GATED COMMUNITIES AS A SYMBOL OF INEQUALITY

Snežana Đorđević[*]

University of Belgrade, Faculty for Political Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

This article takes the concept of gated communities to represent a special form of securitised housing, developed in the United States in the 20th century and popularised around the world in later years, and examines it as such. The neo-liberal society is an especially fertile ground for the development of this concept due to the unequal distribution of wealth, growing social stratification, poverty and segregation. Often, the surrounding roads are privatised and access to public areas is restricted for the purposes of these settlements, which leaves entire complexes within cities inaccessible to the majority of citizens. All these processes are in conflict with the democratic concept of the open city and the model of mixed housing, nurtured in the welfare state. The segregation of citizens, and their marginalisation and displacement (gentrification), along with the endangerment and privatisation of public spaces significantly reduce the democratic capacity of urban communities. The main concern of this research is the examination of the reasons which contribute to the expansion of gated communities, and the effects they have on the spirit of the urban community (alienation) and the democratic capacities of cities. The aim of the paper is to examine the notion of gated communities on a sample of cities in the Anglosphere (USA, Canada, New Zealand), and to analyse their specific effects. The analysis of the existing research and case studies concerning gated communities in the world often consists of the use of statistical methods, regulatory change analyses, and the interviews and surveys of tenants, managers, politicians and officials. The comparative method, used in this paper, focuses on the similarities and differences of gated communities in different countries, which enabled us to draw conclusions on better housing and urban development policies (synthesis).

Key words: gated communities, public spaces, social segregation and poverty, privatisation, gentrification

---
[*] Corresponding author: Snežana Đorđević, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Political Sciences, 165 Jove Ilića Street, sneska152@gmail.com

ОГРАЂЕНА НАСЕЉА КАО СИМБОЛ НЕЈЕДНАКОСТИ

Апстракт

Овај чланак се бави концептом ограђених насеља, која представљају посебну форму безбедног становања која се развила у САД у 20. веку, а затим проширила светом. Услед неједнаке расподеле богатства, растућег друштвеног подвајања (стратификације), сиромаштва и сегрегације, неолиберално друштво представља посебно плодно тле за развој овог концепта. За потребе насеља овог типа се често приватизују околне саобраћајнице и приступи јавним површинама, чиме читави комплекси у граду постају недоступни већини грађана. Сви ови процеси су у супротности са демократским концептом отвореног града и моделом мешовитог становања негованог у држави благостања. Сегрегација грађана, њихова маргинализација и расељавање (џентрификација), као и угрожавање и приватизација јавних простора значајно умањују демократски капацитет урбаних заједница. Главна истраживачка питања тичу се идентификације разлога који доприносе ширењу затворених насеља и анализе њиховог утицаја на дух урбане заједнице (отуђење) и на демократске капацитете града. Циљ рада је да представи ограђена насеља на узорку градова англосфере (САД, Канада, Нови Зеланд) и да анализира специфичне ефекте овог вида становања. Анализа постојећих истраживања и студија случаја ограђених насеља у свету се често ослања на статистичке методе и анализе регулаторних промена, те интервјуе и анкете станара, менаџера, политичара и званичника. Упоредни метод, коришћен у овом раду, фокусира се на сличности и разлике затворених насеља у различитим земљама и омогућава доношење закључака о могућој, оптималној политици становања и урбаног развоја (синтеза).

Кључне речи: ограђена насеља, јавни простори, друштвена сегрегација и
                    сиромаштво, приватизација, џентрификација

INTRODUCTION

The Notion of Fenced Housing and Issues for Debate

Gated communities developed in the United States during the 1970s as residential settlements for the rich, characterised by fences, gates, guards and cameras. During the 21st century, this concept of securitised architecture and urbanism expanded to many countries (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, p. 2). It has great consequences for the spirit of the city, and its social and democratic development.

Debate

Cities within the neoliberal, capitalist society emphasise that citizens are free to choose to live in gated communities that offer the services of monitoring, and control and protection of residential buildings and settlements, as well as many other services (gyms, recreation facilities, shopping malls, cafes, restaurants and places to meet and relax, etc.), all of which incur additional costs. In relation to this, spatial planners and managers take this type of need very seriously, and securitised architec-

ture and urbanism are becoming an important part of spatial planning (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, p. 2).

