE VI have improved their living situation. However how much of this that can be linked to better housing and how much that can be linked to social service programs is unknown.

The situations are as mentioned very different in the cases examined and the social situation in Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg was more difficult than in Gården. But one disadvantage that Gården have for its residents’ social development is the location. Being physically cut off from the central city the residents of Gården lack some possibilities that residents of Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg possess due to these areas’ central location, near job opportunities and services. Even though the recent development in Gården has improved the available services the labor market is still small, and services are limited. There is for example no health care available in the area. Transportation to service locations is also complicated, with buses as the only public transportation offered.

Susan Popkin expressed the same thought as Katarina Ahlqvist, executive director on Gården-bostäder, that one need to keep the social programs running. The process and the continuity are very important to have any greater impact, and there is a problem if one puts final dates on these services. Both funds and time frame were limited in Capper Carrollsburg. WCCDC are still keeping some residents in their programs even though the CSS has officially ended. As with how the social services have been organized in Gården, keeping it as a continuous process, one both have the opportunity to carry out the programs thoroughly, and one can develop and change the focus of these services as the needs change. This is in contrast to how the Metropolitan Initiative carried out programs in the area, which went on for a limited number of years. There are benefits of course even with programs like these, which set light on an area for a shorter time. These might also have positive gains, through for example providing residents with certain skills or creating a positive feeling of confidence. But there seem to be an advantage if the programs are anchored through a longer process.

It is an interesting difference how WCCDC stresses the benefit of being autonomous from D.C. Housing Authority and being able to develop the strategy without their influence, while the advantage according to Gårdenbostäder is how they have a comprehensive view on the entire regeneration process and the activities in the neighborhood. The advantage of being able to provide assistance in several ways and backing up their programs is crucial, as has already been discussed. Looking to Bourdieu’s forms of capital, both accumulation of capital and transformation into other capital has a cost associated with it. There is a cost of labor time and resources in increasing one’s cultural capital, through for example achieving certain job skills. But in order to get a job and turn this into economic capital more time and resources are needed. Having this time and resources provided by an actor such as Gårdenbostäder is of course positive. So the way that they have followed up the job training provided with job opportunities have reduced this cost on the residents concerned. Also, as the report by Hans Lind and Stellan Lundström at Royal Institute of Technology concluded, there have been economic benefits for the society as a whole thanks to the regeneration in Gården, and among those activities social programs.
Conclusion

The social programs occur or have occurred in all three cases studied. In HOPE VI CSS, Community and Social Services, are mandated. In Gårdsten the mission of the housing company as it was started was to step out of the normal activities of housing companies, and regenerate through “unconventional means”. All actors have had the opportunity to shape the programs provided from the needs of the residents. In general the programs aim at improving skills for employment, to improve the economic capital of residents through improving their cultural capital. Gårdstens-bostäder has carried out the programs themselves, sometimes in collaboration with other actors. The benefit of this is that they have a comprehensive view of the area, what the residents need and how to make measures effective. This also means that they can anchor the social programs in the overall development, and let the social programs and other measures feed off each other. While the CSS program is a separate part of the HOPE VI the social programs in Gårdsten are incorporated in the overall activities. WCCDC experience an advantage that they are independent from the housing authority and their activities.

It seems as if many individuals have benefited, in all three areas. One should take into consideration that the situations were different before regeneration. Even if Gårdsten was one of the most problematic areas in Sweden the social situation in the cases in Washington D.C. seems worse. But there is also a structural difference, as Gårdsten is more cut off from the city than Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg. This adds to the segregation, which might be difficult to fully overcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. cases</th>
<th>Swedish case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is planned to end after HOPE VI grant period ends.</td>
<td>Continues after the physical regeneration is finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried out by independent organization.</td>
<td>Carried out by Gårdstensbostäder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSP requires to actively recruit participants.</td>
<td>Open doors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self sufficient through employment training, budget counseling, health program.</td>
<td>Employment training, employment bureau, “fun activities” for the youth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social mix

The strive to create a population of mixed income and experiences is visible in all cases, and it derives from the urban problems that are perceived. There are two ways of working towards this aim, trough attracting new groups into the area, or through improving the social and cultural capital of those who live there already.

How is mixed income accomplished?

The HOPE VI program has as one of its goals to create a mixed income community. This is addressed through several different efforts. One is to introduce new forms of tenure within the former strict public rental housing. The aim is to mix pure public units with both affordable housing partly subsidized by the state and pure market rate homeowner units. By doing this one definitely secures bringing residents with different incomes into the community. In Townhouses on Capitol Hill the
mixed income goal is addressed by mixing 134 cooperative units with 13 market rate units where the allocation of the units in the cooperation is based on different income groups related to the average median income in the area. The goal in Capper Carrollsburg was to create one-third public housing, one-third affordable housing and one-third market rate housing. The program that is to be finalized however ended up containing 755 public housing units, 50 affordable housing units and 840 market rate units.

Gårdstensbostäder aims to gain a resident stock with more diverse experiences (in terms of age, lifestyle but also employment) focusing mostly on the existing residents, their economic situation and the way they perceive their area. One does not put such a heavy emphasis on the mixed income element as one does in HOPE VI. The change in Gårdstensbostäder’s leasing policy is however aiming both at a change in the composition of the population towards a more stable population, and at creating a more secure, comfortable and popular housing area. New renters living on income support are not accepted as tenants any more. Tenants should have a record without any remarks when it comes to disturbance and paying the rent.

