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Summary

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is known as a mixed-use development near and oriented to public transport facilities. While TOD has become a predominant model of urban planning based on the idea that there will be both social and economic benefits of implementation, the recent popularity of TOD in many cities has provided a new focus for the gentrification–displacement debate as well as affordability paradox. Furthermore, whereas transportation access is often seen as a pivotal strategy to mitigate neighborhood segregation, equity advocates argue that TOD is a place-based strategy which often neglects low-income resident’s need and thus fails to reduce socio-economic segregation. In this study, the author tries to shed light on these issues by bringing together previously disparate literature on mentioned contradictions and discuss the critic’s concern regarding the newly started TOD project in Rosengård, a low-income neighborhood in Malmö, Sweden, using mixed-method research. The research illustrates how the area has gradually entered into the gentrification process due to the establishment of the new train station, the transformation of the public housing system to the market-led housing stock, and using the ‘Starchitecture’ strategy in designing a spectacular signature architecture. More importantly, in contrast to the media acclamation and vast technical adherence of the planned TOD, the study demonstrates that there is a growing concern of gentrification-induced displacement and shows even at this early stage, how living condition in the area is more inconvenient for original dwellers due to the gradually cutting off parts of necessities.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Growing debates of Transit Oriented Development and neighborhoods

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is viable for transportation and land-use integration in many developed and rapidly developing cities of the world. TOD is a straightforward concept: concentrate a mix of moderately dense and pedestrian-friendly development near transit stations to promote transit riding, increased walk and bicycle travel, and other alternatives to the use of private cars (Azhari, 2014). In other words, TOD has become a predominant model of urban planning (Rayle, 2015) based on the idea that there will be both social and economic benefits of implementation, e.g., reduction of CO2 emissions and urban poverty (Dawkins, C & Moeckel, R, 2016), slow growth in vehicle emissions, revitalize declining urban areas, improve quality of life, and serve equity goals by increasing accessibility for the transit-dependent (Rayle, 2015).

However, whereas public transit is often seen as benefiting low-income and minority populations, in many cities, the threat of displacement has motivated equity advocates to challenge TOD and transit investment initiatives. In other words, the recent popularity of TOD as an urban redevelopment strategy has provided a new focus for the gentrification–displacement debate (Dawkins, K & Moeckel, R, 2016) as well as what Dong (2017) calls the affordability paradox. Many studies over the years have demonstrated property value appreciation near new transit stations. Although property value appreciation is a sign of gentrification (Kahn, 2007), studies on impacts of rail stations on nearby areas have mostly interpreted property value appreciation in a positive sense without much thought about its potential impact on low-income and minority populations, a phenomenon which Dawkins and Moeckel (2016) call transit-induced Gentrification (Dawkins, K & Moeckel, R, 2016).

At the same time, empirical research has so far found little evidence that gentrification leads to displacement (Freeman & Braconi, 2004; Newman & Wyly, 2006), and some studies even suggest that gentrification reduces residential mobility (Ellen & O’Regan, 2011; Freeman, 2005; Kinnish, Walsh, & White, 2010). However, Rayle (2015) challenged methodological shortcomings in displacement studies claiming that those works could not reveal different forms of displacement. Another example that has cited in this regard is a work by Baeten, et, al., (2017) that analyzed displacement pressure in the wake of contemporary large-scale renovation processes in Swedish cities. He found that there are anxieties, uncertainties, insecurities, and temporalities that arise from possible displacement due to significant rent increases after renovation and from the course of events preceding the actual rent increase. They also illustrated how seemingly unspectacular measures and tactics deployed in the renovation processes of Swedish housing have far-reaching consequences for tenants exposed to actual or potential displacement (Beaten, 2012).

The next significant challenge of TODs is the assurance of income mixing in station areas (Lung-Amam et al., 2014). While there is an argument that TOD has the potential to encourage economic activities by increasing households’ disposable income through the reduction in transportation costs, many scholars suggest that the improvement in transit service may reduce the overall supply of affordable locations or make life more
inconvenient for low-income households and small business operators (Lung-Amam et al., 2014). Meltzer & Ghorbani (2017) argue that employment effects from gentrification are quite localized. They even suggest that in gentrifying areas, incumbent residents experience significant job losses within their home census tract, even while jobs overall increase (Meltzer & Ghorbani, 2017). Similarly, Rojas (2018) claims that creating opportunities can be mistaken as a placed-based approach, mainly if the desired “ends” include the number of housing units, income level, or new jobs created (Rojas, 2012). She argues that attracting a new major employer to locate within a community is a great opportunity, but do low-income residents have access to that employer’s or other jobs require more work.

Transit is also literally known as an effective integrated strategy in regional development. While many related kinds of research have focused on the connection between transit and urban sprawl, there has been less explicit research on the role of TODs in mitigating urban (socio-economic) segregation in low-income inner-city neighborhoods. Socio-economic Segregation exists in Rosengård and is one of the most challenging issues of the case (Gehl, 2009). Moreover, Malmö City hopes that the approved transit-led project will break the existing segregation of the area through the established transit station and related investments. Therefore, the “segregation-integration debate” added as the third explanation to this research.

In the last decades, Sweden has become a model of neo-liberalism, the process that is called a ‘silent revolution,’ where the welfare state has dismantled, private companies run schools, elderly homes, nurseries, and transport deregulates. As Tasan-Kok (2012) claims, in such conditions, urban planning is becoming increasingly neoliberal and entrepreneurial, and plan would be a prerequisite for neoliberal urban development then serious contradictions arise in the governance of cities; in the absence of control, property owners and landlords are at liberty to act as they please in the way they develop their property (T. Ta¸san-Kok, Guy Beaten, 2012). As TODs are a kind of place-based intervention strategies (Rojas, 2012) for redevelopment declining urban areas and basically are designed and developed based on a profit-seeking approach, how we can understand the current project in the case study; as a significant step towards a more sustainable city of Malmö, or as a set of contradictory urbanities as what Beaten (2007) declared using the example of the Hyllie urban development project in the city of Malmö.

Rosengård, which is currently is known as an infamous symbol of segregation in Malmö 1 (P. Parker & A. M. Madureira, 2016) in Malmö, was built as part of ‘Million Homes’ program in the 1960s and 1970s, consists of 24038 residents. Following a long struggle, the City Council approved the project Culture Casbah on November 24, 2016. The project includes a 22-story tower, 200 new homes, and 30 premises. To finance the project, municipal housing company MKB sold 1,650 public apartments within walking distance of the new train station to a new private housing company. The new train station, established in December 2018, links Rosengård district to the Malmö Central Station in one direction, and the out-of-town shopping areas of Svågertorp and Hyllie in the other. By opening a

---

1 It’s known for being segregated yet that there are many different segregated areas in Malmö, though that Rosengård, through media coverage has become an infamous symbol of segregation.
separate line to Lund in the next years, then the field will entirely be a part of the urban and regional transit network. Policymakers hope that this new project will revitalize the area and symbolizes integration the city and expect within a few years, all Malmö residents in Rosengård can take the train to work, college or excursion, within the city, to the rest of the state or abroad via Copenhagen Airport.

In contrast, there are many local politicians and equity advocates who have challenged the project. There were a hundred Malmö residents who manifested themselves against the plans for a sale of public housing in Rosengård to finance the massive construction project Culture Casbah (Ekström, 2016). Equity advocates argue that residents risk becoming worse off with a private landlord, which lacks the municipally-owned MKB's social remit. Politicians have the concern of rising rent levels and criticize the municipality's decision to hand over a 75 per cent stake in the apartments just a year before the new train station is scheduled to be opened, which could see them rise in value (Sveriges radio, 2017).

1.2. Research questions and purpose of the study

This research discusses three mentioned debates; gentrification-displacement, affordability paradox, and segregation-integration, based on the critic’s perspective. The author tries to make the issue clearer by bringing together previously disparate literature on mentioned contradictions and discuss policymakers’ hope and critics’ concerns using empirical evidence from the area. Therefore, the study tries to find answers for some questions for each debate regarding the ‘concerns’ of the potential consequences of the implementation of the project as follows:

- Gentrification-Displacement debate: The main issue is ‘are there any evidence/signal of the gentrification process in the district?’, ‘how residents interpret the newly investments; as a positive change and an economic opportunity generator or a threat for their specific atmosphere? Has the gentrification process started in the area”? To what extent the concern of displacement exists in the area?

- Affordability paradox: The question is, do the residents believe that the new train station has/may has a significant role in their living cost? How do people think of potential rent increase? How are they thinking of affordability at all?

- Segregation – integration debate: What does exiting segregation mean in locals and participants' perspectives? How are they thinking of integration? To what extent the participants hope that the area will integrate into the rest of the city physically and socially?

The idea of this research was born at the time of establishing the new train station. On those days, there were diffused critical articles mainly on potential rent increase and segregation. This research has formulated to structure the contradictions of transit-oriented
development in low-income neighborhoods and aims to develop a critical discussion on this kind of urban redevelopment planning within a Swedish planning context. The study leans on analyzing residents’ perceptions, city planners, and activists’ opinions relating to the newly started TOD in Rosengård through a mixed qualitative-quantitative method. The study does not judge the current TOD plan or even does not predict the results of the implementation of the project. This research aims to start a dialogue. Finally, by highlighting possible unwanted socio-economic outcomes of the project, the research may prepare an initial framework for those who are willing to help the area to experience less negative impacts.

1.3. Layout

In the next chapters, following description research methodology, related literature is reviewed; the theoretical principles of TOD and the role of TOD in redevelopment and revitalizing declining urban areas are discussed, and then based on previous studies, three contradictions will address. In the next chapter, the characteristics of the area and the details of the TOD plan are presented, and then first and second-hand data will analyze in detail. In the discussion section, by reviewing the principal results and putting together literature and survey findings, the questions of the research are answered in quite a critical view.
2. Method

2.1. Methodological Approach

The ‘multi-strategy research’ (Bryman, 2012) by combining a qualitative and a quantitative approach has used in this research. Generally, mixed quantitative and qualitative methods enable exploring more complex dimensions and connection between the human and social world. In both quantitative and qualitative methods, concepts can be imprecise and open to interpretation. Qualitative research typically answers research questions that address “how” and “why,” whereas quantitative analysis typically addresses “how often” and “how many” (Mary A. Malina & Hanne S.O. Nørreklit & Frank H. Selto, 2011) This study needs to implement both mentioned methods

Rosengård’s transit-related investment is a long-term project approved by the city council in late 2016, the new train station established in late 2018, and the project is in the process of detailed planning. Thus there has not started the renovation of apartments or building new utilities; however, the target area’s management has transformed from public housing company MKB, the public-owned housing company to Rosengård Fastigheter AB, a new private housing company. The research does not aim to evaluate the project or even to predict the possible effects of the implementation of TOD for the future. The study aims to discuss existing concerns relating to the planned TOD. Since the approval of the project by the city council, there have been many disagreements with the project from both residents and equity advocates.

In doing so, the research needs to explain three different participant categories who have had a role in protesting manifestation since the time of approving the project in the city council. These three categories are 1) residents; 2) city professionals, 3) urban activists, and 4) Rosengård Fasrigheter AB, the new private housing company. For residents, there was a combined survey research with a qualitative interview, a sequential explanatory (Quan-Qual) method. The survey research conducted using a questionnaire on residents. It was also needed to conduct a semi-structured qualitative interview to understand the meaning and why of their approach. In order to make an understanding of city professionals’ and urban activists’ attitudes and their opinion, a qualitative structured interview conducted. A structured interview and many email contact are done with the housing company. The company also provided some second-hand data relating to the demographic characteristics of the neighborhood.
Figure 01. Target area compared to entire Rosengård (top) and the relation between the train station, target area and Rosengård Centrum (below)
2.2. Research design

2.2.1. Case Study Approach

The case is part of the Rosengård neighborhood in Malmö, an area within approximately 600 meters radius from the new train station, located between the new station and the centrum\(^2\) (see figure 01, 02). The target area concludes of 1650 residential, public apartments with 5069 dwellers (including Törnrösen and half of Örtagården subareas). This area has separated from the rest of the city by Amiralstaden highway from the north, the rail from the west, and big open spaces from the south. The area has a strong relationship with the Rosengård Centrum.

2.2.2. Methods

The data collection process took nearly two months (May and June 2019). Second-hand data including demographic characteristics and documents related to the project have got from Malmö City, Rosengård Fastigheter AB as well as media contents. In the following, it shows that how first-hand data collected and analyzed; Due to different circumstances of different case studies and the difference between consequences implementation of TODs in different areas, and particularly if findings are received based on a single case study as it is the case in this research, it is often hard to generalize this research’s findings.

- Official documents

The secondary data are municipal planning documents, and demographic characteristics are used in this research due to some reasons; part of secondary data such as socio-economic demographic data is combined with other sources such as interviews or observation in order to reduce bias and establish credibility. Furthermore, some of the uses of documents can be to provide a background, find additional questions, as supplementary data, and as a verification of findings from other sources (Bowen, 2009). In this study, statistical, demographic data, documents of the project, and institutional planning documents from Malmö municipality are used to provide an understanding of the project, neighborhood, and a basis for analyzing critical points in connection with the new investments.

\(^{2}\) The area has approximately 210,000 square meters (370*570m).
- Quantitative survey (see pp. 57-58)

The target population is 5069 people who reside in the area. The sample size (358 respondents) was estimated based on Cochran's formula, with confidence level (95%) and margin of error (5%).