Spatial separation indirectly means that 'other' areas and their inhabitants are unacceptable, and that they are a source of insecurity and crime. Many authors are advocates of a social democratic concept of society based on the principle of equality among all people, and on efforts to combat poverty, because excessive social differences undermine the chance for democracy. Fencing, they point out, encourages the separation of people and reduces the chance of people meeting, getting to know each other, socialising and creating a real community. Therefore, this very controversial concept should not be taken as a recipe for quality urbanism (Glatze, Webster & Frantz, 2006, Smith, 1996, Smith &Williams, 2007).

On the other hand, many authors do not problematize the social environment, but emphasise the good sides of these settlements (their usefulness for tenants) and affirm this concept of housing, relying on a long tradition of fenced buildings in the history of urbanism. They start with the ambience of medieval European societies and cities with fortified castles, high walls, and often a canal that can only be crossed via a suspension bridge[1]. The authors point out the rich tradition of fenced settlements from other cultures and from all continents (Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Australia). For example, cities in the Middle East have a long tradition and urban culture of separating rich people into houses and castles surrounded by walls and tall vegetation. More recently, separate settlements were built for foreigners (workers from Western countries) (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, pp. 3-4; Bagaeen, 2010, p. 15-27).

In that sense, these authors see gated communities as a continuation of that tradition, and it is natural for them that this housing concept is very popular and eagerly accepted around the world. They do not connect securitised architecture with the social environment of insecurity, violence, social inequality and injustice, which a democratic society should aim to change.

Instead, they find the basis of the popularity of this concept *in human nature and needs*. On the basis of their empirical analyses, they conclude that there are two bases for the emergence of these settlements: (1) a fear of crime, and the need to protect family, apartment and privacy; and (2) the need for people to boast of their wealth, higher social status, spatial separation, and obvious ability to pay for this type of service (snobbery, belonging to a closed club of the rich and powerful) (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, p. 6).

---

[1] Another example, which this group of authors does not mention, are the ghettos in some medieval cities, which separated the Jews, their inhabitants, from other citizens. These ghettos were locked at night.

This second group of needs is rarely analysed - it is assumed to be natural, and the focus of the analysis is placed on the relationships between the people living in the analysed gated community. This research indicates that these relationships depend a lot on the nature of the inhabitants (friendliness), on their profession and the amount of free time at their disposal, and on designing a space for socialising in the community. However, this group of authors does not raise the question of the extent to which gated communities separate tenants from other citizens, or the question of whether this separation harms them as social and political beings. Both dimensions are very important. As for social issues, it seems that the tenants do not need 'wider' socialisation. On the contrary, there is a need to separate oneself from risky social groups, which are poorer and less 'happy' than them. In terms of the political dimension, this social group is characterised by a privileged position, good social networking, and good influence on political centres, which they use to protect their interests. 'Other' citizens, as empirically proven, lose power, importance and influence in society (marginalisation, displacement, repression). Gated communities are a symbol of the neoliberal society, with great class and social differences, in which there is very little room for democracy.

COMPARATIVE STUDY

USA – Los Angeles

American cities have an interesting past of gated communities, encouraged by *functional zoning* in spatial planning, wherein parts of the city are separated for business and trade (centre), industry (specific locations), and housing and recreation (the suburbs, on the outskirts of the city, surrounded by greenery). The homogeneity and stability of the community were preserved by regulations which introduced a number of restrictions regarding the potential tenants' wealth, skin colour, and other characteristics (*social zoning*). That was a good basis for establishing gated communities over time. From the very beginning, a private type of managing these settlements was developed, marked as common interest developments (CID). The Property Owner Association (POA) was established as the main governing body of the settlement (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, pp. 95,101, McKenzie E. 2006).

This process is best explained on the example of a specific city. Los Angeles had about 1,700 fenced buildings and settlements in the early 1960s. In the decade following the execution of this research, the city will have almost 20,000 gated buildings and settlements. Among the first gated communities established in Los Angeles are Rolling Hills (1935) and Bradbury (1938), followed by Seal Beach (1946) and Hidden Hills (1950). This practice was especially developed in Orange, San Bernardi-

no and Riverside counties (Bagaeen &Uduku, 2010, pp. 97-98). The following figure shows some of these elite, residential settlements.