The situation in Sweden where municipal rental flats are available for all groups in society makes it harder to enforce a mixed income population. Since the municipal housing companies do not provide other alternative tenure forms the strategies at hand are to put in propositions or criteria in the detailed plans or to depend on the market demand. A problem here is that the Swedish municipalities in many cases own a lot of land and it is hard to get hold of properties in the large-scale multifamily housing areas in order to develop properties of other tenure. In Gården however, there has been some private establishment of other forms of tenure on nearby land, both row housing owned in the form of housing cooperatives and villas with regular homeownership.

The social program parts of HOPE VI aims at helping the public housing residents become self sufficient; getting an education or increasing one’s health so that one can get a job and maybe buy a home, hence to create a more mixed income population. This can be considered as inward looking efforts. The self sufficiency programs in HOPE VI includes both credit counseling and homeowner education helping out with budgeting and teaching what responsibilities comes with owning your own house. The Public Housing Authority supports people with low income to buy their homes, keeping down the prices through subsidized mortgages. (Adams, 2011)

The screening procedure in the regenerated areas typically includes higher criteria than before that prevent some former residents to return to the area after the regeneration process is finished. There could also be other reasons for why residents do not want to return, as associating the area with bad memories or that one got established somewhere else during the period of the regeneration.

Another way that HOPE VI tries to achieve mixed income works in the other direction, instead of bringing new people to the area one aims at bringing public housing residents to new neighborhoods. The approach is based on a voucher system. The voucher enables the families to relocate to a private landlord by paying the difference between the private rent and their ability to pay. This system aims at moving public housing residents into areas with more varied incomes. There has however been a problem to find landlords who accept the voucher in cities such as Washington D.C. where the housing market is strained.

Gårdstensbostäder is working in different ways to achieve diverse experiences. This is done through a variety of resident activities. Some initiatives are trying to get residents to come together and
participate in the layout of their own living environment, both in the regeneration process but also to make the area more sustainable in terms of use of resources. Some resident activities aims at creating mixed income among the residents that already live in the area. This is done by introducing social programs such as education and an employment office aiming at creating working opportunities and getting more people into the labor market. In connection to this Gårdstensbostäder also sets up criteria for contractors to employ local workforce. They arrange training courses to start your own business and in combination with bringing services to the area by setting up a grocery store themselves and developing the center they could be said to having created a local labor market.

The differences between how the Gårdsten case and the U.S. cases investigated here works when it comes to social services can be connected with how they formulate their goal. The U.S. cases strives during regeneration for a fixed situation where there are determined portions of different income groups, the social programs go on during regeneration and partly aim at achieving the mixed income goal. In Sweden one rather aims for a more stable social situation than mixed income. This is also why there is no end date on the social efforts in the area; one only adjusts them to the current need. In Sweden there is also a special security of tenure that means that you can only be evicted if you damage the property, disturb other residents or do not pay rent. This means that you cannot be displaced due to the new renting policies or criteria as easily as in the U.S. public housing. This is an important difference which concern to what extent one can influence the composition of income groups in an area. In the U.S. the possibilities are greater to actually move people living in public housing while regenerating, as this is thought to benefit the development. Because of the right of tenure in Sweden this is much harder to obtain.

How are new groups attracted?

In the HOPE VI cases studied the design is an important instrument to attract new income groups and to merge different groups without showing a difference in appearance of their homes. The units prepared for public housing residents should look the same as units for home ownership. One uses a new design that stand apart from the bad associations of the old public housing through using traditional styles that speak of homeownership and through making distinctions between public and private more evident. The program aims to join the new housing area with the surroundings. The finish of the materials used is an important factor because of the former neglect of maintenance in public housing areas. Introducing homeownership units in those areas is also thought to secure the future maintenance since homeowners are concerned of not decreasing the value of their properties and invested money.

Gårdstensbostäder also works with changing the image of the area from the outside with the aim to attract other income groups. This is made partly through increasing the property value and the redesign of the built environment by introducing a new and more varied design breaking with the common image of the large housing areas from the modernistic times, designing attractive private areas as terraces and making the area more secure. The sustainability objective could also be seen as a way of attracting groups from the outside both through being able to offer sustainable living but also through the prizes one gained by working with these factors. The prizes have resulted in media attention that puts Gårdstensbostäder in a new positive light. The fact that Gårdstensbostäder wants to be seen as unconventional, working with new methods, which is not always connected to
municipal organizations, is also something that can attract other groups. Another important factor that can attract new income groups have been the aim to heighten the level of service provided in the area, for example by opening a grocery store when the area was lacking one.

The neighborhoods that we investigate in the U.S. are located in areas that are close to other affluent areas. They do therefore already have a potential to get attractive. In Gårdenst the location can be seen as a problem working against the integration to become a mixed income community since it is geographically isolated on a hill, the only public transport connecting it to the rest of the city being one bus line. This points to how crucial it is to create a better image to the outside for Gårdenst, when people that do not live there seldom have any reason to go there.

What are the results of the mixed income?

The regeneration process in Gårdenst has not had a large impact on employment numbers; still around half of the residents are unemployed. According to the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning it was however attracting other groups shortly after the regeneration was finished. The largest change is that there are no vacant flats now, something that creates economic capital in form of rents coming in the housing company. Even if the employment numbers has not changed, there has been a development of business location to the area, partly sponsored by the efforts by Gårdenstbostäder. This can be said to create a population with more diverse experiences and add both to the economic capital by the value of the businesses but also to a social capital by the new networks that opens up in the area.