The questionnaire was prepared in English, Swedish, and Arabic. Finding a respondent to fill in the questionnaire was not so challenging as there were many people always sitting in the Centrum. However, finding the right respondent (live in the target area, able to write their opinion and be conscious of new changes in the area) and interested in answering the questions responsively was not easy. Among various forms of questionnaire surveys, the paper survey conducted as well as an online questionnaire. To find suitable respondents, the author used to stay and walk between Törnrosen and Örtagården buildings every day to find respondents who are currently living in the target area. Moreover, Local Mosques, Bennet Bazar, the Centrum as well as the new train station were the main places that the author conducted the questionnaire survey.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections. The first section has focused on the size and structure of the household, their occupational and income status, the year of move-in to the current apartment, their previous place of living as well as about the reasons and counter-reasons that influenced them to move to Rosengård and to continue to live there (Demographic questions 1-6). This part helps the author to investigate the first socio-demographic characteristics of residents as well as personal motives and doubts concerning living in the urban district.

The next set of questions asked for information concerning the possible rent increase and household's possible move-out/displacement (multiple choice questions 7-8). The following multiple-choice questions 9-12 were about their trip pattern regarding the new train station, using the pattern of the new train station, new possible housing applications, and the possible benefits of the train for respondents. The final section (Likert scale questions 13-16) have focused on their attitudes of Culture Casbah, economic opportunities and economic resources, the current rent level, their concern of possible rent increase, and their perspective of Rosengård in the coming years.

To achieve a rather high return rate of the questionnaires and thus a reasonably representative result, every respondent was asked beforehand whether he or she was willing to take part in the survey. For each respondent, there was a short description of the research; then, they fill out the questionnaire. Most of the time, respondents needed more explanation for some questions. Due to some reasons, the online questionnaire was not as successful

---

3 Due to un-connection with the smart phones and social media. Women are in a worse condition in this regard. Exception to young people, most residents do not have connection with the internet, they have no email address or membership in Facebook or telegram. So the online questionnaire failed in the area.
as there are only four responses. Finally, for two weeks, the author could find 41 respondents. There is no limitation to find people in the area, but the problem was to find proper respondents as most of them could speak Arabic or Swedish but could not write down their ideas on the paper.

Qualitative interviews (see pp.54-55)

- **Residents**: a semi-structured interview conducted in the target area. Contrary to previous researches who used to conduct interviews in the centrum, I wore a hijab and conducted two small group interviews in two local mosques. Furthermore, nine individual respondents selected through the survey, those who were intended to be interviewed, and were conscious of the district and its changes. Interviews conducted in English, Farsi, Turkish, and Kurdish. Each interview usually took 30 minutes on average. During the course of conversation though, some questions were discussed more intensely and answers of the interviewees expanded beyond the original question, which allowed to focus on specific aspects, e.g., how they understand the TOD plan in Rosengård, how they interpret the emerging gentrification process, how they are thinking of possible displacement, housing affordability, and integration in the area.

- **City professionals**: the four interviewees selected based on their field of work and professional experience relating to Rosengård. Carina Listerborn, a professor in Urban Planning at the Department of Urban Studies at Malmö University, is a profession in urban conflict, neo-liberal planning, and housing inequalities. Jonas Alwall, Senior Lecturer in International Migration and Ethnic Relations at Malmö University, who has different experiences of studying on Rosengård. The Local's reporter Richard Orange, who has reported all Rosengård's main issue specifically the train and Culture Casbah in the last five years and Lars Åberg, who has debate articles on Malmö, mainly on cultural and integration points for decades, the author of the book "The Future City", a critical book on Malmö and segregation.

- **Activists**: Toktam Jahangiri, sociologist and educator, very familiar with Rosengård’s social challenges, has worked on issues of migration and has been active against approving the Culture Casbah on November 2016, was interviewed. The interview with Toktam Jahangiri took approximately two hours. Another activist was Aida Nadeem, is an artist, originally from Iraq, has had a long relation to Rosengård that started Malmö-Move with her friends with the cooperation of Malmö City.

- **Rosengård Fastigheter AB** (the owner of the TOD project); there were many email contacts with this company. There has been a response for five questions structured

---

4 Malmö-Move is a music, dance, spoken-word artistic manifestation performed, in public spaces in Malmö by diverse groups of artists based in the city with the aim to make “better Malmö”. The next event will hold in Rosengård.
interview (see pp. 56) from Jenny Tebäck as well as some useful demographic data of the area.

Observation

An unsystematic observation used in this research. However, due to little knowledge of the new train station and how much residents are using, invisible aspects of the social networks of residents and some related items, this methods’ use have limited to observing the spontaneous, natural behavior of the local people in their natural atmosphere. Mainly, it took three days (two working days and an off day) during the different times, including (both in rush hours and off rush hours) to observe the usage pattern of residents of the new train station. Furthermore, unsystematic long hours of observation between buildings of Törnrosen and Örtagården helped to discover some limited specific behavior like the residents using patterns of local Mosques (prayer rooms) both in and out of the target area, their lifestyle and social relationships.

2.3. Limitations of the research

The first limitation of this research was dealing with people in different cultures and different languages in the area, which, in many cases, created a barrier to have an active interaction with them. Making a trustable connection with key persons in the area was challenging and needed spending much time. The next limitation was the status of those people who could speak Swedish or Arabic but could not write their own idea on the paper. More importantly, the real challenge was the misunderstanding between the research questions and the respondents' knowledge. There was a real challenge to make a common understanding of some concepts like “renovation,” “Culture Casbah,” and “rent increase.”

The next challenge was unknowing about the last changes. Many people knew nothing about the new train station, Culture Casbah, and new owner. Some of them even had not seen the new train station. It was not easy to find the right respondent in the area as many were incurious to their district or were not aware of the last changes to their neighborhood, and basically, participating in the survey was not crucial for them.

The lack of time was another barrier to this research as the author had to survey in two weeks and interviews in less than one month. Furthermore, the author was interested in getting policymakers and politicians' opinions directly through an interview, but due to some reasons (the European election 2019, the specificity of the case, unwillingness to participate in the research), it did not happen. Instead, the study has only benefitted from the details of the politician’s vote to the Culture Casbah. Another challenge was convincing some groups like Somalis and Yugoslavians to participate in the survey.
3. Literature review

3.1. Birth of TOD

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is nothing new as a policy. Cities during industrialization grew near public transportation. Urban life pulsed in time to train schedules and thrived around train stations. Stockholm, by example, developed gradually along with its public transportation systems for almost two centuries as a “transit metropolis” (Cervero 1996), and much effort in its planning and development, even today, is spent on improving public transportation access (Carlton, 2007).

The concept of Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) codified by Peter Calthorpe in the late 1980s and, while others had promoted similar concepts and contributed to the design, TOD became a fixture of modern planning when Calthorpe published “The New American Metropolis” in 1993 (Carlton, 2007). Carlton (2007), by referring to Calthorpe (1993), represents that TOD has been defined generally as “a mixed-use community that encourages people to live near transit services and to decrease their dependence on driving” (Carlton, 2007). Carlton (2007) reviews an essential aspect of Calthorpe’s perspective on TOD as a neo-traditional guide to sustainable community design as well as a community design theory that promised to address a myriad of social issues.

Calthorpe5-along with Robert Cervero-, prescribed a road to achieving environmental sustainability through a compact, pedestrian-friendly urbanism. The attempt was to focus on a) shortening trips, b) reducing through traffic, and c) strengthening street hierarchies without necessarily accounting for transit. Later efforts indicated a swing towards acknowledging the vital role played by commuter rail in the success of the first garden cities by Howard. Subsequently, his practice began to talk about affordable housing and mixed uses marked by a walkable environment. Further, pedestrian pockets that accommodated both cars as well as transit and walking conceived. These could not address the issue of urban sprawl effectively but we can consider it as the pioneer to TOD (R. Joshi et al., 2017).

3.2. Transit-Oriented Development and New Urbanism

The TOD agenda first came to the fore with Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), commissioning a study in 1989 to examine the case for promoting high-rise housing near transit stations. On discussion were issues like “jobs-housing balance,” which are today considered elementary when talking of transit (R. Joshi et al., 2017). The research revealed that those people who are living close to transit were more likely than others to use BART. The result was that high-rise housing with densities of 70-90 units per acre and ground floor retail was encouraged in a manner as seen today (R. Joshi et al., 2017). Calthorpe’s association with Robert Cervero helped the former in suggesting land use densities that

5 is widely regarded as someone who pushed the concept of TOD
would help transit ridership. It was an extension of the concept of the pedestrian pocket described. They would collaborate with others and referring to Carlton (2007) define what has come to be known as New Urbanism (R. Joshi et al., 2017).

“We advocate the restructuring of public policy and development practices to support the following principles: neighborhoods should be diverse in use and population; communities should be designed for the pedestrian and transit as well as the car; cities and towns should be shaped by physically defined and universally accessible public spaces and community institutions; urban places should be framed by architecture and landscape design that celebrates local history, climate, ecology, and building practice” (Carlton, 2007)

New Urbanism tried to contribute to the revitalization of metropolitan cities based on lessons learned from past mistakes and stressed on the need for replicable guidelines based on narrow streets, on-street parking, and shops near residences to blunt the damage done by automobile-centered planning. (R. Joshi et al., 2017)

3.3. TOD as an Urban Redevelopment Strategy

As a planning model, TOD arose in reaction to the perceived problems of suburbanization that characterized postwar development in the United States (Jones C. E., 2017). In response, planners eventually coalesced around a new vision for urban development based on pre-automobile forms. At the center of this new vision was the transit village, or TOD—typically a cluster of relatively dense buildings oriented toward a rail transit station, supported by pedestrian-friendly design. While the TOD concept draws on historical forms like the streetcar suburbs, what differentiates today’s new development is institutional context. By the late 20th century, the low-density suburban model became so embedded in the policies, institutions, and production processes that drive development that creating TOD required wholesale changes in policies and practices (Rayle, 2015).

Planners and developers have promoted TOD as a complete package that usually includes plans and financing for transit construction (if transit does not already exist), a local land-use plan, zoning regulations to allow higher density and mixed-use, and other policies such as reduced parking requirements and design guidelines (Cervero, Ferrell, & Murphy, 2002; Dittmar & Ohland, 2004). Even though a tiny proportion of the population lives in transit-served areas (Renne & Ewing, 2013), TOD as an ideal has dominated planning practice in cities with transit (Rayle, 2015).
3.4. Advantages of TOD

3.4.1. Transit Concentrates Land Value—and Advantage

Because fixed-route transit provides accessibility that people and businesses value with relative certainty, its ability to encourage development. Fixed-route transit serves a limited number of stations, so effects on accessibility are concentrated in those limited areas. Compared with bus transit, rail transit concentrates accessibility, land values, and advantages for residents in those areas (Rayle, 2015).

3.4.2. TOD addresses some urban issues

Today, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is a strategy for ‘smart growth’ at the local and regional level whose focus is building at higher densities and for a variety of uses within walking distance - (usually a half-mile) of a public transit station. TOD aims to create ‘location efficient’ communities with full availability of housing, transit, and commercial options. These communities would be places where people of all backgrounds, ages, and income levels could afford to live, work, and play. To achieve this goal, a reinvestment in ineffective land-use planning, public transportation, and affordable housing will be necessary. When implemented effectively, TOD has the power to address several pressing urban issues (Michael, 2012):

- Auto Dependence: By providing practical, safe, and affordable transportation alternatives, TOD reduces the time we spend driving, our addiction to foreign oil, and the need for expensive and inefficient roadway infrastructure.

- Public Health & Safety: Embracing public transportation reduces harmful greenhouse gas emissions, improves air quality, and promotes a healthier, more active lifestyle.

- Economic Stimulus: TOD has huge job-creation potential in construction, operation, and maintenance (Michael, 2012). TOD also has the potential to encourage economic activity by increasing households’ disposable income through a reduction in housing and transportation costs.

- Livability: TOD encourages vibrant, walkable neighborhoods, civic engagement, improved public amenities, and helped to create a real sense of place. In short, TOD aims to create places where people will enjoy living.

Yang & Pojani (2017), who have worked on decade experiences of Transit-Oriented Development in Brisbane Australia, claim that successful TODs promises a range of benefits to a variety of parties. They show how the public sector can benefit from TOD through increased transit ridership and fare revenue; joint development opportunities, enhanced economic development, increased tax revenues, and reduced infrastructure costs. They also explain how the community can benefit from TOD through neighborhood...
revitalization, reduced traffic congestion, reduced travel distances, reduced pollution, and fuel consumption, increased safety (from traffic and crime), increased physical activity, contained sprawl, and preserved open space. Finally, they summarize their research on how the private sector can benefit from TOD through increased real estate values, increased rents, increased retail sales, increased labor pool access, and reduced parking provision costs (K. Yang, D. Pojani, 2017).

However, transit-oriented development is not a panacea that can cure all the ills of our Nation’s urban areas. The different approaches that communities will take in implementing TOD will yield different results. A commitment to providing affordable housing options in the vicinity of transit stations will most likely be the determining factor of successful TOD (Michael, 2012). The degree to which transit-oriented development will deliver on the many benefits promised by its advocates is not guaranteed. (Karlovich, 2012).