Figure 1. 1a. Hidden Hills; 1b. Riverside;
and 1c. Bradbury gated communities
Sources: https://www.realtor.com/realestateandhomes-search/Hidden-Hills_CA;
https://www.castorage.com/blog/the-pros-and-cons-of-riverside-ca/;
https://homesoftherich.net/2010/09/mansions-galore-in-bradbury-ca/

The main reasons for fencing were cited to be security and the preservation of the value of the entire residential settlement (buildings, green space, fountain, etc.), as well as the value of real estate. (Caldeira T.P.R. 2000, Low S. 2003) The cost of *expanding the city*[2] is passed onto property owners (often an association of owners exists), and to development managers (developers). The residents of gated communities are, in fact, doubly taxed – in addition to paying regular taxes (to the city), they pay for the maintenance of the settlement (surveillance system supervision, cleaning, maintenance etc.).

The development manager is in charge of buying land, arranging it, and negotiating with the city officials about the standard of arrangement and construction. The manager signs a contract with the best bidders - architects who need to build houses and facilities and, finally, promotes this product (the new settlement and apartments) on the market with the aim of selling it at the highest possible price (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, p. 101).

The city demands that these settlements meet all urban and architectural standards. Besides standards concerning the type of buildings and the quality of infrastructure (water supply, sewerage, heating, electricity, IT), there are often requirements for landscaping (Bagaeen & Uduku,

---

[2] American cities have traditionally been family house oriented, and have therefore expanded rapidly through urbanisation. The construction of new settlements is expensive because it requires large investments in infrastructure, so the question of who is in charge of financing it always arises. The expansion of cities has become a problem around the world, especially due to the large influx of inhabitants, with wild settlements emerging on the borders of cities without the construction of the necessary infrastructure. In American cities, the structure of settlements is changing. Increasingly, apartments (high-rise buildings or large complexes of buildings) are more sought after than houses, and this shift is known as densification and the intensification of urban functions (urban space provides many services).

2010, p. 99). Besides regular taxes, the city often creates *hook-up fees* for special services made available to the settlement. Therefore, managers create a flexible design for the settlement to reduce the financial burden that public planning imposes on them.

These private settlements are very useful for the city – in addition to paying high taxes which increase the city's budget, they ensure the security of property not only within the settlement in question but also in neighbouring settlements.

These settlements often receive privileges. A good example is Los Angeles city investing 13% of its budget in the gated part of the Calabasas area - the western part of the city. The investment concerned landscaping, and the creation of a public golf club as a centre for rest and relaxation (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, p. 99, Le Goix, 2010, p. 102). There is a long list of such projects, and gated communities are considered to be permanent rent seekers. These activities further deepen unequal distribution.

The prevailing problems of small investments in public housing (privatisation), the reduction of the social housing fund and its poor maintenance, and a lack of limit on rents (regulations insensitive to the position of the poor) contribute to the reduced availability of housing for the poor. This increases the number of poor settlements and homeless people. The consequences of unequal distribution and growing social inequalities are physically visible in American society and its cities. To get a clearer picture, we have to take into consideration the numerous ghettos in all American cities, and the criminalisation of homelessness (Giuliani's policy of zero tolerance to crime), wherein homeless people are forbidden to sit or sleep on the streets or in parks, and are often imprisoned instead of being provided with accommodations. Even their freedom, as a basic human right, is endangered (Reese, Daverteuil, & Thach, 2010. p. 319). An increase in crime rates, in turn, increases insecurity in the community, and further encourages fencing (Webster, 2002; Glasze, Webster, & Frantz, 2006).

The spatial increase of gated communities spontaneously led to the closure of some streets connecting them with public spaces (parks or shores of lakes, rivers, oceans). On that basis, 'ordinary' citizens' access to these public areas was severely restricted or entirely cut off. For example, the Rincon Point gated community (in Los Angeles), located along the Pacific coast, privatised and closed streets which lead to the coast. In order to alleviate this injustice (because regulations require all citizens to have access to the coast), three parking lots were constructed to enable citizens to enter *a very limited area of the coast* (protecting the privacy of the residents) in five places (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, pp. 101-103).

Another example is the failed idea of the Capistrano Unified School District[3] of Los Angeles, which wanted to build a new primary school in the gated settlement of Coto De Caza in order to reduce its expenses (Figure 2). In addition to the children from this settlement, other children would go to that school. Students, their parents, teachers and other school staff who live in other settlements, would receive *special passes* that would be valid during working hours[4]. The inhabitants of the settlement (1700 of them) were very dissatisfied with this project, and 84% of them refused it in the referendum. It is interesting to note that the parents of potential students from other settlements were also not in favour of the idea, because they did not like the regime of limited access to the fenced school (Nguyen, 1999; Le Goix, 2010, p. 102).