In the HOPE VI cases we studied there has been a large change in the composition of the inhabitants. A larger part is now working and owning their homes. This compared to the Swedish case is mostly because large parts of the original residents now have moved elsewhere as described in the social program analysis. This has increased the economic capital in the area both through the new design principles that are not connected with the old public housing raising the capital value of the properties and through the aggregated higher income in the area. By adding market rate units within the public housing area one also increases their economic capital. Creating a more mixed income community can also add an increased social capital, since different groups now get access to other and larger social networks. This is in the U.S. example a fact both within the regeneration area but also in the areas where former public housing residents gets relocated.

The whole regeneration process is a shift of image in branding both in the U.S. cases and the Swedish one. A significant element within the Gårdenst regeneration process is that the housing company is trying to create a new identity or image of the area. There are different factors that influence the image that Gårdenstbostäder is working with. One is trying to change the way the current residents think about themselves and their area, making them feel proud of where they live and where they come from. This is made both through the social programs, the resident participation in the regeneration process and especially through the emphasis on sustainable solutions that relies a lot on the residents input and involves both educational and socializing features. The economic costs put in by Gårdenstbostäder to realize this creates both cultural capital through gaining the potential of a larger understanding of environmental issues and social capital through a larger feeling of inclusion. Through the prizes gained and the new design principles applied within the area the image has also changed to the outside.
In the U.S. cases the regeneration is also adding to the creation of a new identity. By turning the area into a mixed income community new role models can be provided to the public housing residents. On the other hand since the very weakest groups are not let back in, they are not gaining access to these and are not able to gain any social capital. The income mix effort then becomes more directed towards creating a middle class neighborhood.

There is a difference in the conditions in the U.S. cases and the Swedish one when it comes to introducing new forms of tenure. The view that owning your house is the ultimate condition is connected with the American mixed income approach. Since only poor people live in public housing rental units the most direct way to create a larger mix of income you have to introduce market rate or other tenure forms. This is also why the approach in the U.S. results in a more definitive change than in Sweden. As neither cooperative nor rental housing in Sweden are connected with groups of certain income to the same extent one cannot create such a distinct change as in the U.S. Instead one has to work with the image of the area in a long-term perspective toward integration by trying to get the inhabitants employed and educated.

Conclusion

Creating a mixed income population is an outspoken goal in the U.S. cases, more a tendency in Sweden. Both in Townhomes on Capitol Hill and in Capper Carrollsburg this is addressed through introducing new kinds of tenure forms in the areas. This change is definitive in the way that it builds in mixed income into the physical structure of the areas. The method is mainly aiming at bringing new inhabitants with higher income than public housing residents into the neighborhood and that way create a mix. In Gårdsten one tries to create a change more by working with the existing residents through social programs aiming at getting residents into the labor market to a larger extent. In Gårdsten there is however also a tendency of putting higher demands on the residents through stricter leasing criteria. In the U.S. cases there are also interventions made towards changing the life situation for the public housing residents, making them better off through employment and education training, and credit counseling aimed at being able to buy your own home. Since the Swedish municipal rental units are available to all groups in society it is harder to make such a definitive change as in the U.S.

Both the U.S. and the Swedish cases work with changing the image of the area and with what public housing can be. In the U.S. there is a strong emphasis on the design part, using types that speaks of homeownership and make a break with the modernist look of traditional public housing. In Sweden one works both with changing the image to the outside, by using more varied design and unconventional methods, and the image of the inside, by creating a feeling of pride among the residents. The economic costs put in to realizing this creates both cultural capital through a larger understanding of environmental issues and social capital through a larger feeling of inclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. cases</th>
<th>Swedish case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear goal to deconcentrate poverty.</td>
<td>Aim for “diverse experiences”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial means, design, social programs. Conditions for returning. Forms of tenure.</td>
<td>Social programs, changing status or image of area. Rental policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite social mix through built structure.</td>
<td>No social mix today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Concluding discussion

We believe that in spite of the context being a very decisive factor for the way the regeneration is carried out, there are lessons to be learned across these contexts. The definition of an urban problem can support a certain procedure of regeneration, and to point to a positive result, where the regeneration has brought a successful change, is a way to legitimize the procedure of regeneration. But a better “after” than “before” does not mean than this procedure is the only path to take. We see a need to improve the knowledge on how to carry out regeneration, and a way to add to this knowledge is to look how others have carries out regeneration. Therefore, we think that a comparison between regeneration cases in different urban situations is a constructive way to improve the knowledge on how to conduct regeneration. Through comparisons we can gain lessons across different settings.

Despite the different ways that the housing policies in U.S. and in Sweden have provided housing for low income groups, neighborhoods that today experience similar problems have emerged in both countries. In all three cases that we have examined the situations previous to regeneration were alike, with problems of segregation and alienation from the rest of society, unemployment, crime, vandalism and a poor urban environment. The extent of these problems seem not to be the same, the problems in the U.S. cases were more severe with for example racial segregation and more serious crime. There are however some structural problems in the Swedish context that we do not find in the U.S. ones, of for example language barriers. Having acknowledged that, we still see the same kind of urban problems that the regeneration attempts to solve. For this reason we see a point in comparing these cases and to try to draw conclusions on lessons that each case could learn from the others. To add to the knowledge base of regeneration and move the development forward, one should also look outside the individual context.

