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1. Introduction

The exclusion of certain districts within cities is a common phenomenon in Europe and much has been written on the causes and effects of urban segregation. However, there is less extensive research on how cities can deal with this occurrence. Many European governments have indeed initiated programmes to fight the issues in segregated areas, but there is much disagreement in academia on the effects of these programmes (Andersen 2000, p. 767). Therefore, this paper investigates how urban planning and municipal governance can address negative aspects of segregation. More specifically, this research aims at answering the following question: How can city administrations integrate socially and spatially segregated mass housing districts in cities with an industrial past?

Based on an examination of different theoretical approaches on urban segregation and integration, it is argued that urban segregation can and should be faced by city administrations with public integration policies to avoid a further division of the city. In order to explore possible manifestations of these policies, three similar cases of segregated districts in Europe and their respective counter-strategies are analysed: Århus in Denmark, Malmö in Sweden, and Mannheim in Germany. The comparison between the three cities aims at showing why cities have different integration approaches: if it is a matter of conceptualisation or different circumstances. To answer this question the following more specific research questions are applied to the cases:

- RQ 1: Why and how did the city administrations of Århus, Malmö, and Mannheim plan counter-segregation policies?
- RQ 2: How are the concepts of segregation and integration perceived by the city administrations of Århus, Malmö, and Mannheim? What are the underlying thoughts and premises?
- RQ 3: What measures are planned by the city administrations in Malmö, Århus, and Mannheim (and what are the taken measures and their outcomes)?
- RQ 4: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies? What are the risks and benefits?

As there are various understandings of segregation not only in academia but also in politics, the first two questions aim at understanding the perception of segregation by the city administrations as well as if they understand the studied areas as segregated. Moreover, the questions are asked in order to understand what the city administrations perceive as remedies for the segregation: if they understand integration as a valuable counter-segregation approach and if so, what are the underlying premises of this assumption. The answers to the third and fourth question will provide a deeper understanding of the chosen strategies, their advantages and disadvantages.

The paper starts with a review on academic literature on urban segregation and integration, then continues with a short discussion of the used methods, and afterwards proceeds with an in-depth discussion of the case studies. After a comparison of the cities’ strategies, it is concluded how the public policies within the studied districts can help to counter urban segregation.
2. Literature review on urban segregation and integration

To approach the question of how city administrations can integrate socio-spatially segregated mass housing districts, the academic literature on urban segregation and integration will be reviewed in the following chapter. As a starting point the term ‘segregation’ must be defined. As Ruiz-Tagle states: “A substantial conceptual understanding of segregation is needed to distinguish and restate a strong concept of socio-spatial integration” (2013a, p. 388). Without understanding what urban segregation is, it is difficult to discuss the risks and benefits of urban integration. Thus, starting with a brief history of the research field of urban segregation, its definitions, causes, and consequences will be discussed, so that in the end, it can be assessed if integration is a valuable approach to counter negative effects of segregation. In doing so the question whether urban segregation is in fact a disadvantage will also be addressed, as this assumption is often accepted as a commonplace.

2.1. History of thought

Based on the analysis of cities in the United States (US) and Chile, Ruiz-Tagle (2013b) gives an overview on the history of thought on urban segregation. He assumes that the academic conceptualisation of segregation has had a major influence on current and past integration policies (Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 1). As he gives a comprehensive overview over the history of thought on urban segregation, his article is used as a basis for this sub-chapter. He states that the earliest explanation for the residential separation of social groups was promulgated by scholars working within the Chicago School (Ignatov/Timberlake 2014; Machado Bógus n.d., p. 2; Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 1). The human ecology perspective laid the foundations for acknowledging the connection of social phenomena with spatial patterns (Machado Bógus n.d., p. 2; Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 1). The scholars of the Chicago School presumed that urbanisation resulting in a rapid increase in volume and density of population will eventually lead to social disorganisation (Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, pp. 1-2). Segregation is explained as being “a mere incident of urban growth, locational changes and urban metabolism; a condition that the city inevitably produces in a context of competitive cooperation, and as normal elements of city life” (ibid., p. 2). However, this account has been criticised as the Chicago School “did not provide an analytical model to explain the ‘natural’ occurrence of segregation, they did not address class and racial oppression, and the use (and overuse) of the social disorganization paradigm became a morally charged and ethnocentric viewpoint to separate the normal from the pathological” (ibid., p. 2).