Figure 2. 2.a and 2.b. Coto de Caza gated community
Sources: https://tours.previewfirst.com/pw/62381; https://realestatebyrana.com/
coto-de-caza-realtor-rana-zand/

The location and settlement management model. When gated, private settlements are established outside of cities, counties are in charge of their regulation. The Property Owner Association (POA) pays for all services. However, some of the services, such as water supply, sewerage, fire-fighting and some specific police services severely increase costs, and these settlements try to incorporate themselves into a part of the city that suits them. Namely, due to their wealth, one of the biggest fears of these communities is that they will be annexed[5] by poor city municipali-

---

[3] In the USA, primary and secondary schools are run by special government units – school districts. They are in charge of founding schools, hiring teachers and staff, financing, implementing programmes, enrolling children, and controlling the quality of work;

[4] Such passes already exist in some other schools of this school district.

[5] Annexation is the process of annexing one part of the city to another, and it is realised by the city. In the USA, there is a great sensitivity to these issues due to the culture of individualism and the underdeveloped culture of solidarity with the poor, which is a trademark of social democratic societies and values. In the past, the practice of annexation caused long, exhausting legal battles, especially on the eastern coast (old cities), with the

ties, which would benefit from their funds. Nowadays, both the district and the city *enable the self-initiative incorporation* of these settlements into the part of the city that suits them, allowing the gated settlement to have access to all public services at regular prices. The settlement is given the status of an independent local government unit, with the PAO as the main authority. Many of these settlements are called *minimum states*, and their establishment can be seen as a form of sustainable public-private partnership (PPP) that contributes to taxes, security and the increase of real estate value throughout the city (Bagaeen & Uduku, 2010, pp. 107-108; Le Goix 2010, p. 99).

In short, gated settlements are oases for the rich which separate them from the rest of the urban community, inaccessible to other residents of the city. These settlements are the embodiment of the notion of an 'escape from misery and poverty', and are a symbol of the collapse of democratic communities.

Canada - Toronto

Canada was a developed welfare state, but since the 1980s, it has gradually begun to abandon social democratic values due to globalisation. Now, this society is neoliberal, with a post-Fordist economy. Additionally, serious changes are taking place in the field of spatial planning, construction, and housing. Numerous authors have researched the effects of globalisation and the globalised economy on models of government organisation and management (entrepreneurial government, deregulation, privatisation, new public management). Moreover, numerous studies analyse the effects of these processes on urban design, construction, and housing models which are more attuned to the needs of neoliberal society. (McKenzie, 2005) There are numerous case studies of gentrification, as the notion of moving poor people from neglected settlements to periphery locations. This attractive resettled urban space is used for the development of business, tourism, trade and housing built primarily for wealthier citizens (August, 2008, Epstein, 2017).

Canada has a permanent influx of immigrants. In the past twenty years, people migrating to Canada have been quite wealthy, very well educated and with very well paid jobs. The policies of city officials must take care of their specific life style, including their housing demands.

The classic, North American model of the city, according to which one works in the centre and lives in the suburbs, is becoming obsolete in many respects. The younger population finds commuting[6] to be a waste

---

rich part of the city aiming to keep its independence despite the city's efforts to provide all parts of the city with a package of minimal public services.
[6] Commuting is a long daily drive from home to work, and back home.

of time and energy, so young people look for apartments in the centre of the city, close to work and all the important institutions they need (markets, shopping malls, galleries, theatres, libraries, parks, recreational spaces). This population significantly reduces the number of cars used, promoting efficient public transport (metro in big cities), walking, and cycling. A number of construction companies point out that they are building on the routes of metro stations (within a distance of 90 meters), while others take into consideration more diverse factors, choosing to build on plots on the coasts of lakes and the sea, or near metro stations, shopping malls and parks (Rosen & Walks, 2015, p. 164).

Strong competition in the field of well-paid jobs often requires people to be fully committed, without a limited working day (constant availability of employees to the employer). Thus, the phenomenon of *workaholism* is developed, leaving people little room for a private life, a family, and especially children. Therefore, tenants from this rather large group are '*empty nesters*' - singles, people with a partner, or couples with only one child. In this context, large houses become an unnecessary luxury.