Regeneration tries to obtain a better use and a higher value of space. We have investigated and compared how the projects and their actors formulate, relate to and strive for a higher and better use of space. The strive for a higher value stems from how one formulates the problem. The types of values that characterize the defined ideal outcome, color the process that works towards this
outcome. To view the regeneration processes in terms of the values that it strives to accomplish, in addition to the direct activities one can also recognize the intentions behind. Even if the activities differ the intentions might be the same. Through drawing conclusions on what values that are being prioritized before others and in what situations, important lessons can be learned.

Bourdieu’s model of the forms of capital is useful as regeneration strive to accomplish several values at the same time. Often both the real estate value and the wellbeing of residents are considered. Bourdieu divides the capital into economic, social and cultural. The model helps us to tell which of these capital values different activities strive to obtain. Bourdieu also includes transfer between these forms of capital, for example with the help of cultural capital one can gain economic capital. This transfer is related to a cost. We also see transfers between different forms of capital in regeneration.

In the comparison of the cases we have in turn highlighted different themes of the regenerations programs, identified from our investigated cases. These are organization of the processes, participation of residents, physical regeneration, social programs and social mix. Through separating the processes into their components it is easier to compare and to tell what the cases have in common and what differs. Just looking at the cases in their entirety could make them appear very different. The comparison according to these themes has helped to tell whether there are lessons to be learned across the contexts.

The result of our empiric research has been presented and analyzed to answer the questions: What elements of the projects or programs strive for a higher value in a similar way and what does it in different ways? The analysis has shown that there are both similarities and differences, both in activities and in the values one tries to obtain. The main objective of this comparison is to tell whether there are any lessons to learn across the contexts. In this final chapter we will round up our investigation with a discussion that highlights these lessons. What lessons for future regeneration can be learned from the comparisons? As a way to sum up the comparison made in the analysis we will continue the discussion through in turn look at the differences and the similarities of the different approaches.

There are different political context in Sweden and in the USA, and differing housing policy. For our regeneration cases this means that the actors are organized in different ways, due to for example the power of the local against other levels of governance. In Sweden the municipality controls the planning and takes care of the financing of regeneration. In USA the public housing is a part of the federal HUD, who makes the rules and who here provides funding through the HOPE VI program. The Swedish state plays no major part in the regeneration of Gårdsten. Also, while the housing company in Gårdsten is rather autonomous in its activities, the responsibility of the public housing authority in the U.S. cases is split with other actors. These other actors are brought into the process for additional funding, leverage. This is seen as a very important feature in order to make any visible and lasting changes in the sites, while the fact that Gårdstensbostäder does it on their own is important for the success in Gårdsten. Also the maintenance of the regenerated areas is taken care of by the housing company in Gårdsten, and becomes a way to connect to the residents. In HOPE VI cases such as Capper Carrollsburg this is often contracted to private actors as this is thought to bring the best return in terms of a job well done. Summing up, Gårdstensbostäder’s autonomy and the responsibilities they take show a strive for social capital between them and residents. The
organization in HOPE VI is done to receive a gain of economic capital. Looking to transference between forms of capital you can however see an extension from social to economic in Gårdsten, and through economic to social and cultural in HOPE VI.

Resident participation is a major feature in the regeneration of Gårdsten. It can be said to be the main method of regeneration, and something that remains important throughout the process and in the continuing work of the housing company. In HOPE VI it is also mandated and the cases investigated seem to appreciate its importance, but it is usually something that takes place early on in the process and not again later. One exception to this rule is Townhomes on Capitol Hill, former Ellen Wilson Homes, where the CDC initiated regeneration and remained important throughout the process. Still today a cooperative organization manages the development and decisions are made in the board of this cooperative group. The methods of participation are of a more traditional sort in HOPE VI, charrettes and meetings where the residents are informed about the process. In Gårdsten charrettes are also a way to produce proposals for development, but while the process continues the methods changes in order to keep making the residents interested in participating. Gårdstens-bostäder is the initiator and mobilizing force of participation in Gårdsten. A similar situation applies in Capper Carrollsburg, but in Townhomes on Capitol Hill the CDC, the neighbors, initiated their possibility to influence.

The physical regeneration in Gårdsten and in Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg has produced visible differences between the cases. The physical regeneration is much more visible in terms of the changes produced in the U.S. cases than in Gårdsten. Here one has torn down the original development and built something completely different, while in Gårdsten one took the decisions to renovate instead, as the buildings were thought to have value for the residents. While the physical regeneration is mostly functional in Gårdsten it holds a different aesthetic expression in the HOPE VI cases. Those two cases have a strong postmodern, New Urbanist design, a strong reaction against the modernist aesthetic. Contrary, in Gårdsten it still is a modernist area. Speaking of symbolism, while the design of Gårdsten still represents the same form of living situation, same form of tenure and same position in the city, the new design of the HOPE VI sites is now a mixed income neighborhood representing middle income residence. The gain in economic capital is represented more evidently in HOPE VI.

Social programs are a separate part of the HOPE VI program, while it is a part of the daily activities of the housing company in Gårdsten. In Gårdsten the ability to have a comprehensive view of the activities is considered beneficial for the success of the social programs as the programs can be supported by other measures, like support of the labor market for example. In HOPE VI and particularly in Capper Carrollsburg the fact that an outside actor other than the housing company takes care of the social programs is expressed to be advantageous.