In the 1960s, the idea of a so-called culture of poverty arose that assumed that poverty was the inevitable outcome of characteristics of poor people (Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 2). However, at the same time the Civil Rights Movement started to fight against racial discrimination in the US and criticised the diversion of responsibility for poverty from structural factors to cultural patterns (ibid., p. 2). In line with that, Marxist views on segregation decried the structures in society as cause for segregation (Ruiz-Tagle 2016). Segregation was seen as a result of capitalist societies (Machado Bógus n.d., p. 3). This criticism, among other things,
led academia to “discredit the idea of a culture of poverty and to recognize racism and isolation as the main factors” of urban segregation (Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 2).

In the 1980s and 1990s, a new wave of research on residential segregation emerged, focused on concentrated poverty, especially in inner-city areas, as a new problem (Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 3). The forced mixing of different social groups was believed to solve the problems of concentrated poverty (ibid., p. 4). Moreover, at the same time, public housing was attacked for its design, i.e. a high number of units and high-rise buildings as well as high vacancy rates (ibid., pp. 3-4). Urban design principles were believed to be able to address aesthetic and efficiency issues but also to solve some social problems (ibid., p. 4). One example of a comprehensive set of urban design principles is New Urbanism: “This movement created prescriptions regarding physical design, land use, demographic diversity, transportation measures, safety measures, and architectural symbolism” (ibid., p. 4). Another major line of thought used for urban segregation policies is the development of neoliberalism paradigms between the 1970s and 1990s (ibid., p. 5). These led to less public housing and again foisted responsibility off from the state on the poor.

Although, these lines of thought had their peak in a chronological order, Ruiz-Tagle (2013b) assumes that they all are still underlying in the foundation of recent desegregation policies, that is a) the portrayal of ghettos as pathological social forms, b) the link between poverty concentration and social problems, c) the implicit suggestion that geographies of opportunity follow the more powerful groups and trickle-down to the rest, and d) the assumptions that socially mixed environments would create a so-called virtuous circle of social networks. He criticises that, once some concepts are put by scholars, politicians find it easy to, for instance, not establish anti-segregation policies but blame the poor for the segregation (ibid., p. 11). To better understand the policy consequences that follow from these lines of thought, the following sub-chapter discusses different definitions of segregation as well as underlying paradigms that are used in contemporary academia.

### 2.2. Definitions of urban segregation

The Oxford dictionary describes segregation as “the action or state of setting someone or something apart from others” or, more specifically, as “the enforced separation of different racial groups in a country, community, or establishment” (Oxford English Living Dictionaries 2017a). Synonyms are separation, setting apart, keeping apart, and sorting out (Oxford English Living Dictionaries 2017a). Thus, urban segregation might be defined as the intentional or unintentional separation of a specific group or area within a city. Moreover, Machado Bógus (n.d.) understands segregation as a separation that is not actively brought about by the segregated group. Thus, her definition excludes voluntarily separated urban areas, such as gated communities. It therefore is also different from the mere concentration of particular social groups within a city as long as this concentration happens voluntarily (Musterd 2003, p. 630).

Machado Bógus defines urban segregation as a “social groups’ involuntary isolation in certain spaces within cities” (n.d., p. 10). Further, “it can be considered as a consequence or manifestation of social relations that are established and based on social structure,
stratification, rules and conduct codes in place then” (Machado Bógus n.d., p. 1). Thus, Machado Bógus (n.d.) understands urban segregation as spatial separation of social groups due to social reasons. Ruiz-Tagle’s concept of urban segregation is in line with that: “Segregation can be defined as a reflection of social causes (e.g. prejudice, discrimination, a sense of superiority) with physical manifestations (i.e. denial of access to space, spatial concentration) and social consequences (e.g. social dislocations)” (2013a, p. 389). Young (2000) speaks in that regard of residential segregation, that is the concentration of specific social groups in a neighbourhood. Thus, residential segregation will be understood as “the spatial separation of two or more social groups within a specified geographic area, such as a municipality, a county, or a metropolitan area” (Ignatov/Timberlake 2014). Andersen et al. use the term spatial segregation but understand it just the same as the spatial separation of social and cultural groups within society (Andersen et al. 2016, p. 2).