In the process of adapting to these needs, Canadian cities accept the principles of *dense housing* and *urban intensification* in spatial planning, offering apartments (condos) in tall buildings or building complexes in gated communities (Rosen & Walks, 2015, pp. 154-156). At the same time, a condo represents a luxuriously equipped housing unit within a luxury housing complex (vertical and horizontal division, depending on the type of building), and implies *a private management model*. Tenants have the opportunity to choose a model of protection. In high-rise buildings, cards allow tenants to take the elevator only to the floor their apartment is located on, and to some floors where various common services are located. Not infrequently, these complexes contain spaces for washing and drying clothes, swimming pools, recreation centres, libraries, restaurants, or halls and spaces for various other needs (celebrations, events, meetings, etc.).

The transition from the concept of welfare state housing to the concepts of the neoliberal society. In order to more clearly see the great changes in the way of living in Canadian cities, it should be noted that the welfare city had a spatial planning model defined through *functional zoning* – production in *industrial zones*, business, trade and cultural institutions in the city's *centre*, and residential zones on the outskirts of the city, with green spaces, recreational facilities, and cultural and educational institutions in accordance with the wealth of the community. *Social zoning* was a consequence of this model. Richer people lived in luxurious settlements, the middle class lived in standard quality settlements, while the poor lived in more modest settlements and buildings. However, for the majority of the Canadian population, the *mix housing* model was dominant. Unlike American cities in which ghettos existed, Canadian cities did

not allow this kind of segregation. There were some settlements based on grouping the population by ethnicity (Italian, Chinese or Latin Quarter) or profession (art quarters, IT experts, scientists and researchers in university campuses), but these groupings enriched the city with diversity and in no way endangered the democracy of the community.

At that time, the welfare state and the city authorities had a *policy of limiting rents* that kept up the citizens' standard of living. Furthermore, the city or state provided buildings and apartments as affordable housing for more vulnerable social groups (people with lower salaries, young people, artists, etc.). There were special housing programmes that provided subsidised (paid) housing for the most vulnerable social groups. The constant construction of these buildings and their maintenance, in spite of great financial expenses, were eagerly accepted by welfare states, including Canada, because of their great benefit to society.

But the neoliberal government believes that such an approach is neither justified nor sustainable. First of all, American cities, along with Canadian and European cities, underwent a change: social housing was sold at prices more affordable than the market ones, and the maintenance costs were automatically passed onto the tenants. Poor tenants could not buy apartments (this was the basis for further social stratification) and were forced to rent apartments on the private market. They could only rent bad apartments, on the outskirts of the city and at increased rents rates (regulation removed rent limit), which opened the way to housing poverty and homelessness.

The development of condo-ism in Canadian cities. The influence of corporate groups, organisations and agencies has been growing in Canadian cities, especially large ones such as Toronto, Vancouver, and Montreal. They indicate that rent restrictions actually decrease developmental potentials, because the construction of apartments (condos)[7] demands payment in advance, at prices more favourable for investors. This new business model has significantly strengthened construction and has increased the income of the construction industry and the city. In that context, the city changed regulations related to zoning, the principles of construction, and the design of the settlement, adjusting them to the new model of housing and living (Rosen & Walks, 2015, p. 157-165).

There are good examples that illustrate these changes. Zoning regulations in Toronto have enabled the construction of two 20-storey buildings (42,000 m^2) on the shores of lakes in Downtown and North York, which are symbols of development (Figures 3a, 3b and 3c). Corporate organisations succeeded in getting permits for the construction of two

---

[7] Condominiums existed in Europe during the 19th century, and later spread around the world.

buildings with 39 floors and 56 floors, respectively (doubled the space to 93 000m^2). This project drastically increased the earnings and income of the city. Of the entirety of the city's budget, 750,000 euros (one million Canadian dollars) were allocated for social housing, and 150,000 euros (200,000 Canadian dollars) were allocated for the improvements and en-richment of the transport system (Rosen & Walks, 2015, p. 162, 163). In this way, the city discovered the formula of development and gave priori-ty to it, carefully monitoring the process of spatial planning and removing all obstacles to development. The following figure, Figure 3, presents: (3a.) two settlements (Downtown and North York) on a city map; (3b.) the panorama view of these settlements; and (3c.) two tall buildings whose construction demanded a change in regulations.

Figure 3. 3a. Map of the largest construction space in Toronto: Downtown and North York; 3b. Panorama of new buildings; and 3c. Two solitaires constructed on the basis of changed regulation
Sources:
https://br.pinterest.com/pin/484629609883289572/?amp_client_id=CLIENT_ID(_)& mweb_unauth_id={{default.session}}&simplified=true
https://torontorealtyboutique.com/2020-toronto-real-estate-market-predictions/
https://www.tridel.com/pre-construction-condos-north-york/

In relation to this, the Ontario[8] Municipal Board (OMB) formed a quasi-judicial body that constantly monitors the challenges and problems in spatial planning and urban development. Furthermore, on the basis of this, the Board corrects regulations and zoning, and supports entrepre-neurship and development.