There are structural differences that affect how one is able to work toward a more mixed resident group. In HOPE VI, due to the conditions of public housing, one can relocate resident and help them find other housing. The attempt is to find new homes in mixed income neighborhoods. One also uses financing and organization as tools to achieve mixed income communities in the HOPE VI sites. Public housing is mixed with other forms of tenure such as market rate housing. The right of tenure in Sweden stops any possibilities to relocate residents to achieve a mixed group. Even if mixed income groups had been a more profound aim in Gårdsten the same type of tools would not have been
possible. In Sweden one is not able to actively control what groups move into the area in the same way as in the former U.S. public housing developments. Not even other forms of tenure such as cooperative ownership, the Swedish equivalent of owned apartments, are tied to a specific group to the extent that the composition of residents could be controlled. The distance from the inner city in Gårdsten also makes it difficult to attract new residents, a problem that doesn’t exist in our studied HOPE VI sites.

Despite the differences described above there are also some similarities to be found within the regeneration processes. Both the U.S. and the Swedish regeneration approaches have resulted in changes in the way that the actors organize and manage the processes. As mentioned above these changes have resulted in differences but there are also features that are more similar. In both countries the legacy from modernist planning has colored the way one chooses to organize one self, old habits were to be abandoned and a new “fresh” way of thinking was to influence the organization. Both DCHA and Gårdstensbostäder get directives from other bodies, HUD and the municipality of Gothenburg. In both countries one has for example started to work in a more efficient, flexible and businesslike ways, through a larger strive for profit. This has in both countries been seen as a positive change.

In the regeneration schemes a similarity can be seen in the way one has been reacting to the modernist role of the planner. A more inclusive way of planning can be seen in both countries. Instead of viewing the planner as the expert the role of the planner has moved toward a more negotiating one, where more participants are brought into the process, both private actors and residents. Resident participation is a part of all cases investigated. All cases use some form of information meetings and have residents in deciding boards, a fact that could point to a level of adaptation to their needs. Both Capper Carrollsburg and Gårdsten have workshops where residents are welcome to participate. In both countries these boards have been the one that decides on the criteria put on residents to come back into the area.

In the physical part of the regeneration schemes there are also similarities in that one reacts to the original modernist design to erase negative connotations. In both the U.S. and Sweden features of the design is in some ways an attempt to create an opposite idiom. Even though the modernist impression still remains in Gårdsten, one in both countries use more details, addressing the large scale and monotony of the buildings in order to create a more human scale. Another common design feature is connected to the creation of defensible space by distinguishing between private and public and facilitating for having “eyes on the street”.

In both the U.S. cases and in the Swedish cases there has been a social program component in the regeneration scheme as mentioned above. They are based on the needs of the residents and address problems with unemployment, and need of education with the aim of the residents becoming more self sufficient. In all cases some kind of job apprenticeship program is set up, and in both Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Gårdsten one tries to get residents or participants in programs employed by the contractors of regeneration.

In both the U.S. and in Sweden there is a strive towards getting a more diverse population group. This is connected to the problems one sees in having few resources within the area. Measures are taken to get residents to get a job and earn their own income and aims towards making the areas more sustainable when it comes to the resource base. It also facilitates to get new role models for
those who are worst off. Another feature, already mentioned above, is that there are higher criteria set up for the residents. In Gårdsten this is done through rental policies and in the U.S. through criteria to return. In both countries one can also see a strive to change the image of the area from the outside. Partly this is done through increasing the property value through the new post modern design which breaks with the old negative connotations.

If we look at HOPE VI and the Gårdsten regeneration project as two separate ways of regeneration, the major common denominator of these two approaches is that elements of modernism in the original developments are defined as an urban problem to be solved. The critique towards the modernist planning and design is a common point of departure for the two regenerations schemes. The direction taken from that point however differs. If we allow ourselves to generalize, we could say that HOPE VI follows the design path “traditional urban form” as described previously in this thesis. Gårdsten follow a path of a new “planning and role of the planner”.

Regeneration in HOPE VI is characterized by the aim to create a strong break towards the physical design of the former development. This is much due to the fact that the previous architecture was strongly connected to the tenure form, as public housing often was designed in similar ways due to economic shortages etcetera. The stigma created was identified as a major problem contributing to the segregation that these areas often experience. So instead, HOPE VI design aim at a totally different idiom. The strive is now to erase the visible characteristics of public housing. Instead one follows a design path that departs from the wake of modernism and creates developments of traditional urban form. These should connect to the rest of the city, both structurally and visually. Elements that Nan Ellin (1999) point to as characteristic for the postmodern design, historicism, contextualism, symbolism, human scale and no zoning or mixed use zoning are also elements that are visible in the HOPE VI cases that we have studied. The proximity to the historic Capitol Hill and the physical form of those houses and neighborhoods is a major contributing factor for the design of both Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg.

It isn’t only a better appearance of the buildings that is the goal aimed for. The design also has other functions, and safety is one feature that is often connected to the form of the public housing. The report investigating the safety in Capper Carrollsburg in the 1970s, Comprehensive Security Planning: A Program for Arthur Capper Dwellings, Washington, DC (1977) for example pointed to undefined public space as a contributing factor to a feeling of being unsafe. Instead, the new developments follow the principle of Jane Jacobs “eyes on the streets” with all houses facing the street. Also, distinguishing what space is public and what is private according to the defensible space principle, as one has done in both Townhomes on Capitol Hill and Capper Carrollsburg, agrees with a post-modernist approach for safe environments. According to the principle of safety, the way that HOPE VI reacts against modernist design, adds to the value of space in the form of increased social capital. When residents no longer need to feel unsafe, trust within the group of residents adds to social capital.