3.5. Progression of TOD and criticism

An extensive literature review reveals some well-known facts that TOD has different aims and definitions, implying that TOD is open to interpretations by various stakeholders. However, contrary to expectations, TODs have not taken-off in a manner that was expected. It can be attributed to either the lack of resources or the absence of favorable densities in the West. Calthorpe (1993) advocated that governments spend vast amounts of money in getting rapid transit constructed and bringing high-density development around the transit stations. (Shaketi, 2018). The American milieu was not accustomed to the notion of high densities, used as they were too sprawling cities that could be traversed by car. Factors such as a) freely available parking in abundance, b) lack of walkable environment around transit, c) low levels of service, d) inadequate mixing of land use, e) missing housing-jobs linkages, and f) inability of development codes to cope with the TOD concept have long impeded the growth of TOD in America (Shaketi, 2018). The ones that exist are not following what Calthorpe and Cervero had advocated (R. Joshi et al., 2017).

For these reasons, however, it is seen that TODs help high-income communities, many of whom are interested in moving back into the city centers from the suburbs. The commercial success of TOD depends to no small extent on the spike in land price that follows its announcement and later implementation. This spike in land prices allows the implementing authority to fund infrastructure provision in the receiving area by charging higher land development fee/tax. The improvement in the area after the coming of TOD attracts wealthier communities who then price out lower and middle-income communities already living in the city Centre. As a result, the lower and middle-income communities are forced to move to the peripheries, far away from jobs and transit. The TOD, therefore, may disrupt instead of helping these communities who are more likely to use transit in the first place (R. Joshi et al., 2017).

In other words, the recent popularity of TOD as an urban redevelopment strategy has provided a new focus for the gentrification–displacement debate and also what Dong (2017) called its affordability paradox. Many studies over the years have demonstrated
property value appreciation near new transit stations. Although property value appreciation is a sign of gentrification (Kahn, 2007), studies on impacts of rail stations on nearby areas have mostly interpreted property value appreciation in a positive sense without much thought about its potential impact on low-income and minority populations (Dawkins, K & Moeckel, R, 2016).

3.6. Transit-Oriented Development in Sweden

Although TOD is not (yet) widely recognized in Europe, many of the new towns created after the Second World War have the characteristics of TOD communities. Countries such as the Netherlands and Denmark have adopted planning systems based on similar principles, by encouraging mixed-use developments and high-quality pedestrian and cycling facilities, for example (Hartkoorn, 2013). With its crucial premise to provide mixed-use developments that are well-connected to stations and that encourage transit riding, TOD provides a promising urban model for densely populated areas such as the Netherlands. Like Hartkoorn (2013), there is a claim that TOD is rarely used in Europe, even though the concept has been intrinsic in planning practice across many countries. TOD sometimes is called by other names or included in sets of related policies and concepts.

In contrast, Renne (2016) claims that on the global stage, TOD is most fully developed in Europe, and in particular, Scandinavia. He argues step one in bringing TOD from theory to reality has been the formulation of a vision and conceptual image of the future metropolis, such as the celebrated ‘Finger Plan’ of Copenhagen, Denmark, and the ‘Planetary Cluster Plan’ of Stockholm, Sweden. He claims that there is no better example of the efficiency and sustainability gains that come from balanced growth than Stockholm, Sweden. The last half-century of strategic regional planning has given rise to a local settlement and communication pattern that has sustainability lowered car-dependency in middle-income suburbs. Stockholm planners have created jobs-housing balance along rail-served axial corridors.

By referring to Kenworthy and Laube, (1999), Renne (2009) argues that Stockholm was one of the few places where automobility appears to be receding. Between 1980 and 1990, it was the only city in a sample of 37 global cities that registered a per capita decline in-car use, a drop off of 229 annual kilometers of travel per person (Cervero, 2009). Although the term TOD has not been used explicitly in any planning documents, TOD has been an implicit guiding concept of Stockholm’s municipal development for many decades. More recently, several new development projects just outside the inner city have been planned and coordinated with the potential needs for public transport (e.g., Liljeholmen and to some extent, also Hammarby Sjöstad). This approach has blurred partially the otherwise sharply defined borders of the inner city. The Stockholm metropolitan area is still characterized by a monocentric structure, both functionally and also morphologically. However, the current plan for the metropolitan region aims to develop a more polycentric structure by promoting development in seven ‘regional urban cores’ located 15-40 km from the center of Stockholm. Underlying the development of the regional urban cores will be
investments in the transport system to improve inter-modal accessibility. There has been a focus on the increase the density, compactness, and energy-efficiency of settlements, upgrade the urban environment, and add new urban functions at the same time. As such, several TOD elements are central to the development that will take place in these regional urban cores. (CASUAL, 2016).

As mentioned above, all of the achievements in Stockholm come from city-regional perspective policies mostly in the outer edge of the city, not implementation TOD concept in redeveloping an inner-city disinvestment neighborhood. For example, Stockholm Loop, which aims to solve the Swedish housing crisis through transit-oriented development and sports, aims to be an active catalyst for 120,000 new homes and its residents' needs in terms of work, housing, distribution, trade, and sport. According to Belatchew Arkitekter (2018), these buildings create an identity for the different new neighborhoods with the potential to counter the city's depopulation daytime through innovative programs for both housing, workplaces, distribution, trade, culture and, not least, sports (Stockholm Loop, 2018). The project sees sports to create ties between people over social barriers while simultaneously retargeting the spotlights from the centre to the periphery (Stockholm Loop, 2018).

3.7. TOD and Gentrification debate

For the above reasons, many scholars claim that rail transit is a useful tool for accomplishing redevelopment—while sometimes the possible consequences have pointed to gentrification. Often, proximity to transit stations is associated with higher land and property values. Context matters: The crime and poverty sometimes associated with transit can lower property values, and transit alone does not necessarily revitalize areas that are unattractive to capital for other reasons. Moreover, TOD projects often include investments other than transit, such as street design and landscaping, that enhance property values (Rayle, 2015).

Neighborhoods near existing or planned transit may be susceptible to gentrification because they generally have above-average populations of renters, blacks, Hispanics, and low-income households (Belzer, 2006). Atkinson-Palombo and Kuby (2011) found that in Phoenix, station areas categorized as areas of urban poverty had a higher percentage of parcels subject to TOD zoning compared with other neighborhood types.

Researchers have shown that TOD initiatives have, in many cases, increased housing prices. TOD has also been associated with gentrification measured in terms of demographic change. Reviews of TOD research found that people who choose to live in TODs are likely to be childless singles and couples, and while TODs do contain households with different incomes, working professionals are overrepresented (Rayle, 2015). Pollack et al. (2010) studied the neighborhood-level change in 12 U.S. cities with new rail transit. They found that from 1990 to 2000, census block groups near transit experienced faster increases in housing prices, monthly rents, and median household income compared with the larger metropolitan area.
Kahn (2007) used a statistical model that accounted for the indigeneity of transit expansion to study 14 U.S. cities that expanded their transit systems between 1970 and 1990 (Jones C. E., 2017). He found that census tracts within one mile of transit stations were significantly more likely to increase their share of college graduates, compared with tracts without transit. Citing the findings of Bartholomew & Ewing, 2011; Debrezion, Pels, & Rietveld, 2007; Duncan, 2011; Kilpatrick, Throupe, Carruthers, & Krause, 2007, Ryle argues that because people value accessibility, transit investments can increase housing prices in surrounding neighborhoods, potentially causing gentrification a phenomenon which Dawkins and Moeckel (2015) call Transit-Induced Gentrification (Rayle, 2015).

Referring to Atkinson (2008) and Davidson (2011), Ryle (2015) argues that gentrification has taken on so many forms in so many contexts that it no longer makes sense to describe it as a universal, single process. Based on this view, she claims that gentrification may result from macro forces of capitalist markets, economic restructuring, and demographic change, but local political contexts and community action mediate these forces. Also, she notes that studies from various cities have documented how communities have successfully mobilized to win support from city governments and to resist, or at least delay, gentrification, and displacement. She reviews their result that various forms of gentrification, such as that by the black middle class, has complicated the dichotomies of race and class conventionally observed in these processes. Considering Saracino, 2010 and Lees et al., 2008, however, she adds how displacement pressures vary through the successive phases of gentrification. In sum, then, she summarizes how the literature leaves the relationship between gentrification and displacement open to debate.

3.8. Transit-induced gentrification and Displacement

Since Glass (1964) first used gentrification to describe the shift from working-class to middle-class neighborhoods in London, scholars have debated the meaning of gentrification. Slater (2006) argues that “so much has happened to city economies, cultures and landscapes since Glass’ original definition, that we should not be bound by it” (Danley, S & Weaver, R, 2018). However, Slater (2006) argues that the class component of the original definition is central to the concept. Boyd mediates this focus on the class by building on Freeman’s conceptions of white and black gentrification. While Glass and Slater place class at the center of gentrification and Boyd sees the impact of class as mediated by race, Freeman argues that race is central to gentrification, leaning heavily on the experiences of residents in his study of Harlem and Clinton Hill, Brooklyn. In one particularly poignant moment, Miriam says, “It is for the white people; it is not for us.” In this conception, the lived experience of gentrification has raced at its core, paralleling Anderson’s concept of white space (Danley, S & Weaver, R, 2018).

While ontological disagreements over what constitutes gentrification continue, definitions typically contain the following aspects (Danley, S & Weaver, R, 2018):

- Transformation in class and, often, the racial composition of a neighborhood.
• An influx of investment to a neighborhood that has previously experienced disinvestment
• A process of rehabilitating the structures and the built environment
• Class-or race-based conflict over territory
• Displacement of original residents

Of these aspects, the most controversial has been the last: the relationship of gentrification to displacement. Many scholars argue that any definition of gentrification must include displacement; the former cannot be understood without the latter. This position views gentrification as fundamentally about a class struggle over urban territory, in which the imperatives of a capitalist market drive gentrification. This structuralist view implies that if one fails to observe displacement in a gentrifying neighborhood, it is either because families have not yet been displaced and will be in the future or because the process has increasingly manifested itself in less obvious ways. Whereas gentrification-induced displacement — (removal for urban renewal, forced evictions) was once violent, sudden, highly publicized, and contrary, it has since taken slower, more diffuse, less visible, and more ambiguous forms. According to this view, these less apparent forms might include mixed-income policies (Lees, 2008) or a slower affordability crisis (Rayle, 2015).

Marcuse splits the concept of displacement into a myriad of categories including: direct last-resident displacement in which the landlord attempts to force the renter to move by cutting off necessities or dramatically increasing the rent, direct chain displacement in households over time move because of slower rent increases or physical decline of buildings, exclusionary displacement which includes both high-end development that is unaffordable for community members and the decline of housing into abandonment which similarly precludes residence, and displacement pressure in which residents see changes to the economic and community around them, and move even though they do not yet feel direct pressure to do so (Danley, S & Weaver, R, 2018).

This theory underpins a debate about the way displacement happens in practice. A particularly sharp back-and-forth between Slater (2009) and Hamnett captures what is almost described as a normative struggle. Slater argues that the study of gentrification should center around critical perspectives, and particularly around displacement. He harshly criticizes what he calls “the decade-long preoccupation with researching the consumer preferences of middle-class gentrifiers.” He argues that gentrification is closely related to Lefebvre’s Right to the City. Hamnett’s approach takes the opposite tack and is mainly complementary to gentrification. In response to Slater (2006), Hamnett (2009) responds sharply to the critique of his work, arguing that gentrification does not necessarily include displacement (using examples of old factory buildings converted into lofts). He argues that defining any improvement—such as new commercial establishments—in a community as “displacement pressure” makes the discussion about displacement “meaningless” (Danley, S & Weaver, R, 2018).

In addition to Hamnett, several empirical studies of gentrification have failed to find substantial evidence of displacement, too, leading some to suggest that gentrification can
sometimes generate benefits with minimal displacement. Former industrial areas and very depopulated residential areas could have sufficient space for new housing to accommodate new residents without displacing existing ones. They claim that even studies that find some evidence that gentrification and displacement are linked, such as Freeman (2005), they found only a modest relationship, at best, for instance, Freeman (2005) did not find evidence that poor renters appeared to be particularly vulnerable to displacement or elevated mobility rates from gentrification (Rayle, 2015).

Reviewing Marcuse and Slater, Ryle (2015) claims that a broad critique holds that a narrow focus on physical displacement neglects other types of pressures that constitute experiences of gentrification. She argues that empirical studies have operationally defined displacement as the physical movement of households into or out of a neighborhood. Referring to Wyly et al. (2010), she continues that the processes of displacement have shifted from direct, visible forms like tenant evictions to more diffuse, less obvious forms, such as continuous economic pressure or the slow erosion of residents’ sense of belonging in their neighborhood. This broader definition encompasses the social, cultural, and political dimensions of the neighborhood. It also considers indirect, less visible processes of physical displacement not easily captured in quantitative studies. The prevalence of these less observable forms of displacement may help explain the gap between displacement studies and community activism.

Indirect forms of displacement, however, often escape measurement in quantitative studies. Marcuse’s (1985) concept of exclusionary displacement helps explain why the process of neighborhood transformation is frequently much more perceptible to residents than to statistics. Exclusionary displacement occurs when changes in a dwelling unit or the neighborhood, particularly increasing housing costs, prevent a household from moving to a unit into which they might otherwise move. In this case, average residential turnover results in neighborhood change by differentially selecting for higher status residents. Studies finding that in-movers to gentrified neighborhoods have higher status than current residents are consistent with exclusionary displacement (Rayle, 2015).