These processes run a similar course in other Canadian cities. The following figure, Figure 4, presents: (4a.) a map of luxury settlements on the Pacific coast in Vancouver; (4b.) the panorama of the new white city on the Pacific coast; and (4c.) the beautiful building on Bullard Square.

---

[8] Toronto is the largest city in Ontario State.

Figure 4. 4a. Map of the luxury settlements in Vancouver on Pacific coast;
4.b. Panorama of this settlements; and 4.c. Lovely building on Bullard Square
Sources: https://www.sonjapedersen.com/region3d-6.html
https://www.straight.com/news/condo-listings-increase-in-greater-vancouver-but-
prices-expected-to-remain-flat
https://renx.ca/downtown-vancouver-condo-market-shows-signs-of-life/

The model of private management has been applied in these settlements[9], meaning that the tenants form the main governmental body, usually in the form of an association of apartment owners who govern the settlement (Low et al. 2012). The owner manages the space in a private building, in which apartments are rented out, while a representative of a government manages a public building, and a board of apartment owners manages a condominium (Rosen & Walks, 2015, p.156).

A city of inequality. Although funds are still allocated for social housing in Canadian cities, it is not enough for investments in housing for the poor to simply exist, because the neoliberal economy constantly deepens social differences and affects social stratification, encouraging numerous spatial injustices. In the process of spatial planning and development of cities, the practice of gentrification, which displaces the poor population in order to build commercial, business and luxury housing facilities on the soil of their settlements, survives. The increase in social disparities, segregation, housing poverty and even homelessness can be seen 'on the face' of Canadian cities.

New Zealand - Auckland

The third example discussed in this paper concerns the gated settlements in New Zealand. It indicates that this model of housing does not necessarily strengthen social division and segregation. New Zealand, together with Australia, has developed a democratic, decentralised political system with a participatory decision-making model, and has preserved a good part of the welfare state's values. New Zealand is a leader in the development of new public management (NPM), with a rich practice of creating services 'tailored to the needs of citizens'. The cities and settle-

---

[9] They can, in the legal sense, appear in the form of: CID (common interest development), community association (CA) or common interest community (CIC).

ments of both countries are examples of open, democratic cities. The concept of mixed housing and the concept of social housing has been largely preserved. Great efforts have been made to make cities pleasant for all residents (liveable city), and public spaces are designed as beautiful and pleasant places for people to meet, and socialise (open city). Homelessness is not a big problem in these cities.

Urban settlements were built according to the British model of arranging spaces, with streets, squares, and buildings organised into blocks. Buildings and houses differ depending on the wealth of the inhabitants, but their style is similar. Gated communities are only a part of the architectural trend, integrated into other urban architectural models that do not alienate or seriously separate citizens from each other.

Gated communities are not developed for security as is the case in the USA, but rather in order to protect privacy. A number of settlements in Auckland, the capital city, are growing rapidly (sprawl), and the city is also investing heavily in the construction industry. Part of these settlements in the suburbs are gated communities, but the fences are not too high, especially on the street side. There are fences, gates, and sometimes cameras and guards, and inscriptions such as 'no parking' occur frequently, while inscriptions such as 'dangerous dog' or 'no entry' are rare occurrences (Dupuis & Dixon, 2010, pp. 118-119).

An empirical study was conducted in Auckland, in the North Shore City neighbourhood, which boasts 220,000 residents and yet more free space for further expansion. Some of the new settlements are gated[10]. Interviews were conducted with the residents of 10 different gated settlements (different size, quality of construction, social structure of residents, type of apartments, etc.). The residents are well educated, they hold well-paid jobs, they often own apartments or houses in these settlements, and they frequently travel (Dupuis & Dixon, 2010, pp. 119-122).

Tenants often bought apartments without even paying attention to the fact that the apartment was in a gated settlement, which is a good indicator that this society does not have a lot of crime, so security is not a priority for tenants in that sense. However, they point out that they have felt secure since moving to the settlement, although there is no immediate danger.