A connection to history and to traditional urban form serves at creating feelings of pride, identity and a feeling of community in the HOPE VI sites. The aesthetic is thought to play a vital part in creating a feeling of pride. Following a traditional urban form according to for example the New Urbanist principles, the use of a variety of building types in a traditional manner is thought to add to the connection to the neighborhood and a sense of belonging. Using a design connected to the
traditions of the place, one according to these principles adds to the feeling of belonging to that place. Again, social capital is a result through the way a feeling of belonging also contributes to the community group. Also, the use of traditional architecture is due to the fact that one thinks that these principles are better at solving the urban problems of today. In HOPE VI, this traditional and historic design feature also is related to the goal of creating mixed income communities. As resident of higher income should be attracted, and these are to buy their home, one simply needs to create attractive architecture in order for these groups to want to buy a house in the HOPE VI site. The aesthetic becomes a way to increase the economic capital in the site. Touching on the concept of capital, design also increases cultural capital. Architecture, a beautiful building, is cultural capital in its objectified form.

If we connect these postmodernist designs in HOPE VI as increased value, and value to Bourdieu’s concepts of capital, we have found attempts for social, cultural as well as economic capital gains in the way the regeneration is carried out. The way the areas are designed, all these three forms of capital is approached. According to Bourdieu’s model social and cultural capital always have economic capital at its root, and they stand on their own only as far as they conceal that they do. This is very evident in the cultural capital, as the objectified cultural capital in the form of architecture helps bringing economic capital when the buildings are sold. The objective social capital however could almost be viewed independently. This is also connected to the formulation of the postmodernist design principles as something that can help people form a feeling of belonging and community. Naturally social capital can be a way to attract people. Some people might choose to buy their home where the social capital is strong. But we can also allow ourselves to view social capital as a value on its own instead of trying to find a second motive.

Gårdsten represents a new way of planning and a new role of the planner in its way to create the good city. The regeneration in Gårdsten is strongly influenced by the idea of taking a larger comprehensive grip on the role as a housing company. Gårdstensbostäder was started as an answer to the problems within the area and with the aim and directive to work in unconventional ways together with the residents. As Moa Tunström writes the postmodern planner is no longer focusing on the problems or the solutions, it is the process that is the main focus. Gårdstensbostäder has from the start emphasized the importance of dealing with community building, and that this work is not something that can be finished, it should instead be considered as a process. When one matter is solved there is always a new pressing issue that needs to be attended.

Moa Tunström notes that the new planner gets a greater legacy from the errors of the old planner. By using the expression “unconventional” Gårdstensbostäder also signal that they want a radical break with the modernistic way of planning, since municipal planning often is associated with bureaucratic way of planning. This could be connected to Patsy Healey’s description of the communicative planning approach which she argues tries to escape from narrow instrumental rationality. Communicative planning aims to through encounter and discussions come to a consensus. Through on one hand the encounter and on the other hand finding a solution based on several peoples view, this way of planning can be said to create and increase social capital. In these meetings the social capital is built up through enactment, as the residents of Gårdsten act in a way that confirms the common goal of creating a better living environment for all of them. This enactment strengthens the group and social capital.
There has been some critique against this idea of forming a consensus, pointing to the fact that it does not take power structures into consideration. Since not everyone have the same ability of expressing one’s wish, existing power structures has to be neutralized so that these differences have no effect on the discussion. Gårdstensbostäder aims to reach different parts of the resident groups through raising different issues, trying to facilitate for a more diverse representation in the participation.

A main idea of the postmodern planner is according to Tunström to be the facilitator of the people and to make their voice heard, which questions the planner’s role of being an expert. Gårdstensbostäder has been working to mobilize and bring in the residents into to regeneration process through different ways of raising interest among the inhabitants. Gårdstensbostäder has as a goal to bring up questions that are important to the residents and to make them “real”, that is, give feedback to the residents during the process, assuring that one not only is making promises but also fulfill them. This is a matter of building trust, showing the residents that their opinions are taken seriously. Again, the objective of social capital within the resident group and between residents and housing company is seen in the way regeneration is planned. Another way that Gårdstensbostäder diverges from the modernist planning, and an approach that relies on the building of trust, is by the way they organizes the daily maintenance of the area. By having house managers with offices close to the residents in the housing area they try to create some form of relation between the housing company and the residents.

The new view on planning can result in two paths to increased value. Either one might bring the community together to allow them to formulate themselves around their problems and possible solutions. This could be seen as increasing the social value through strengthening the community and the social network that community consists of and have access to. The other increase in the value of space consists of getting a more accurate understanding of the answer to the questions “what is the problem and what is the best solution?”, facilitating the possibilities to find interventions that are the best for a greater number of people and hence increase the social, but also cultural and economic capital. Generally for Gårdsten’s regeneration according to this way of increasing the value of space, social capital is a very important and fairly dominating goal. However, it is stated in the directives that Gårdstensbostäder got for the regeneration, that this social capital, through this unconventional way of working with participation and building trust, was the method for raising the value of the area. So the end goal in Gårdsten is not only social capital, but economic and cultural as a result of social capital.