Baeten et al. (2017), in their valuable research, analyzed displacement pressure in the wake of contemporary large-scale renovation processes in Swedish cities. They found that there are anxieties, uncertainties, insecurities, and temporalities that arise from possible displacement due to significant rent increases after renovation and from the course of events preceding the actual rent increase. They also illustrated how seemingly unspectacular measures and tactics deployed in the renovation processes of Swedish housing have far-reaching consequences for tenants exposed to actual or potential displacement.

Moreover, many authors define displacement more broadly to encompass loss of place, a conceptualization that includes erosion of neighborhood-based social networks, community resources, and political power. For Marcuse, residents experience displacement pressure when property values rise, old neighbors move away, long-time businesses are replaced by new ones oriented toward a different clientele, and public services become less supportive—making it clear that displacement is “only a matter of time.” Similarly, Chernoff (1980) described “social displacement” as a loss of political control in one’s
neighborhood, which can lead to “demoralization, or a sense of one’s lifestyle being threatened” (Rayle, 2015).

The sociological literature on collective efficacy and neighborhood effects can bring some conceptual clarity to this issue. Importantly, the conceptualization of displacement as a loss of place presupposes that there is something special about a place, to begin with, beyond its physical use as a residence or place of business. Put differently, this view assumes the existence of neighborhood effects—and implies that these effects are normatively sound. To the extent that neighborhood effects work through social networks and collective efficacy, or political and institutional resources, gentrification could disrupt those processes. As original residents move out of a neighborhood, those remaining would experience consequences from the erosion of social networks and the loss of resources embedded in (Rayle, 2015).

Gentrification and displacement, then, are symptoms of the scarcity of quality urbanism. The driving force behind both is the far more extensive process of spiky re-urbanization—itself propelled by large-scale public and private investment in everything from transit, schools, and parks to private research institutions and housing redevelopment. All of which points to the most significant, most crucial task ahead: creating more inclusive cities and neighborhoods that can meet the needs of all urbanites (Florida, 2015).

3.9. Transit Oriented Development and segregation

3.9.1. About the segregation

Segregation means separation. When it comes to populations, the concept means that a specific group of people lives in one area while people of another group do not live in that area. Indeed, cities have always been characterized by segregation: their walls separated city dwellers from peasants in the countryside, while inside the city walls, people found their place according to their caste, religion, or craft (Colini et al., 2013).

The sociologists Häussermann and Siebel (2001) wrote that ‘spatial segregation is the projection of the social structure on space.’ In the 20th century, European cities countered segregation by building social housing, along with other public policies and regulations, but today, almost all European cities face growing problems of spatial segregation. Although Europe still has relatively less polarized and segregated urban structures compared to cities in other parts of the world, segregation affects prosperous, growing, and shrinking cities alike (p.10).

According to Van Kempen (2012), segregation is closely linked to concentration, which implies that there is an over-representation of one group and an under-representation of one or more other groups in a specific space. However, from a societal perspective, the spatial concentration of people with, for example, the same ethnicity is not necessarily problematic in itself. Vranken (2012) deploys the concept of fragmentation. Cities have visible spatial differences, which result in fragmentation. If these fragments become
inaccessible, then we encounter segregation into ghettos, gated communities, and other manifestations of hyper-segregation. The most extreme examples of segregation might take the form of polarization, in which different parts of the city fight against each other. These are degrees of segregation which are not only static but also sequenced and depended on timely development (Colini et al., 2013).

Over the years, segregation literature has been dominated by the racial-ethnic debate. While essential, this status has tended to overshadow other dimensions of segregation, and particularly those linked to rising economic and financial inequalities. Unemployment, flexible labor markets, growing precariousness, and weaker welfare systems have lowered the living conditions of some groups, and are among the main reasons for the reproduction of spatial segregation. Despite the intense academic research and policy practices dedicated to this topic all over the world, the urgency of dealing with it is again at the top of the agenda of European cities. Because policies have often failed, and issues of segregation have never been eradicated. Hence, realizing the nature of segregation and the different experiences in the urban realm is crucial before attempting to give some order to the policy practices ranged against divided cities (Colini et al., 2013).

3.9.2. Costs and Benefits of Residential Segregation

Segregation is caused by economic, societal, and political structures operating on both lower and higher scales. At the local level, it appears as a result of locational choices – where people choose to live or are forced to live. These locational decisions are taken within the societal, demographic, economic, and political context of their countries and regions. First, these include the housing markets (Kempen & Özükren, 1998). What is the housing stock available? Where is it? Also, to whom is it distributed and how – by the market or through other allocation mechanisms? Are there practices of discrimination? Second, there is a question of income, taste, and need, how much one can or wants to afford, where one wants or needs to settle down (distance to work, to school, and other facilities), and what is the support provided by the welfare state? Also, there are land-use regulations that influence who can live where (Colini et al., 2013).

In terms of costs, existing literature suggests that ethnic residential segregation may negatively affect the desire to acquire host country-specific human capital, such as language skills. Therefore, it may restrict immigrant job opportunities, in particular, if the lack of such skills leads to a hesitation to explore jobs outside the neighborhood. Residential segregation may also reduce the quality of public and private services, especially if an outflow of high-quality workers accompanies such segregation. Finally, evidence from the US suggests that neighborhoods with high ethnic concentration tend to be far removed from the suburban areas that experience job growth (A. Böhlmark & A. Willén, 2017).

Existing research suggests that increased segregation may prolong the assimilation process and that there thus may be treatment heterogeneity by group characteristics. Specifically, if immigrants separated from majority neighborhoods revert to the native mean more slowly, then immigrants with worse labor market and educational attainment
characteristics than natives may suffer while immigrants with better characteristics may benefit. Several papers have examined this hypothesis concerning education- and skill-level and the results are consistent with this hypothesis (A. Böhlmark & A. Willén, 2017).

Bertrand et al. (2000) and Böhlmark & Willén (2017) claim that the majority of theories concerned with residential segregation predict adverse effects on immigrants, conventional social interaction models suggest that an expansion of ethnic networks may generate beneficial effects through two channels: information and norms. Concerning the former, the expansion of ethnic networks may facilitate the acquisition of valuable information about education, job opportunities, and social welfare programs. About the latter, norms may improve immigrant outcomes through the transmission and sharing of work ethics and attitudes towards welfare (p. 9).

3.9.3. Segregation, policy interventions, and Transit

There is no global consensus to determine what is ‘still acceptable’ and what is ‘an extreme’ level of segregation, but it is clear that both extreme forms of self-segregation by the rich and coerced forms of segregation of the poor are part of the problem of an unequal society and ‘unjust’ urban development. By referring to Kempen (2012), Heilmann argues that areas become problematic not because of the concentration of an ethnic group, but owing to a combination of socioeconomic and physical problems and specifically lousy housing, poor education, lack of mobility and public transport, and criminality.

Reviewing literature unfolds that, in general, there are two common policy interventions to tackle socio-spatial segregation:

- **sectoral interventions** including educational policies, housing policies, and in particular social housing policies, work integration policies, public health policies, public transport systems, and place-marketing

- **Area-based interventions** including ‘Hard’ interventions might involve physical restructuring programs (e.g. demolition, new infrastructure, and housing developments) or less hard measures, such as the refurbishment of the housing stock, the public realm, provision of new facilities (exceptionally social or cultural facilities and parks) and the improvement of public transport. ‘soft’ interventions include strengthening networks and interactions between people in the area (for example through work integration and training programs in specific areas, street work, local festivals where the community can gather), and support for individuals to access the labor market through training, work experience, and job placement.

- As mentioned above, TOD, like the process in the Rosengård study area, is a kind of Area-based intervention which many times promised to be a useful tool for urban integration and mitigate current segregation. Heilmann (2018), is someone who can confirm such claims. He revealed that neighborhood income in census tracts that
received rail access increases compared to neighborhoods that were promised to receive access but did not due to funding cuts. According to this research, the treatment effect is positively correlated with initial neighborhood income and harmful for the poorest tracts. It reconciles gentrification and “poverty magnet” effects of rail infrastructure found in the earlier literature and highlights the role of transit as a potential incubator for income segregation (Heilmann, 2018).
4. Presentation of Object of Study

Rosengård, an urban district near the city center in Malmö, is one of the largest housing areas in Scandinavia and one of its most culturally diverse. From an aerial masterplan perspective, the area ideally located for traffic, but down on the ground, the dual carriageways surrounding it had become barriers, severing links to the rest of the city. There was only one street running through the area – the rest were dead ends leading nowhere. The Rosengård estate is a full-scale modernist housing development. Like many large-scale schemes of its kind throughout the world, it was physically run down and had deteriorated into a socially and economically isolated area. (Gehl, 2009).

The problems in Rosengård, however, are real and complicated. The most advertised aspects of the area are (physical and socio-economic) segregation, stigmatization, and poverty. Many immigrants live in overcrowded flats, often shared. The area is also known as an infamous neighborhood due to criminal actions by jobless youths. In Rosengård as a whole, the employment rate in 2018 was 39 percent (SCB, 2018), in some subareas, it is under 30%. From 2000 onwards, there have been many interconnected projects to tackle with these problems called “Rosengård in Transition” (2010-2014) including 12 small and medium projects in order to create new social arenas for meetings and activities, new job opportunities and a better infrastructure connecting Rosengård with other parts of Malmö (Rosengård in transition, 2016). The result, however, was not impressive; segregation in both physical and socio-economic dimensions strongly exists, still “avoid Rosengård” is the main feature of the area and poverty is reproduced continuously.

However, according to the Malmö mayor (2018), Rosengård will be revitalized and redeveloped to a livable and attractive area as it was in the first days of establishment in the 1960s and 1970s. The project in which the city has waited for more than twenty years; a new train station and many significant transit-related investments called Culture Casbah. The first steps of the project, in fact, started in 2010 when studying and planning for a new railway station started. In late 2016, Malmö municipality approved the project Culture Casbah and to finance the project, municipal housing company MKB sold 1,650 public apartments closest to the new train station to a new private housing company named Rosengård Fastigheter AB. The new train station established in late 2018, and the new private company has started the managing area since early 2019. Currently, the details of the project Culture Casbah is under the planning, and it is supposed that 2021 will be the starting point for the implementation of the project.

---

6 Rosengård Fastigheter AB
This Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) plan includes three main parts; 1) the new train station, 2) renovation 1650 privatized apartments, and 3) Culture Casbah, including a 22-story tower, 200 new homes, and 30 premises. All of these investments take place in a comfortable walk distance of the new train station (less than 800 meters’ distance from the station) located precisely between the station and the Rosengård Centrum concluding Törnrosen and half Örtagården, two sub-areas in the neighbourhood. According to the plan, new and varied architecture breaks off the traditional million-program architecture and contributes to giving the area a new character. At the same time, Rosengård and the city center have been closer together by building a new train station at the existing continental track and has become part of Malmö’s new ring line, the so-called "Malmöringen." The strip between the new train station in the west to Örtagårdstorget in the east will be filled with new homes and business premises for shops, cafes, and restaurants.

Policymakers hope that this new project will revitalize the area; with a mixed and dense settlement, people's life, culture, shops, and restaurants, the area will be experienced differently than today for everyone who already lives in the area and for visitors. Within a few years, all Malmö residents in Rosengård can take the train to work, college, or excursion, within the city, to the rest of Skåne or abroad via Copenhagen Airport. Similarly, Rosengård becomes an attractive area to establish itself in for companies and new Rosengård residents. Through the new station, the capacity of public transport is significantly increased. Also, the travel time to and from Malmö Central station is halved, from the days just over 15 minutes by bus, to about 7 minutes by train.
Figure 04. the location of the landmark concerning the new train station

Source: https://www.Rosengårdfastigheter.se/en/culture-casbah

Figure 05. Culture Casbah, a 22-story building

Source: https://www.Rosengårdfastigheter.se/en/culture-casbah
5. Analysis

“If you want creativity, trust the local”.

Guy Beaten

The analysis and findings based on the three debates are presented in this chapter. For this reason, the chapter has divided into three parts; in the first part, the secondary data, such as the socio-economic characteristics of the target area and other related documents, are analyzed. In the next section, findings and analysis of the combination of quantitative-qualitative data, which was gathered through the survey, observation, and interviews, are presented and, the perspectives of the city planners and activists are discussed in the last section.

5.1. An analysis of the Politician’s vote to Culture Casbah

According to Malmö municipality (2016), of 61 voters, 44 politicians said ‘Yes’ to the project, and 16 voters said ‘No.’ Figure 06 shows that while Social Democrats (S), in a cooperation with Moderates (M), The Greens (MP) and Liberal party (L) were in agreement with the implementation of the project, Sweden Democrats (SD), Left party (V) and Feminist Initiative (Fi) were completely against the proposed TOD plan. Left party and Feminists said No due to their concern of gentrification, increasing rents, and unwanted possible adverse effects on local low-income tenants. There were even some members of these parties who participated in the protest held in November 2016. A political struggle on the project is evident as there was the same decision by two different approaches; leftists big No contrary to rightists Yes. How should we understand this struggle? Was the SD’s policy on market rent the main reason for their disagreement or their immigration policy?

Figure 06. Party’s Vote to Culture Casbah, 24 November 2016, City Council Malmö.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Malmö city council (2016)
Though the plan promises revitalization, urban integration, and sustainability, analyzing documents relating to political debates on the project illustrates a political struggle. On the one hand, Social democrats and other agree parties believe that investment in Rosengård is necessary. Similarly, as mentioned in the previous section, some city planners such as Jonas Alwal believe in the investment to revitalize the area. At the same time, SD party members disagree with the project precisely because they believe that investment in Rosengård—a neighborhood with lots of immigrants, is wasting resources. On the other hand, an interview with a member of the Left-wing party declared that left parties are concern about negative consequences such as significant rent increases and displacement. They also believe that such projects are a kind of privatization and threatening the welfare system. These concerns also point to the fact that the main unanswered questions turn around “the right to housing,” which is threatened by this neo-liberal strategy.