As a reason for choosing this settlement, the tenants stated that the position of the settlement suited them due to its good connection with the city centre, and its proximity to family, relatives or friends. Furthermore, they liked the lifestyle in which the maintenance of green spaces and buildings is performed by the settlement services (in their private houses, they had to do it themselves), and in which the safety of their housing is

---

[10] Development managers took over this settlement model from Australia (mostly from Queensland State). The first settlement was built in 1993, and there are 17 so far.

guaranteed when they are on the road. They stated that exclusivity is not an important feature of these settlements, often stressing that they used to live in more luxurious houses before.

The answer to the question concerning the existence and nature of the mutual relations of the settlement's inhabitants, and the dilemma of whether there is a community spirit largely depends on the people who inhabit it. In some settlements, relations are good, and inhabitants constantly agree on common issues (maintaining the space, painting the fence or solving some problems which can bring the tenants very close) and even socialise. They also care about the preservation of everyone's privacy. Conversely, there are tensions in some communities, where some want benefits without investing anything. Tenants often point out that the design of settlements and housing units, and the design of space can make it easier or harder for people to connect and communicate (Dupuis & Dixon, 2010, pp. 125-127).

Regarding the sustainability of these settlements, New Zealand has recently been paying great attention to climate change, and the problem of uneven rainfall causing floods and droughts. Many settlements have installed solar panels (green energy) and underground reservoirs to collect excess water during floods, which is used for irrigation in times of drought. The good sides of these settlements are the protection of privacy, and the availability of public goods, such as the beautiful beaches on the ocean coast along which these settlements were built. The practice of closing coasts is avoided, which further indicates the standard of open cities.

Researchers point out the potential downsides of these settlements for residents. Among the first mentioned is the possible isolation for settlements made on meadows on the outskirts of the city, which are far from the centre. Citizens are either entirely cut off from or are left with weak ties to lines of public transport, and are directed to the use of personal transport (cars). In the USA, for example, no one would see this as a problem (Dupuis & Dixon, 2010, p.127).

We can conclude that, in cities in New Zealand, a gated settlement is just one of the options, which does not separate people, and does not endanger the quality of democracy and the decision-making processes, and, consequently, truly represents a very good example.

CONCLUSION

Gated communities in the neoliberal city are a consequence of growing inequalities, and a symbol of the division of people and the segregation of the rich, which threaten the quality of the urban community and its democratic capacity. There are many instruments that cumulatively create a divided city – priority is given to development and profit, and the privileges of the rich are carefully preserved. The processes of spatial

planning and the 'renewal' of the neoliberal city are, as a rule, accompanied by gentrification and the displacement of poorer residents to even worse conditions. Growing social disparities are poorly overcome in the area of housing because little is invested in social housing and rents are not limited, so housing poverty and homelessness, as the worst phenomena, are constantly growing.

This type of problem can be solved only by returning to social democratic values in redistribution, to greater investments in vulnerable social groups (today, this is a large part of the population), and to increased availability of housing. Protecting, beautifying and increasing the functionality of public spaces and facilities, as places for meeting and socialising with people, renews both the community and the chance for democracy.

REFERENCES

August, M., (2008). Social Mix and Canadian Public Housing Redevelopment: Experiences in Toronto, *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), 82-100

Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). (2015). *Beyond Gated Communities,* London, New York Earthscan by Routledge.

Bagaeen, S,. (2015). Beyond Gated Communities – Urban Gating, soft Boundaries and Networks of Influence and Affluence. In: Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). *Beyond Gated Communities.* (p. 9-25). London, New York Earthscan by Routledge.

Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). (2010). *Gated Communities - Social Sustainability in Contemporary and Historical Gated Developments*, London, Washington DC. Earthscan.

Bagaeen S., & Uduku O., (2010). Gated Histories: An Introduction to Themes and Concepts. In: Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). *Gated Communities*, (p. 1-8). London, Washington DC. Earthscan.

Bagaeen S, 2010, Gated Urban Life versus Kinship and Social Solidarity in the Middle East In: Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). *Gated Communities*, (p. 15-27). London, Washington DC. Earthscan.

Caldeira, T.P.R. (2000). *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sao Paulo*, Berkley, CA: Univesity of California Press.

Dupuis, A., & Dixon J. (2010). Barriers and Boundaries: An Exploration of Gatedness in New Zealand. In: Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). *Gated Communities*, (p. 115-129). London, Washington DC. Earthscan

Gillad, R., &, Walks, A., (2015). Beyond Gating - Condo-ism as a way of urban life. In: Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). *Beyond Gated Communities.* (p.154-169). London, New York Earthscan by Routledge.