The idea that planning in the USA strive more towards economic profitability, and that Swedish planning has a more social and community focused aim, we think is a rather general notion, based on a long tradition of planning in the respective countries. The idea that Swedish planning would focus on social values was confirmed many times during our conversations with our interview subjects in Washington D.C. Our division here, that ties the U.S. cases to a regeneration that emphasizes the design in postmodernist planning, and the Swedish case that show an idea of a new sort of planning, might seem to confirm this notion of economic versus social values. But, the way that we have used Bourdieu’s form of capital as a model for value, makes it clear that more values are strived for. Social, cultural as well as economic capital are objectives that all regeneration cases investigated aim for. So even if design is a focus, it does not mean that the social and the notion of community building are
ignored. Similarly, even if the community and the social is the major focus, economic gains are also a goal.

Moving on to possible lessons learned, we feel we must first step back to the contexts. We are still of the opinion that contexts matter, and when making the effort to transfer single activities that have proved to be beneficial in one case to another case we many time find the conditions of that context as an obstacle. The political system in the U.S. can for example hinder the autonomy of the housing authority, as the political system in Sweden has allowed Gårdstensbostäder to have. In the same way, the geographic location of many Swedish suburbs hinders the possibility to tie them to the rest of the city in the same way as has been done with the cases in Washington D.C. Instead, we turn to the general paths that the respective cases have taken. As each case has been successful in many ways, and as we have shown that all capital values are part of the regeneration processes, we think that these paths can tell us about the lessons. The Swedish regeneration could in the future benefit from including a clearer focus on the design. In the same way, the U.S. regeneration could benefit from the planning path in the same way as Gårdsten has.

Following this discussion the U.S. regeneration approach could benefit from some of the characteristics in the Swedish regeneration. The postmodern idea of seeing planning more as a process, focusing less at a final solution, could be an advantage to the U.S. way of working. Since the U.S. situation consists of a more diverse group of actors, this off course implicates a more difficult process. In the U.S. cases investigated the actors seem to many times have diverging interests and that is also a legacy from the American political context. But by finding a common framework within which the different actors can work one might be able to realize a more comprehensive planning grip of the regeneration where one does not leave the site or the community when the physical design and the buildings are in place. If one instead view the development of a neighborhood as a ongoing process where one always can find questions to work with that are important to the residents one would also have the possibility to build up the trust that was lost during earlier times through a more thorough attempt for resident participation. The U.S. regeneration schemes would also benefit from working harder to get more and more diverse groups of residents to participate by for example bringing up different issues and making the planning process zestful. The whole regeneration procedure would then be a part of a more long lasting path towards stability.

The regeneration of the Swedish million homes developments often takes the current look of the area as the point of departure. The values of the original buildings are very much acknowledged due to their role for many residents that have them as their home and living environment. This is a good thing we think, and to do it as it has been done in HOPE VI where usually the original developments are torn down and a complete break from the old is made, is probably not the solution in Sweden. However, we do feel that regeneration in Sweden could benefit from a greater acknowledgement of the design and the physical shape of the buildings. If the objective is to make a greater change of the area, and to possibly make the environment attractive for other groups, design might help to achieve that. To make it attractive might both help to bring in new residents of other experiences and to raise the common view of the area and make it less cut off from the rest of the city. In a clearer design approach we do not necessarily think that one need to follow a new sort of design principles, and adhere to for example a postmodernist design with more human scale and a traditional urban form, but the lesson might rather be to understand the impact that design might have. Colors, materials and maintenance, are aspects to work with but also greater measures. Even looking into the Swedish
case Gårdsten, we see a difference in how much one has allowed oneself to change the physical form of east and west Gårdsten. In east the break is greater to what was before, and the product is something that we believe is more attractive both for residents and outsiders. The white buildings and the terraces are elements that agree more with a contemporary design than the buildings of western Gårdsten were the function seems to be the focus of the physical shape. So without leaving the path one takes today, where the process and resident participation helps to create a better environment, adding a clearer element of design into Swedish regeneration might help produce neighborhoods that are attractive for residents as well as in the public opinion of the area.

In general, we see that all cases have identified some obstacles within the area which affects the strategies of regeneration, and which does so that one does not follow the paths that we recommend above. For HOPE VI it is a matter of the residents, were these are recognized as being a group that many time is difficult to reach and make a part of the development. But as seen in Gårdsten, through a more thorough attempt of mobilization and through persistency and using varied methods over a longer time it is possible to make resident take part. The residents in Gårdsten and in other Swedish examples where participation has succeeded is also groups that are considered “difficult” and segregated from society. In the same way, the problem of the way that Gårdsten is cut off from the city through its location in the same way as many Swedish suburbs are, has become a hinder for attempts to connect to the urban fabric and the result has been that the focus of regeneration is inside the area. Without letting this focus go completely, one might try to connect to the rest of society both through making it more attractive in the eyes of others but also through reaching out to other actors and social functions.