5.2. Analyzing demographic characteristics and socio-economic structure of the target area

In the last years, equity advocates and scholars have criticized TODs mainly due to less attention by TOD planners to original low-income residents’ needs. People and their need is the core concept in transit-induced gentrification debate. Contrary to newly built neighborhoods, inner-city districts with long residential history are more critical than other treated areas. In this view, socio-economic characteristic of neighborhoods is central to the debate; are original residents displaced or experience a better condition in their living. Hence, in this research, socio-economic status of the target area is analyzed in order to illustrate in what condition the new TOD is implemented and who is affected by this new investment.

In the last ten years, Rosengård’s population has experienced slight growth. While the population in Malmö raised from 280,801 in 2007 to 333,633 people in 2017 with nearly a 1.98 percent annual growth rate, Rosengård’s population has changed from 21,904 in 2007 to 24,038 in 2017 with an annual growth rate of only 0.97 percent. However, the population of Törnrosen and Örtagården has grown very slowly with an average growth rate of 0.48 percent probably, due to the current problematic condition, being disinvestment for many decades, there has been no significant population change in the target area.

Figure 07: population change in the target area-Törnrosen and Örtagården (2007-2017)
Currently, 5069 residents live in the target area (Törnrosen and half Örtagården); the number of 3133 dwellers in Törnrosen and 1936 in (the privately-owned) Örtagården. Taking a look at the population change in last ten years shows that despite the overall growth observed in Örtagården, Rosengård, and Malmö, the number of residents in Törnrosen shows a bit continuous decline since 2012 (figure 06), probably due to rising socio-economic push factors and stigmatization in the area.

Big size household is one of the most apparent characteristics of the target area due to the high number of children in each household. According to the questionnaire, around half of the respondents (48 percent) are living with four other members in their households. Demographic statistics, of course, show that at least 33 percent of the Rosengård residents and around 36.5 percent of residents of the survey area are under 18, compared to 23.17 percent of Malmö. In contrast, only 10 percent of respondents mentioned that they are living alone, and around 42 percent of respondents are living in a two or three-member household.

Figure 08: household size

![Size of households](source: survey May 2019)

Foreign-born is another highlighted characteristic of the area, which sharply distinguishes the area from the rest of the city. Statistics illustrate that nearly 88 percent of tenants in the target area has a different background (SCB, 2018). The distribution of backgrounds for the target areas is Nordic countries (2%), Europe (25%), and the rest of the world (73%), mainly the Middle East and North Africa (SCB, 2018). Though the survey results show that Arabs, Africans (mainly Somalis), Bosnians, Kurds, Swedes, and Turks are the main nationalities respectively in the target area, a 2010 research study illustrated a nationality neighborhood map for Rosengård, showing that Yugoslavia, Iraq, Lebanon, and Afghanistan are the main nationalities in the survey area in order.

7 [https://linesinthebackground.wordpress.com/tag/findings/](https://linesinthebackground.wordpress.com/tag/findings/)
8 Demographic composition has been changed in Rosengård and the target area in last years. Arabs and Kurds are more active in administrating both Mosques and the Bazar than other nationalities. Africans, despite their significant population, are somehow excluded in the target.
Poverty is the other main characteristic of the target area. The manifestation of poverty in the area is due to the concentration of low-education and low-skill dwellers. At least 74 percent of adults in the target area are categorized as “low purchasing power,” compared to 33 percent for Malmö (SCB, 2018). Currently, of 26-64 years old residents, nearly 36 percent are ‘Primary educated,’ 38 percent of adults are ‘Secondary educated,’ just 22 percent have gotten diplomas, and only 4 percent of adults have graduated from the college (SCB, 2018). This status points to a massive gap between job skill requirement in Sweden with the skill level of unemployed residents in the target area and their challenge in being benefitted from the potential economic opportunities and new jobs during and after the implementation of TOD in Rosengård and consequently, indicating the residents' vulnerable position to any potential rent increase or general living costs in the area.

5.3. The TOD from the perspective of Rosengård Fastigheter AB

The author had many contacts with the representatives of Rosengård Fastigheter AB during April, May, and June 2019. Finally, the author could get the company’s response to some questions relating to their policies, details of the project, the rent, and residents’ participation through several emails.

Based on the owner’s response, the company is only in the early planning stage before the formal plan. During 2019, the land-use plan of the area will be prepared, and the company will start the construction from 2020. It is supposed existing 1660 apartments to be continued rentals. The representative said: “we will not take away anything from their neighborhoods; just add new things (accommodations and facilities) with Culture Casbah”. The 200 hundred new homes and 30 premises will be mainly for rental, but the company will also evaluate the demand to buy.

In response to the question, ‘new investments will certainly bring economic opportunities to the area. In what ways the project Culture Casbah will benefit local low income and low skill residents? the representative said that ‘We believe we will bring in working opportunities in the area and we add on new and better service in the area as well as the opportunity to move into a new apartment in the area.’

5.4. An integrated analysis of the survey and qualitative interview with the locals

5.4.1. The rent

Rent has always been a central concept in the debate of the affordability paradox of TOD. While TOD planners often interpret land value appreciation and rent increase in positive sense (Kahn, 2007) and an incentive to attract investors to a disadvantaged neighborhood, for those low-income dwellers who usually have no extra sources than what
they currently have, the significant increase in rent would play a determining factor in their displacement process. Protesting manifestation by activists and Malmo residents at the time of approving the TOD plan in the city council in late 2016 was due to their concern about the possible rent increase.

The survey indicated that the current rent in the target area, depending on the number of rooms varies from nearly 5000 SEK to 12,000 SEK monthly. The private owner has recently started the management of the target area, but as the renovation has not started yet, there has been no significant rent increase so far. At the same time, though Rosengård is one of the low-cost neighborhoods in Malmo, around 30% of respondents declared that they know at least a household who has moved out of the area to live in a lower-cost place in last two year. Most local tenants (unemployed residents) receive government subsidies to afford their housing costs, and at least 18 percent of respondents claimed that they hardly afford the current rent. Moreover, for most dwellers (unemployed residents), housing is the primary consumption. They usually are low mobile, has few trips in a day or a week and consequently low transportation cost.

It is quite clear that any significant rise in rent may price out most dwellers from the target area. Housing is considered affordable if a household’s full cost of shelter (rent plus utilities, or principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and utilities for homeowners) is no more than 30 percent of their income. Households spending more than this amount are considered cost-burdened. Those who spend 50 percent or more of their income on housing are considered severely cost burdened (Hersey, J & Spotts, A, M, 2015). The results of the interviews illustrated that approximately 70 percent of respondents the housing cost is more than their other living cost, indicating high vulnerability status facing with new changes in the district.

5.4.2. The new landlord and cutting off some services

Interview with the local tenants declared that there had been gradually cutting off necessities since early 2019 when the newly formed housing company has started managing the area. “From six months ago, they have stopped servicing,” an Indian immigrant in Törnrosen claims. He added:

“Six months ago, if you had a problem, just needed to call MKB. They took care as soon as possible. However, recently, if somebody calls them, they tell it is ok, we will check. It needs to wait for the next week. After a week, they call and ask about the details of the problem […]”

This situation exactly reminds the process, which was illustrated by Baeten (2017) and his co-workers as part of the displacement pressure phenomenon during the renovation.

---

9 There been approximately a +2 percent change in the rent level annually due to the general conditions
10 Such as Lindängen
process in the big Swedish cities. Interview with respondents mentioned a growing uncertainty, anxiety, and a real concern of what would take place in the future.

During the survey, it has declared that only a limited number of local businesses had been informed of the Culture Casbah by municipal housing company MKB. Most respondents are not aware of the details of the current changes. Strangely, some residents are careless or unresponsive regarding the neighborhood. They did not know what is happening, and they even do not know the difference between MKB and Rosengård Fastigheter AB. Many residents even are not aware of the new company’s sign on their building that has recently been re-labeled.

The municipality and housing companies, however, have had a poor connection with the residents in the process of designing the redevelopment project. Through the interviews, it was declared that respondents did not know about the project accurately. In their view, the renovation process would be some limited improving practices for their homes, and it also will be okay. An Iraqi 45 years old man, with four children regarding the rent increase says:

“[…] our apartments need renovation. The kitchen is not in good condition. The balcony needs to be secured by the birds.

For a few respondents, people should not be concern regarding their homes. A 50 years old man from Kurdistan said:

We are receiving support from the Swedish government, so it does not matter the rent is low or high. I have not seen a family be pushed out; the government guarantees our housing.”

However, once they informed of more significant changes in the area, then their concerns revealed. During a small group interview, one of Somalis said:

“It will be terrible. We have been living here for many years; now, they want to make the area better while we have to go to another place. Here children grow with our relatives, going to somewhere else will be awful, it is awful. I absolutely cannot pay more for rent”.

For most respondents, the renovation means pricing-out. They are worried about their children that are growing up in a criminal area, and on the other hand, they are concerned about moving to a worse place or living in a smaller apartment. However, those who have a business or are employed welcome the next changes even if the rent goes up. They are the only group that somehow agree with this statement that “the existing rent level is fair/good.” However, according to the questionnaire, most respondents (66%) indicated that they would not be able to afford to stay in their apartments if the rent increases after renovation.
5.4.3. Culture Casbah; It does not build for us

In order to understand the people’s perception of the TOD plan and the future of Rosengård, there were three questions regarding their approach to the new changes and future investments. ‘Change’ was a most wanted desire by young residents, as some young Arabic women and men respondents added this point as their specific point at the end of their questionnaire. These kinds of respondents (27%), mostly youngsters and local businesses\(^{11}\), are optimistic about the coming years; they hope the new project is going to have a positive effect on the area, and they can live in a better Rosengård. Contrary to their parents, they mostly are unsatisfied with the current status of the area. They hopefully look at the changes which are supposed to take place in the area.

In contrast, most residents, specifically those who are unemployed, are not so hopeful about these new investments. Although most people by pointing to the small changes such as urban furniture, playgrounds mentioned that these improvements have made for us but why the municipality to make significant changes for us. Despite the idea that the word 'Casbah' rooted in the Middle East, residents have not well connected with this project\(^{12}\). In their view, they are ignored in this process. One Somalian said:

“They do not listen to us. They do not need our Idea,”

The landmark is supposed to be built at Bennets väg 13, where at the moment is the building of Akam Livs at the heart of Törnrosen district. The owner of the market has previously extended his five-year lease three times. The current contract will end in 2021. He mentioned that the housing company invited him six months ago to explain Culture Casbah. Also, recently, there was a negotiation between him and the housing company’s lawyers. Akam Livs occupies an area of around 700 square meters. Through an interview, it was declared that lawyers threatened that his rental agreement certainly would not be extended as before, so it is better to accept their proposal. They told him that the new building would be built. They have suggested that they can find a 400 square meters’ commercial place that Akam Livs could occupy instead of the current location and wanted him to prepare the desired plan for a 400 square meter establishment. In contrast, Akam Livs request is to have a 400 square meter place in the new building instead and to have a place to continue his business in Törnrosen from now on. However, the housing company has not accepted this request. He continues:

“The policy of this company is to keep you pending. Nobody knows what would be their response finally. Will this new building be constructed? We have to change the decoration here, but we have to wait, [...]”

In general, distrustful feelings were declared in each interview. The distance between policymakers and local people proves to be very long. Nearly 65% of respondents

---

\(^{11}\) During the interviews, I found that approximately more than half local businessmen are not living inside the target area or even in the Rosengård.

\(^{12}\) http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/culturecasbah
are not optimistic about the near future. Culture Casbah from a local’s perspective is a new building that may not let them even to enter. One of the Somali interviewees says:

“This is for rich people; they do not build it for us.”

In general, the author could sense these two different worlds; on the one hand, there are residents mostly are low-educated, low skill, and low-income and on the other hand, a new project which is based on a profit-driven strategy, revitalizing the area for the middle-class people. Though the City hopes to make the area into a mixed-income residential neighborhood, the locals see an ambiguous future.

5.4.4. Remain or Leave; a local debate on the advantages and disadvantages of living in Rosengård

When it comes to displacement and displacement pressure, some aspects of the socio-economic character of the local area will play a determining role in facilitating or making slower the process of displacement. For example, when people have individual and their reasons to live somewhere, then, pushing out of those people from the area would be harder or may be slower than usual. It is because original residents tend to preserve their specific way of living. Furthermore, in these situations, people may also have a different reaction to the integration policies.

In this view, Rosengård is not a usual neighborhood; this research illustrates that people in this area have shaped their particular way of living; they have made their social interaction. The survey shows how people have moved in this area from different parts of Sweden and Malmö, try to remain in this area due to living close to their families and friends. When it comes to displacement pressure, obviously those people will be more helpful to each other. Thus, in the following the study shows and analyses the specific character of the area achieved from the field survey and interviews;

5.4.5. ‘Proximity’; an important reason to live in Rosengård

Through the qualitative interview, it has been revealed that the concentration of immigrants does not just happen on its own. More than half (53%) of respondents have mentioned that they have been living in the area for more than five years, some even more than 15 year+s. Around one-third of respondents have been living in the area for 3-5 years, and only 15% for less than three years. Relating to the former place of living, most respondents (46%) declared that they were living in a different district of Malmö before they came to the study area, 29% mentioned they were outside of Sweden, 14% out of Malmö and 11% ‘in a different flat in Rosengård.’