Glasze, G. (2005). Some Reflections on the Economic and Political Organisation of Private Neighbourhoods, *Housing Studies*, 20(2), 221-233. doi:10.1080/ 02673030304200331745

Glasze, G, Webster C., & Frantz K (Eds). (2006). *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, London: Routledge & Taylor and Francis.

Griffin, E. (2017). A kinder, gentler gentrification: racial identity, social mix and multiculturalism in Toronto's Parkdale neighborhood, *Social Identities.* 4/6. p.

707-726. doi: 10.1080/13504630.2017.1310039, ISSN: 1350-4630 (Print) 1363-0296 (Online)

Le Goix, R., & Callen, D., (2010). Production nad Social Sustainability of Private Enclaves in Suburban Landscapes - French and US Long Term Emergence of Gated Communities and Private Streets. In: Bagaeen S. & Uduku O, (Eds.). *Gated Communities*. (p. 93-114). London, Washington DC. Earthscan.

Low, S. (2003). *Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*, New York, NY: Routledge.

McKenzie E. 2006. The Dinamics of Privatopia: Private Residential Governance in the USA, In Glasze, G, Webster C., & Frantz K. (Eds). *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives.* (p.142-152). London: Routledge & Taylor and Francis.

McKenzie, E. (2005). Constructing the Pomerium in in Las Vegas: A Case Study of Emerging Trends in American gated communities, *Housing Studies*, 20(2), 187-203. doi:10.1080/02673030042000331727

Neil, S. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier- Gentrification and Revanshist City,* London, UK: Routledge.

Neil, S. & Williams Peter (Eds.). (2007), *Gentrification of the City,* New York, NY: Routledge.

Nguyen, T. (1999). Coto De Caza Residents say no to School withing Gates, Los Angeles Times, March 4th, Orange Countzt edition, pB1.

Reese, E., Daverteuil G. & Thach L. (2010). Weak Center Gentrification and the Contradictions of Containment: Deconcentrating Poverty in Downtown Los Angeles, In: *Journal Compilation*, *Joint Editors and Blackwell Publishing Ltd*. Oxford, UK, Malden MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Webster C., 2006. Dynamic Urban Order and the Rise of Residential Clubs. In Glasze, G, Webster C., and Frantz K (eds). *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives.* (p.153-169). London: Routledge & Taylor and Francis.

Webster, C. (2002). Property Rights and the Public Realm: Gates, Green Belts and Gemeingschaft, *Environmental and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 29(3), 397-412. doi:10.1068/b2755r

ОГРАЂЕНА НАСЕЉА КАО СИМБОЛ НЕЈЕДНАКОСТИ

Снежана Ђорђевић

Универзитет у Београду, Факултет политичких наука, Београд, Србија

Резиме

Ограђена насеља су настала у САД у 20. веку и тек су 1980-их, путем глобализације и неолибералног друштва, преузета широм света као облик безбедне архитектуре и урбанизма.

У САД су ова насеља уклопљена у друштвено окружење због великих социјалних разлика, духа индивидуализма, несолидарности са сиромашним насељима и становништвом, и навикнутости на просторне неједнакости и неправде. Ова насеља су стално тражила, захтевала и очекивала разне услуге од градске власти. Бројни су примери даљег ограђивања простора око ових насеља (улица и приступа јавним површинама попут паркова, обала река, језера, океана, итд.), што је додатно поделило грађане у граду, маргинализовало сиромашније грађане и под-

стакло их да се осећају инфериорно. У том смислу, овај концепт подрива осећај заједништва грађана и демократски потенцијал града.

Канада, која је по социјалдемократском моделу организације и вредностима била блиска европским земљама, од 1990-их полако напушта те вредности и даје предност развоју и профиту. У просторном планирању и концепту становања тежи ка згушњавању становања, ка промоцији станова уместо кућа, и ка интензивирању простора. Развој грађевинске индустрије и профит постали су приоритети, а доступност доброг становања за угрожене друштвене групе губи на значају за градске функционере. Центрификација и различити облици просторне неправде оставили су ружне ожиљке на канадским градовима.

У овим условима расте сиромаштво, али и бескућништво, које се раније, у доба социјалне државе, није толерисало ни у овој земљи, као ни у Европи.

Најбољи случај преставља Нови Зеланд, који је сачувао социјалдемократске вредности као део демократског друштва партиципативног одлучивања. У случају Новог Зеланда се може закључити да су ограђена насеља само једна од форми становања, која не ствара јаз међу људима, нити угрожава демократске капацитете заједнице.