Our aim with this thesis has been to compare different regeneration schemes, two in U.S. and one in Sweden in order to see in what ways they are similar and in what ways they differ from each other. The assumption was that the contexts are influential in the ways regeneration projects or programs take form, but we also thought that in spite of the context being a decisive factor comparison could be fruitful and lessons could be learned across the settings. Initially, we did think that these lessons could be more specific than the ones we have been able to make. The thought was that the five themes over which comparison was made would also point out some specific activities that could be transferred to the other situations. We however noticed that these more specific transferences were hindered by circumstances within the other context. We simply noticed that it was more useful to make the lessons more general in the way that we have presented it above, to point out a general direction of regeneration that the different schemes could benefit from adapting to. Also, the comparison in itself was given a greater role in our investigation. Since we have had an explorative approach to our research, our contribution with this thesis has then also been to broaden the knowledge of how schemes of regeneration that appears to be very different in their approach and the way they are carried out, are related to each other, in what ways they are alike and what differs them from each other.

In order to be able to say something more specific about lessons, about specific activities that one situation could transfer from the other, we believe that one would need to go deeper into investigations of the context. Except for housing policy that we have touched on here, topics such as political systems, the forces of and possibilities to act within the economic sphere in each country, the historic development of the societies and concepts such as path dependency would help to make a clearer assessment of what is possible to change within the contexts and what dimensions of
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changes are needed in order to do things differently. This would improve the understanding of what lessons are realistic, and if they are even necessary or at all requested. The scope of the investigation that we have carried out and presented in this thesis has been able to confirm our idea that there is a point in making comparisons across contexts in order to learn from one another. We have been able to draw conclusions about lessons on a general level; a deeper investigation might be able to do it more specifically. Examples of questions that might lead the investigation further are:

Is there a way to combine private leverage and comprehensive view over the process, in order to have a longer time perspective but at the same time more financial means and other perspectives through new actors?

In HOPE VI there are competitive elements that would be interesting to investigate further as the new Swedish law affecting the activities of the municipal housing companies does call for a more profitable way of operation. This combined with the tendency of some municipal housing companies, and rental housing companies in general, to sell off parts of their housing stock, would call for collaboration with private actors within the same community. From the point of view of the housing company one might need to keep the standard of the rental housing to the same standard as the resident owned housing. Also, in order to maintain a high standard of the whole area including services such as those Gårdstensbostäder provides, collaboration between actors and a comprehensive view need to be combined.

How does the new federal regeneration program Choice affect the regeneration approach in the U.S?

The new federal program Choice does take more aspects into consideration in the way that housing improvement is linked to social services such as school, transportation, and access to jobs etcetera. One has a broader view of the community in order to fight poverty. Would this open up for the possible new paths of regeneration that we have pointed to?

Is it possible for municipal housing companies to provide housing for those with lower incomes, and at the same time make it attractive and profitable?

Due to tax benefits targeted at those who own their home new rental apartments in Sweden are more expensive than new villas. (SABO, 2010) The same applies in USA, where tax benefits encourage homeownership. The need of a program such as HOPE VI stems from the fact that public housing has not been allowed to cost, so that renovations have been lacking. Would a higher demand of the profitability of municipal housing companies lead to that one need to choose either between keeping rents low or maintaining a higher standard of the housing stock through regeneration?

Vilka element av förnyelseprojekten eller -programmen eftersträvar ett högre värde av stadsmiljön på liknande sätt, och vilka gör det på olika sätt?

Vilka lärdomar för framtida förnyelsearbete kan härledas från jämförelsen?

Jämförelsen av projekten baseras på uppfattningen att förnyelseprojekt kan lära av varandra även om de förekommer i olika samhällskontexter och att detta är ett konstruktivt sätt att öka kunskapen om hur upprustning kan utföras. Tre fall har undersömts i en fallstudie. Townhomes on Capitol Hill och Capper Carrollsburg i Washington D.C. har förnyats under det federala programmet HOPE VI som rustar upp problematiska “public housing”-områden, områden skapade under det amerikanska bostadssociala programmet. Dessa båda projekt är lokaliserade i centrala Washington D.C. och har såsom är gångse i HOPE VI-program transformerats från låginkomstområden till områden med boende av blandade inkomster. Detta har skett genom att de gamla områdena har rivits och ersatts med nya typer av bostäder med blandade upplåtelseformer. Gårdsten i Göteborg, Sverige, har förnyats enligt Göteborgs kommuns vilja att minska segregeringen i staden. Ett nytt bostadsbolag,
Gårdstensbostäder skapades för detta ändamål, och deras arbete har utgått från de boende. Deltagande och de boendes önskningar har varit drivande, och en stor del av bolagets arbete går ut på att underhålla de boendes deltagande. Alla fallen har inkluderat sociala program som framförallt syftar till att förstärka de boendes kompetenser och förbättra deras ekonomiska situation. Jämförelsen mellan de tre fallen har gjorts enligt fem teman: organisation av projekten, boendedeltagande, fysisk upprustning, sociala program och social mix. Uppsatsen belyser skillnader och likheter i förnyelseinsatserna och visar hur de eftersträvar social, kulturell och ekonomiskt kapital och på så sätt försöker höja värdet av rummet. De amerikanska exemplet höjer värdet av rummet genom att uppnå vad vi kallar en traditionell stadsmiljöutformning, med fokus på design. Det svenska exemplet höjer värdet av rummet genom att fokusera på en ny form av planering och ny planerarroll som utgår från boende istället för att agera som expert. Slutsatsen är att förnyelsearbete i USA kan gagnas av att lära av det svenska exemplet, med en upprustning som utgår från de boende, mer deltagande och ett mer långsiktigt angreppssätt. Upprustning i Sverige kan lära av ett större fokus på design och arkitektur såsom i de amerikanska fallen.
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