One of the findings is the reasons for living in the area. It found that the economic goal despite the general perception is not the most important. Only 20% of respondents mentioned that they are living in the area just because of low rent; around 45% believe that
they are living in Rosengård to live close to their friends and relatives. As discussed in the following, this factor has a leading role in creating particular advantages for living in the area.

Reasons to live, was declared through interviews, is a conductive point regarding the study. Some tenants believe that the area is an excellent place to live, while others, specifically youngers, claim that they will move out once they can find a better place. Most respondents pointed to the “proximity to their family and friends” as the main reason both to move in and to remain in the area. This situation has many benefits for them to live in this area. It is more critical for unemployed as well as aged men and women as they can meet their needs without speaking in another language. After many years of living in Malmö, still, many need a translator in some cases. One of the respondents says:

“This situation has made us very dependent on each other, specifically women and elderly men; nobody feels strange here.”

The majority of people in all mentioned groups confirm this idea. A Somali respondent says:

“[…] we are not alone; we see our friends and relatives every day; we are close to each other. If we want help or are sick, there are many to help”.

Youngsters, however, do not agree with this idea. They claim that we are just physically in Sweden. One of them says:

“[…] This situation made people inactive, exactly like what Turkish immigrants experience in Germany, we are losing many opportunities just because of language problem.”

5.4.6. “Atmosphere: a significant advantage of living in Rosengård

Living proximate to each other has let ethnic and religious groups to shape their desired community and have their specific privacy. This condition, which in work terms Rosengård Atmosphere is a manifestation of their way of living, which has been the main pull factor for most residents during the last decades. This specific way of life is a complicated socio-cultural function that benefits different groups in different ways and different levels. As mentioned before, “family” is the smallest social unit. Individuality, despite the rest of the country, is not work in this area. In Rosengård, most men can maintain their control over their families. The authority has different dimensions, including dress code, relations, lifestyle. Furthermore, cooperation between family members and among families, specifically between Arabs, is at a high level. Therefore, the secrecy level will be high, which has specific beneficiaries for most of them too.
Figure 09; reasons to live in Rosengård

Living together is also supported by some socio-economic motivations; the cost of living in the area is firmly lower than the rest of the city; Medical center, sports club, shopping centers, mosques, all and all located in a leisurely walk distance from their houses, it does not need to pay for access. Furthermore, due to the consumer preference, there are unusual and low price products in local shops so that many who are not living in Rosengård even come to this area weekly to shop.

5.4.7. Residents, who have displacement experience exposed to a new form of displacement

Most residents in the target area are from the Middle East and the north of Africa. Around 11 million people displaced from the Middle East and North Africa as of the end of 2018 (IDMC, 2019). Most Rosengård residents are part of this enormous displacement. For example, all Kurdish people who are approximately 5% of all residents in the target area experienced genocide and the process of eviction from their homes (UNPO, 2013). An interview with the responsible of Akam Livs, who is originally from Kurdistan declared a terrible story of his family of displacement. At the moment, he manages a small family company Akam Livs and very helpful for all his relatives. He says:

“In 1988, chemical attacks were intensified against Kurdish people, and I was wounded like other thousands of people. There was no place in that country for treatment. They transferred us to a hospital in Tabriz, Iran. Fortunately, after six months, I had a chance to be treated. We lost everything we had. Millions of people were displaced and crossed the border and came into Iran. Though Iran was also in the war with Iraq in those days and there was no peaceful area to live, many remained there. I, with my family, came to Sweden. It took around five years to gather all my family members here in Rosengård. Its more than 15 years we are living here.”
Everyone in Rosengård has such a story of their previous displacement. After years of fear and anxiety, and they have rebuilt their social networks, now it seems they have to face a new form of displacement and a new form of disruption of social relations.

5.4.8. The new train station and a few ridership

The new train station was established in December 2018. The train leaves twice an hour (on 18th and 48th minutes). During the survey, the author had an observation at different hours on both weekdays and weekends. Despite the beginning days, the train was on time. However, still, there are not many passengers on the train. The number of passengers in every train’s departure was recorded during working days as well as at the weekend.

To understand the relation between the new train station and the study area, the researcher had long hours of observation at the station at different times during the survey. The train has not yet become a part of the pattern of the local people’s movement; it was not seen more than five passengers on each platform in every train leaving. It is estimated that the total passenger in each line may be around 50 passengers a day. It shows that the train still does not have an essential role in the area.

Respondents unfold that the train is mainly used by those who are working/studying in Copenhagen. Only 20% of respondents stated they use the new train station every day. Strangely, more than one-third of respondents have not seen the station yet; they just heard about the establishment. As most residents are unemployed, they do not move out of the area every day or every week. These days, the train is used mostly by those who are students or work in Copenhagen. One of the respondents says:

“A direct train to Copenhagen would be the best news for people who are living in Rosengård and work in Denmark.”

However, nearly two thirds (64%) of respondents mentioned that they usually do not use the new train station because they do not travel every day to the other part of the city. This status is because most people are unemployed. Others (17%) mentioned they use the new train usually weekly. These respondents generally have a weekly visit with their friends and relatives who are living in other parts of the city. In response to this question as to why they do not use the new train, 74% of respondents claim that they do not travel every day. Nearly 19% mentioned that they use the new train station every day because they have to go to Copenhagen, they still need to change the train. It seems that for those who are living in Annelund; however, the effects of the new train station may have been more sensible.
5.4.9. A debate on (Islamic side of) Rosengård; segregation of whom?

There are three mosques only in the target area in addition to Rosengård Culture Center, but the last is the biggest and the only one that women have their place to pray too. Religious people used to go to the local mosques twice a day. Fridays are a vital day that gathers most people in the central Mosques, and they attract players from all over the City. Usually, Friday prayer is not held in every mosque; instead, people have to gather in the central mosques. Hence, someone may be a resident in Rosengård, but he may go to Al-Huda Mosken or Islamic Cultural Center, very far from his address or vice versa. It declared that some participants in Friday Prayer in both Rosengård Culture Center and Islamiska Kulturefforeningen i Malmö were not Rosengård’s residents. On the other hand, many residents of Rosengård went to other Mosques in the rest of the city\(^{13}\).

For instance, the author saw Omar and his friends in three different mosques (two local mosques and one out of the area). Nizar explains that “going to the Mosques is not just for praying; it is a kind of appointment to visit our friends too.” Arabs and Kurdish people have such relations between themselves as well as each other. These two groups comprise around half the population of Törnrosen and Örtagården. Others, like Somalis, whose population is around 25 percent of the target area, have a fragile relation to the rest of the city.

\(^{13}\) It depends on the personality of the mosque religious leader and his knowledge in Islam to attract more followers to the mosque.
Figure 11. The list of connected Mosques and cultural places in and out of Rosengård

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Located within Rosengård (target area)</th>
<th>Out of Rosengård</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosengård Culture Center</td>
<td>Scandinavian WAKF, Danska vägen, Malmö, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masjid al-Sahaba, von Rosens väg, Malmö, Sweden</td>
<td>Masjid Al-Huda, HERMODSDALSTORGET, Malmö, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamiska Kultureforeningen i Malmö</td>
<td>Malmö Mosken, Islamic Center i Malmö, Jägersrovägen 90, 212 37 Malmö, Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the survey, June 2019

Figure 12. Investigated mutual relations between Mosques in Rosengård with the rest of the city.

Therefore, this situation has helped to shape social circulation and a more significant network for Islamic believers beyond their race and ethnicity. One needs to be a believer Muslim (used to pray) to be a member of their secure network. This “Every day & every week gathering,” strengthens the social network both in the local and city level and plays a vital role in distinguishing ‘Their Self’ from ‘The Others’ (Swedish society). This situation, however, has another side too. Children and those who are born in Sweden are not interested in this type of relations as much as their parents.

Another kind of socio-economic connection between Rosengård and other parts of the city is weekly and monthly shopping trips to the area. Through a long observation specifically during the weekends, interview with shoppers and local businesses, it has been
revealed that there are many people (mostly immigrants) who are living in other parts of Malmö and travel to Rosengård weekly to have a shop; there are specific goods that can be found only in Rosengård’s centrum which are usually culturally specific for them. Moreover, low-price is another reason for this kind of shopping relation. This relation, however, is not limited to the Malmö immigrant residents; some residents in small towns near Malmö, such as Landskrona, usually come to Rosengård monthly for shopping too.

5.5. Analysis of the interview with city professionals and activists

In this section, the information which has gained through qualitative interviews with four city professionals and two activists is analyzed. Interview with politicians due to their focus on the election to the European Parliament 2019, and some other reasons failed. However, in order to make a better understanding of politicians’ views of the project, a copy of their ‘Vote’ to Culture Casbah on 24 November 2016 has analyzed. Therefore, in the following section, firstly, there will be an analysis of related data relating to politicians’ approach to the project, then the city professionals and activist’s perspectives based on the interview questions (see pp.58) are analyzed.

5.5.1. Determining factors of Rosengård’s transformation to an attractive place for living

While by pointing to Belgium’s experience in bringing middle-class ethnic Belgians into segregated areas by offering cheaper housing, Richard Orange, an interviewee in this research argues that Malmö municipality should take similar actions to reduce the proportion of first and second-generation immigrants in Rosengård from the current dimensions of 90+ per cent, however, Alwall, Aberg and both activists believe that the primary factors are the inclusion of the residents of Rosengård in the labor market and strengthening a sense of belonging in Swedish society. Jonas Alwall believes that the willingness to invest in Rosengård is itself a great practice and a big step to redevelopment the area. Aberg, of course, argues that all signs of the establishment of a parallel community with separate institutions should be opposed and met with integration efforts, with responsibility shared by all parts.

By mentioning all small and medium projects, including the new train station, which has been implemented in Rosengård since 2010, Carina Listerborn argues that most of these improvements are focusing on the physical environment, while the social problems are very much related to unemployment and discrimination on the labor market. Thus, it seems that TOD more looks at the more affluent people outside of the district to bring them into the area. It does not design for improving inclusion or being a tool for fighting against exclusion and discrimination. Alwall, in a similar way, thinks that physical infrastructure cannot solve the existing issues of the area, but it is a big step and needs to be completed by socio-economic actions such as job creation and shifting the current image of the area.

Furthermore, both Alwall, Orange, and activists claim that the area is not as bad as what the media represents. Thus, one of the determining factors is changing the image of Rosengård. In Orange’s view, bringing the people from Rosengård to other parts of Malmö,
as well as bringing the rest of Malmö to Rosengård by holding festivals and opening the existing facilities to all the city residents like the ice rink and an excellent outdoor swimming pool will be sufficient to mitigate the current image. He concludes that with practicing such small actions, people will gradually realize that Rosengård is not perhaps as bad as they thought. Nadeem, one of the activists, currently performs Malmö -Move based on the idea that art can help to make Malmö more attractive, integrated so, it can work for Rosengård too.

5.5.2. The TOD plan and its potential displacement effect on low-income residents

In all interviewees’ perspectives, displacement is certainly a real concern. Listerborn points out to the Swedish experience relating to displacement resulting from the renovation. She claims that in other parts of Sweden, that renovation has led to increased rents, and people often do not return to their previous flat after renovation social networks being teared up and new people moving in – often with a better economy. She added that often, people who chose to stay, get a worse economy due to higher costs for living. For low-income residents, she believes that there are not many options for cheaper housing, so where to go will be the question. People will probably live denser and more crowded together.

Others are also looking at the issue with concern. Orange claims that if we look at gentrification processes in London, often lower-income residents end up being pushed out to new problem districts even further from the city Centre. He added that having a more substantial proportion of middle-income residents with different ethnic backgrounds would be a positive development for Rosengård, but he believes that it is unrealistic to expect the entire district to become gentrified. Similar to others, Alwall thinks that the gentrification process in the area is slow, and low-income dwellers are displaced, and where they go is the question.

5.5.3. Culture Casbah and economic opportunities for low-income tenants

In Orange’s view, the benefit, if there is one, will come less from the jobs it brings than from changing the demography of Rosengård and bringing in new residents better able to campaign for improved public services and security in the district. During the survey, it made clear that around 20% of respondents agreed with these new changes to the area as there will be a better service, more secure, and better image like what Listerborn thinks. In her view, some people may be favorable to the new building as it may bring in some new services and makes the area more attractive. She also noted that people might sense that the changes also are aiming at attracting others than the ones living there. The latter, which is also confirmed by the result of the survey, is a hidden side of the relation of the residents that they will have with the project. Aberg, however, is skeptical of projects or buildings as vehicles of change. He stresses on the fact that they may improve the very local environment for a short or more extended period, but real change requires jobs and self-support.
5.5.4. Affordable housing; is it possible to remain?

Though Orange believes that it is possible to revitalize Rosengård at the same time as keeping it affordable, there was no more description in this regard. Listerborn points to the City of Malmö, which has signed the agreement of making a SHIFT based on the UN effort to supply all citizens with affordable housing. Though she hopes this will be an intention to make sure that everybody will benefit from the welfare values, however, it seems complicated to turn the economy around to support low-income groups, when a “market-led economy” is the dominating strategy. Listerborn thinks that remaining the area affordable seems to be a gesture of goodwill from the city, but their hands are tied back due to the neoliberal condition of the economy today.

Aberg mentioned that every neighborhood needs to be taken care of, including renovation and revitalization, but the people who live there are the essential factor. By reviewing the first question, he claims that this is very much also a question of self-support and mindset. In his view, any community or residential area that too a high degree is dependent on welfare subsidies will have problems with social isolation and inwardness. He believes that a thriving society is based on active citizens who can sustain themselves. Society needs to be open to all its members, and all those members have a responsibility to take care of society as well. He underlines that education and open minds are crucial to improvement.

5.5.5. The new train station and the hope for integration

Residential segregation is known as a growing problem within many urban areas today. Segregation is assumed to hamper social integration and the life-chances of disadvantaged as well as creating instability in society. Malmö municipality aims to mitigate segregation by improving the transit connection between the area and the rest of the city and social mix. While increasing the variation in the housing structure and social mix is seen as a policy measure to deal with residential segregation, some scholars claim that social mix policies can increase segregation by promoting processes of gentrification while Jonas Alwal believes that Rosengård is a culturally diverse district and it cannot be categorized as a complicated segregated area, Parker & Madureira (2016) claim that the area is one of the most segregated in Malmö.

Due to the above reasons, the train may not play an essential role in integration. While Orange hopes if the trains are regular enough and too frequently, and if there were trains direct to Copenhagen from Rosengård, then they will undoubtedly make a difference. Aberg does not agree with this statement and claims that segregation is not a transportation issue and claims that Malmö is a relatively compact city, and Rosengård is pretty close to the city center. He underlines that what Rosengård residents need is a job to go to; the transformation depends on the residents having employment and being self-supporting.
Similarly, Listerborn points to the fact that Malmö is a rather dense city, and the actual means of transport – buses, cycling, and car use, may not be outcompeted by the train. Like Orange, she argues that the train does not run frequently enough to be useful to all, and passengers still have to change train if they work in Copenhagen. According to Listerborn, the station should probably be seen in a long term perspective, with the hope of a growing population in Malmö.

6. Discussion

The goal of this research is to make an in-depth understanding of contradictions of transit-oriented development in low-income urban neighborhoods with the example of the Rosengård district in Malmö. In this chapter, the results of the research are discussed in three mentioned explanations: transit-induced gentrification-displacement, affordability paradox of TOD, and segregation-integration debate. This chapter has divided into three parts to discuss the results and answer to the research questions, respectively.

6.1. Transit-induced gentrification-displacement debate

Transit-induced gentrification was a departure point of this research. Whereas TOD planners and policymakers interpret the project in a positive sense, this research has tried to analyze the critic’s perspectives based on the following research questions: 1) ‘is there any evidence/signal of the gentrification process in the district?’, 2) ‘how residents interpret the newly investments; as a positive change and an economic opportunity generator or a threat for their specific atmosphere? 3) ‘to what extent the concern of displacement exists in the area?’. These questions are answered through the following discussion based on the results in the previous chapter.

Regarding the evidence/signal of the gentrification process in the district, the results strongly indicate that the area has gradually entered into a transit-induced gentrification process; a historical background review declared that the area was built as a part of the ‘Million Home’ program in the 1960s and 1970s (the first stage), then it has been a disinvestment neighborhood for many decades (the second stage) and the recent big reinvestment project Culture Casbah represents the third stage of the long process of capital flow. According to the literature, gentrification is the third stage of capital flow (stein, 2019). Furthermore, the area has recently experienced a transformation from the public housing area to a market-led housing system, indicating a kind of ‘housing commodification,’ as what Madden & Marcuse (2016) claim. Moreover, the spectacular high-rise building (Culture Casbah) with unique architecture in this disadvantaged are aims at more place branding, improving the rent gap, and facilitating the gentrification through a ‘starchitecture’ strategy. By referring to Justin McGuirk’s book, Radical Cities and COCOTAS (2018), we can argue that this type of architecture is usually more for elites than improving ordinary people's lives.
Another research question has focused on the residents' interpretation of the new investments; as a positive change and an economic opportunity generator or a threat to their specific atmosphere. An analysis of the resident’s sense of the project and their hope for the future of the Rosengård illustrated a strong distrustful in their relation with the project. Despite the idea that the word 'Casbah' basically comes from the languages and cultures of the Middle East and planners aim to attract the resident’s participation through a similar identical symbol, the survey declared that residents have no a positive sense to the project because the project developers perhaps have not been able to connect the residents who mostly come from the Middle East to the project. There is a controversial perspective of the new train station and Culture Casbah. Contrary to 27% of respondents (mostly young people and businessmen) who are welcome to the new “change” and hope for positive outcomes, in other local respondents' perspectives, Culture Casbah does not build for improving their living conditions. A group of Somalian respondents criticized their ignorance by the municipality. They claimed that “the project is built for themselves; it is not for us.” The statement reminds us of Danley & Weaver’s work (2018), who show that the feeling of distrust will work as a catalyst in the gentrification process and displacement pressure.

To discuss the concern of displacement in the target area, it is evident that in this gentrifying district, the concern of displacement is real; Up to now, the renovation process has not so far started and thus, there has not been actual displacement due to the significant rent increase; however, there is some evidence of displacement pressure in the target area; tenants' quality of life has declined due to cutting off the caring services. According to the local respondents, unlike previous years, tenants have to wait for weeks in order to get a response for every request to the new housing company. This situation has caused fear and anxiety for people. Cutting off necessities along with growing criminality, are making the neighborhood to be harder to live than ever. The survey has also shown that for nearly half of tenants paying the current rent level is hard, and most respondents indicated that they certainly would not afford an increased rent level. According to Marcuse (1985), there will be a “direct last-resident displacement” when a landlord attempts to force the renter to move by cutting off necessities or dramatically increasing the rent (Danley, S & Weaver, R, 2018).

In addition to the local dwellers, other participants strongly confirm the concerns about displacement. As Carina Listerborn noted for this study, in other parts of Sweden, the renovation has led to original resident’s displacement and their social networks being torn up. She claims that often, those who choose to stay will get a worse economy due to higher costs for living. Similarly, Jonas Alwall indicated that displacement is strongly predictable for Rosengård, as most original dwellers may not afford to remain. Other city professionals had the same idea in this regard. Moreover, both social activists, by reviewing the same experience in other parts of European cities argue that in the case of Rosengård, displacement is inevitable.

The research has also indicated that the concern of displacement in the area is not limited to the actual displacement or displacement pressure; it also relates to a broader meaning of the right to housing; the right to the neighborhood. Whereas many may argue that agreements such as SHIFT may guarantee to provide affordable housing for all low-
income residents in Malmö, the research indicates that it may not entirely cover the housing right, particularly in the target area. The research investigated that Rosengård in resident’s view has a broader meaning than an area to live; a particular space to live, to pray, to visit their relatives and friends, an environment that accepts their lifestyle and also an atmosphere that they can manage both public and private spaces by their desired ethical code such as hijab. It seems that this status is even beyond the right to “live in neighborhoods and communities” because, in this area, the matter is not only a sense of belonging to the neighborhood; it also refers to their lifestyle and their specific social networks.

6.2. The affordability paradox of TOD

While TOD is seen as benefiting low-income residents through the reduction of the transportation costs and connecting people to the potential jobs and economic opportunities, critics argue that the improvement in transit service may reduce the overall supply of affordable locations and make life more inconvenient for low-income households and small business operators. In this part, the results are discussed to answer the mentioned research questions focusing on: 1) the new train station’s role in the resident’s living cost, and 2) the people’s perspective of the potential rent increase and affordability.

The results indicate that due to some reasons, the new train station has had not a significant decisive role in the resident’s income. The first reason backs to the usage pattern and low ridership; more than two-thirds of respondents mentioned that they do not use the new train station because there are few regular and daily movements from the district to the other parts of the city due to the high unemployment rate. An ‘often’ usage pattern is the other way of using the new train station by a small group of respondents (17%) for their weekly or monthly visits with friends and relatives. Daily passengers (19%) are those who work or study in Copenhagen, though it needs to change the line to the destination. The second point relates to the role of the TOD as a ladder to economic opportunities as it is very critical in this case due to the enormous gap between the requirements of the potential job with the level of resident’s skills and their education status. Therefore, it is evident that the resident’s disposable income would not experience a significant improvement due to this transit-led project.

Another point relates to the people’s perspective of the potential rent increase. According to the project, all apartments will remain rental after the renovation but at a different rent level, which will be determined through the market. The study illustrated that even at the current stage, many impoverished households have trouble managing their living costs. The resident’s fear was their obvious response to the rent increase. Approximately, more than 60% of the respondents claim that they would certainly not afford a higher rent level, and at least 18% of respondents say that it is hard to afford the current rent. While the new investment will undoubtedly lead to rising living costs in the target area, low-income residents may not benefit from potential economic opportunities. Thus, the affordability gap between low-income tenants and the renovated area is rising day by day. In other parts of the world, this gap has formed an international struggle. Recently, there have been many attempts by both equity advocates and some local states in the United States and Berlin,
Germany, on acting against housing privatization and hundreds of residential units transformed back from a private-owned to the public-owned housing. The project in Rosengård steps toward a path in contrast to such equity practices that are expanding in the world.

Consequently, the study indicates that on the one hand, the transit has not a significant role in reducing resident’s living cost, and their economic status may not be improved through a place-based strategy, and on the other hand, their living costs will significantly will raise due to possible significant rent increase as well as rising the general living cost in the neighborhood. Therefore, there are thousands of low-income residents with low and fixed income are faced with a rising living cost status, claiming an enormous affordability gap in the area. Additionally, most local respondents concern about losing their current low-cost environment. In this sense, affordable housing has tied to the neighborhood's affordability, where low-income residents can live proximate to their relatives and friends. Therefore, TOD, in this case, not only participates in improving resident’s disposable income but facilitates original low-income dwellers to be pushed out due to increasing the rent and general cost of living.

6.3. Segregation-integration debate

According to the Malmö municipality, the Rosengård transit-led project is using physical planning to achieve social gains (Malmö Stad, 2018a, p. 5). One of the social aims is mitigating current segregation through a mixed-used development (Rosengård Fastigheter AB, 2019) and social mix strategy (Malmö Stad, 2018a). Therefore, the mitigating ability of the planned TOD from the participant’s perspective was the question in this research. Specific questions are 1) ‘what do exiting segregation mean in locals and participants' perspectives?’, 2) ‘How are they thinking of integration?’ and 3) to what extent the participants hope that the area will integrate into the rest of the city physically and socially?’.  

One of the well-known aspects of segregation in Rosengård is spatial segregation. There is an argument by city professionals who participated in the interview claiming that Malmö is a rather dense city, and the area is quite close to the city center. For instance, Carina Listerborn claims that the actual means of transport in the area – busses, cycling, and car use may not be outcompeted by the train. Moreover, by the establishment of the new train station, then the area has recently linked to Central Station in one direction and the Öresund bridge through Svågertorp and Hyllie in the other. By opening a separate line to Lund in the next few years, then the area will be a part of the urban and regional transit network. Therefore, even at the moment, Rosengård has physically well connected to the other parts of the city. Participants argue that physical integration does not fit to Rosengård’s segregationally issues. As Lars Aberg suggested, what has to be broken in Rosengård is the socio-economic segregation.

Socio-economic segregation is a more complicated aspect of this phenomenon in Rosengård. Although there was a controversial idea of Jonas Alwall on the level of
Segregation in the area due to the cultural diversification, there is an argument that Rosengård is one of the most segregated districts in Malmö (Parker & Madureira, 2016). Segregation is reinforced in the field through both external and internal factors; Media, an external force, based on some evidence, is vigorously strengthening ‘Avoid Rosengård’ day by day. On the other hand, the ‘poverty cycle’ and ‘cultural norms’ have led the community to make a kind of self-supportive system with particular beneficiaries for residents. Their interest in concentration, in fact, comes from the language barrier, lifestyle, and cultural preferences that have shaped a desired social atmosphere distinguished from the rest of the city. For most respondents, the social and cultural atmosphere is more important than the level of economic status. In other words, they prefer to live next to each other in a low-quality neighborhood than to live in a high-level neighborhood lonely.

There is a controversial aspect of segregation in the area, indicating the fact that the area has not segregated from the rest of the city; in fact, it has segregated from Swedish society. Contrary to the popular notion, through observation and interviews, the author found that there are many cultural interconnections between the Rosengård and some parts of the city far from the Rosengård. These connections have shaped based on cultural similarity. Mosques play an essential role in this regard. The second socio-economic integration aspect in the area turns around shopping. This type of connection is seen within a broader geography than the former; many immigrants (Middle-East and North African), from other parts of Malmö as well as other small towns near Malmö such as Landskrona, often, are coming to Rosengård to purchase some specific goods that they cannot find in other shopping centers. These two integration examples illustrate that Rosengård has chosen its way of connecting to the city of Malmö based on some socio-economic preferences. It is evident that there are two different perceptions of the current segregation; on the one hand, there are thousands of residents who have shaped their way of living and a kind of self-segregated system, and on the other hand, a transit-oriented strategy which aims at integrating this area with others; a disproportionate policy.

Consequently, the results illustrate the inability of TOD as physical planning in mitigating the existing segregation in Rosengård as the TOD plan does not meet the resident’s need. Of course, this claim is limited to the existing low-income residents in the area. Under the process of gentrification, the area gradually accommodates the new wealthier residents, and most of the current low-income tenants may be displaced from the district. Then, Rosengård maybe becomes an integrated part of the city but with its new gentrification consumers in the absence of original low-income residents. The concerns point to the cost of this way of integration as it neglects most of its original dwellers, who are priced out and may live in a more undesired condition.

To conclude, the reasons (answers to the research questions) are shown in the figure. The figure illustrates founded reasons for every explanation indicating that TOD empirically in this area would have a massive cost for vulnerable groups; for both who will move out and those who may remain in the renovated area. Those who will go will pay this cost by losing their current home, their neighborhood, and social network, and those who may
remain will pay the more cost by experiencing a worse economic condition and financial pressure.

Figure 13: contradictions of transit-oriented development in Rosengård neighborhood
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7. Conclusion

This research aimed to discuss and deepen the understanding of contradictions of transit-oriented development in low-income urban neighborhoods within a Swedish planning context. The case study of Rosengård district has used to discuss three mentioned contradictions; transit-induced gentrification-displacement, affordability paradox of TOD, and segregation-integration debate. The research aimed to develop a critical discussion on this kind of urban redevelopment planning based on the residents’ perceptions, city planners, and activists’ opinions relating to the recently started TOD in Rosengård through a mixed qualitative-quantitative method.

The results indicated that the district has gradually entered into a transit-induced gentrification process. The process has started by the transformation of city-owned homes to a market-led housing system. The process is facilitated by the new train station and Culture Casbah, a spectacular high rise building with its unique architecture at the core of the district. The concern about the displacement of low-income households has revealed in this study, and more importantly, the results indicated a more significant concern; displacement of those people who mostly had been displaced in a bigger scale and now they may experience a new form of displacement and lose the right to housing, the right to neighborhood and community, their specific atmosphere and social networks.

The study has shown an affordability paradox of TOD in the target area. On the one hand, the Rosengård’s new train station has not a significant role in reducing resident’s living cost, and their economic status may not be improved through a place-based strategy, and on the other hand, their living costs will significantly raise due to possible rent increase and rising general living cost. Therefore, there are too many low-income residents with low and fixed income and a rising living cost status, claiming an enormous affordability gap in the area. Additionally, most local respondents concern about losing their current low-cost environment. In this sense, affordable housing has tied to the neighborhood's affordability, where low-income residents are living proximate to their relatives and friends. Therefore, TOD, in this case, could not participate in improving residents' disposable income and also facilitates original low-income dwellers to be priced out.

Moreover, the results illustrated the inability of TOD as physical planning in mitigating the current socio-economic segregation in Rosengård as the TOD plan does not meet the resident’s need. Of course, this claim is limited to the existing low-income residents in the area. Under the process of gentrification, the area gradually accommodates the new wealthier residents, and most of the current low-income tenants may be displaced from the district. Then, Rosengård maybe becomes an integrated part of the city but with its new gentrification consumers in the absence of original low-income residents. The cost of this way of integration is the displacement of original dwellers, which may live in a more undesired condition.

Finally, discussing the contradictions of TOD in low-income neighborhoods revealed that this form of urban redevelopment is a way of re-using space for more profit and a strategy for reproduction space by the capital, which basically in contrast to the goals
of TOD. Further, the results of this study were based on the critic’s perspective, and it is soon to judge the project in practice as it is at the early stage of implementation. Clearly, more profound research is needed to measure changes in the next few years and evaluate to what extent the current concerns may be realized. How may the area experience gentrification and displacement, and what factors may enhance or slow this process?
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9. Appendixes

Interviews

Interview with city professionals and activists

1. What are the determining factors that will initiate Rosengård’s transformation from a problematic urban district to be an attractive and accessible place for living?

2. The new train station still has not made a significant contribution to the transportation of locals, but the City hopes that the new train station will be useful in breaking existing segregation and connecting low-income residents to the potential economic opportunities, to what extent may this hope be fragile?

3. There are many concerns regarding the potential displacement of low-income residents (following the implementation of the renovating 1660 apartments), to what extent can this concern be valid?

4. Some believe that there will be a considerable gap between the supposed new project economic opportunities with low skill and low-income residents. In what ways the implementation of the project Culture Casbah may benefit the locals?

5. How may welfare values affect the future development of Rosengård? To what extent is revitalizing the area and remaining affordability be possible for the area?

Interview with the representative of Rosengård Fastigheter AB

1. There are many hopes and concerns about the project Culture Casbah, what aim does this project have?

2. As the project is still in the process of detailed planning, what exactly will the project consist of?

3. According to the media, a part of the project is renovating around 1600 apartments by Rosengård Fastigheter AB. How long is this renovation going to take? Will these apartments finally be sold to individuals, or will they remain rental but with a new rent rate?

4. In general, new investments will bring economic opportunities to the area. In what ways might the project Culture Casbah benefit low income local and low skill residents?
5. To what extent the rent level may arise due to the renovation costs?

6. There is a concern of potential resident displacement due to the high rent increase following the renovation, to what extent may this concern be real? Are there any supposed supportive plans in order to remain less potential negative impacts on the area?

7. What picture of Rosengård will we see in the next few years? A revitalized whole Rosengård or a part of the area? Does the company have a plan for the rest of the neighborhood too?

**Interview with residents**

1. Many respondents have mentioned that most of them do not use the new train? What do you think? How often do you use the new train?
2. Have you heard about Culture Casbah? Have you participated in this idea? Was the municipality asked your consideration for this new investments? What do you think of this project? Do you think Rosengård will be better by implementation of this tower?
3. Do you know the new owner of the district? Have you been invited by the company or been informed about the new owner?
4. Do you prefer to live in Rosengård? why?
5. How often you participate in cultural events hold by other cultural centers in the other parts of Rosengård?
6. Have you heard about the renovation? Do you think your apartments need renovation? How much you pay for the rent? If the rent be increased, what you may do to afford?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Ledamöter</th>
<th>Parti</th>
<th>Ersättare</th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nej</th>
<th>Avst</th>
<th>Frånv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Katrin Sternefeldstamn</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stefan Lindhe</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eva Sjöstedt</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lisbeth Persson-Ekström</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>Christer Bengtsson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patrick Bengtsson</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My Gilberg</td>
<td>(MP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hanna Thomé</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Daniel Wolski</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anja Sonesson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anneli Bjojesson</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lars-Johan Hallgren</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christina Wessling</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Torbjörn Teghammar</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jan-Tadeo Espitria</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Niki Karlsson</td>
<td>(MP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Martina Skrak</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nora Manouchi</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rickard Ahnman-Persson</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mediha Ahmadi</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Sanna Axelsson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Katarin Mende</td>
<td>(FL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Helena Nanne</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Adrian Kaba</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>Anders Nilsson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eva Bertz</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tilde Jensen</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>Lilian Gerleman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Susanne Jonsson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Stefan Piaht</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Stefan Piaht</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Johanna Överbeck</td>
<td>(MP)</td>
<td>Ljuba Fredenman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Anders Skans</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Evelina Mattsson</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>Mohammad Mohammad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mubarak Abdulrahman</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>John Eklöf</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Andreas Schööström</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Magnus Olsson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Frida Trolly</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Håkan Fälld</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>Sadiye Altundal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Morodem Jallow</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bassem Naar</td>
<td>(MP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kent Andersson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ivars Hansson</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Carina Nilsson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Linda Dahlberg-Wirje</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>Ramtin Massoumi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Milan Obradovic</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fredrik Sjögren</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Petra Bergquist</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Andreas Konstantinides</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hanna Gedin</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mia Josefsson</td>
<td>(MP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Jörgen Grubb</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>John Roslund</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Anders Rubin</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Rose-Marie Carlsson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tony Rahm</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lisa Rydhe</td>
<td>(FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ilmar Reepalu</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Jan Olsson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Anders Olén</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>Ortwin Lobbes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sofia Hedén</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Carlos González</td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hannah Ovarso</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Anders Örnblad</td>
<td>(MP)</td>
<td>Kari Petersen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Björn Gudmundsson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Emil Svensson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Carina Svensson</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>Birgit Hanson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Anders Prippe</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justeringsmännens signatur: 1.
# The Questionnaire

**Survey about the impact of the new train station and Culture Casbah on Rosengård.**

Note: A student at Malmö University conducts this questionnaire. These questions reflect the respondent’s concerns as well as their suggestions. No names or other characteristics, enabling the characterization of individual cases will be stored or evaluated. The questionnaires will be destroyed after transfer to the computer. Data will be deleted when the research completed.

## Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many persons live in your household?</th>
<th>A. One person</th>
<th>B. Two persons</th>
<th>C. Three persons</th>
<th>D. Four persons and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please state your occupational status</td>
<td>employed</td>
<td>Student/Trainee</td>
<td>Unemployed/seeking work</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please state your monthly income</td>
<td>Less than 10,000 SEK</td>
<td>10,000-20,000 SEK</td>
<td>More than 20,000 SEK</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since when do you live in this flat?</td>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>More than five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reasons do you consider most important for living in this neighborhood?</td>
<td>Low rent apartments</td>
<td>Proximity to family/friends</td>
<td>The authority decision</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did you live before you moved into Rosengård?</td>
<td>Outside of Sweden</td>
<td>Outside of Malmö</td>
<td>In a different district of Malmö</td>
<td>In another flat in Rosengård</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your rent increase within the last two years?</td>
<td>Yes, once, Yes, more than once, No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know households that have moved out of their apartments due to the rent increase?</td>
<td>Yes, I have heard but do not know someone, Yes, I know one household, Yes, I know many households, No, there hasn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you use the new train station?</td>
<td>Every day, every week, Every month, I usually do not use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually do not use the new train, because:</td>
<td>It is expensive, I usually take the bus, I usually use my car, I do not travel every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>Completely agree, Agree, I am not sure, Disagree, Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New housing applications have risen after establishing the new train station</td>
<td>Completely agree, Agree, I am not sure, Disagree, Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to work is/will be more comfortable and cheaper for most residents by use of the new train station</td>
<td>Completely agree, Agree, I am not sure, Disagree, Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rosengård is getting a much better place for living in the coming years due to the new investments (Culture Casbah)</td>
<td>Completely agree, Agree, I am not sure, Disagree, Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the projects Culture Casbah will bring a great job opportunity for Rosengård’s residents</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing rent level is fair/good</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most tenants will not afford to stay in their apartments in Tömrosen and Örtagården if the rent increase after renovation</td>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please state here any other comments, suggestion or critics you have:

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

.................
# Evaluation of the Questionnaire

### Size of Households
- One person (10%)
- 2 persons (26%)
- 3 persons (16%)
- 4 persons and more (48%)

### Occupational Status
- Employed (17%)
- Student/trainee (12%)
- Unemployed (37%)
- Other (34%)

### Monthly Income
- Less than 10,000 SEK (22%)
- 10,000-20,000 SEK (57%)
- More than 20,000 SEK (14%)
- Other (7%)

### Years of Living in Rosengård
- Less than one year (3%)
- 1-3 years (12%)
- 3-5 years (32%)
- More than five years (53%)

### The Former Place of Residence
- Out of Sweden (29%)
- Out of Malmö (14%)
- In a different district of Malmö (46%)
- In another flat in Rosengård (11%)

### Reasons for Living in Rosengård
- Low rent (20%)
- Authorities decision (14%)
- Proximity to family & friends (45%)
- Other (21%)

### Increasing Rent in Last Two Years
- Yes (85%), due to the regular increase in each year.
- No (15%)

### The Existing Rent Level is Fair/Good
- Completely agree (19%)
- Agree (30%)
- I’m not sure (33%)
- Disagree (11%)
- Completely disagree (7%)

### Knowing Households Which Have Moved Out Due to the Rent Increase
- Yes, I have heard but do not know someone (11%)
- Yes, I know one household (11%)
- Yes, I know many households (8%)
- No, there has not (70%)

### How Often Do You Use the New Train Station
- Every day (19%)
- Every week (17%)
- Every month (27%)
- I do not use (37%)

### I Usually Do Not Use the New Train, Because
- It is expensive (0%)
- I usually take the bus (9%)
- I usually use my car (17%)
- I do not travel every day (74%)

### Going to Work Is/Will Be More Comfortable and Cheaper for Most Residents by Use of the New Train Station
- Completely agree (7%)
- Agree (48%)
- I am not sure (38%)
- Disagree (7%)
- Disagree entirely (0%)

### New Housing Applications Have Risen After Establishing the New Train Station
- Completely agree (14%)
- Agree (27%)
- I am not sure (45%)
- Disagree (7%)
- Completely disagree (7%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely agree (7%)</th>
<th>Agree (20%)</th>
<th>I am not sure (40%)</th>
<th>Disagree (17%)</th>
<th>Completely disagree (6%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rosengård is getting a much better place for living in the coming years due to the new investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project Culture Casbah will bring a great job opportunity for Rosengård’s residents</td>
<td>Completely agree (15%)</td>
<td>Agree (22%)</td>
<td>I am not sure (41%)</td>
<td>Disagree (18%)</td>
<td>Completely disagree (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing rent level is fair/good</td>
<td>Completely agree (19%)</td>
<td>Agree (30%)</td>
<td>I’m not sure (33%)</td>
<td>Disagree (11%)</td>
<td>Completely disagree (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most tenants will not afford to stay in their apartments in Törnrosen and Örtagården if the rent increase after renovation</td>
<td>Completely agree (0%)</td>
<td>Agree (36%)</td>
<td>I am not sure (36%)</td>
<td>Disagree (18%)</td>
<td>Completely disagree (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>