However, Lima (2001) argues that also the spatial characteristics of an urban area can lead to or support its segregation from the city. Based on the analysis of Brazilian cities, he stresses the importance of urban form for segregation. He states “that the concept of socio-spatial segregation should be enriched by the investigation of urban form”, defining urban form as the physical form of the public realm, such as architectural elements (Lima 2001, p. 494). One important factor to assess the degree of segregation of an area is, according to him, accessibility, understood as the “result of the combination of the network of spaces and the provision of public transport” (Lima 2001, p. 495). It includes the actual measure of access across space within different parts of the city, the degree of physical mobility, and the perceived accessibility for individuals (Lima 2001, p. 494). Accessibility is thus also closely connected to the provision of employment and social opportunities (Lima 2001, p. 507). This addition does not oppose the aforementioned definitions but merely expands them by spatial causes of segregation, such as architecture or geographical distance.

Thus, the term segregation can refer to involuntary social, spatial, or social and spatial separation of a district from the rest of the city. Areas as well as groups can be excluded from the social life of the city due to for instance racial discrimination but they can also be segregated due to a lack of accessibility to the inner city areas. Socio-spatial segregation combines these two factors and is therefore more complex in its characteristics and outcomes: A district and its residents are involuntarily separated from the greater city life as social and spatial segregation mechanisms take place and influence each other. The following sub-chapters will discuss how this type of segregation emerges and intensifies, which consequences follow, and what can be done about it.

2.3. Emergence and intensification

Causes and consequences of urban segregation are argued to differ between the US and Europe: “In Europe, levels of segregation are relatively low and levels of integration of the poor relatively high, while the US has relatively higher levels of segregation and lower levels of integration” (Musterd 2003, p. 623). The US have a longer history of racial discrimination issues leading to bigger and more homogenous race-based neighbourhoods (Young 2000, pp. 198-201). Cities in the US are often characterised by a wider urban sprawl and the
existence of surrounding suburbs. Wealthier people tend to move from the cities to the countryside where they can afford single-family houses. In contrast, cities in Europe often have an old city centre with apartment buildings which is perceived as attractive. Furthermore, the building and housing policies of many cities in Europe have been influenced by the vast destruction after the Second World War.

A common form of segregated urban areas in Europe are mass housing districts built between the 1960s and 1980s, often referred to as ‘deprived neighbourhoods’ in academic literature (cf. e.g. Andersen 2002, p. 153). Andersen states that this phenomenon is quite common in Europe and that “most European countries have had experiences with the special problems that have emerged in certain more or less well defined parts of the cities called deprived or depressed neighbourhoods” (Andersen 2002, p. 153; Andersen 2008, p. 79). He states that this phenomenon is not anymore confined to the oldest urban areas in a city with the lowest housing quality but shifted to newer housing estates at the city’s outer areas (Andersen 2002, p. 153). One of the reasons behind the segregation of these areas is the market mechanism of supply and demand: “Different kinds of housing are to a different extent attractive and accessible for different social groups” (Andersen et al. 2016, p. 2). In several studies, Andersen et al. detect a strong connection between the uneven spatial distribution of different housing tenures and urban segregation (2016, p. 23). Andersen assumes that “the emergence of urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods is related to social segregation, which tends to concentrate the poor in the least attractive parts of a city”, that is today modernist mass housing neighbourhoods (2002, p. 154).

However, this initial segregating effect of the housing market is intensifies by itself. Once, neighbourhoods are perceived as poor, “ordinary’ people flee to other parts of the cities, thereby making room for an increasing concentration of low-income and socially excluded groups and thus increasing the spatial division of social groups. This effect is even more serious when looking at the segregation of ethnic minorities, where the forces at work are much stronger because many from the native population tend to avoid neighbourhoods with high concentrations of ethnic minorities” (Andersen 2008, p. 80). These neighbourhoods are usually not capable of escaping the downward spiral of segregation and decay but instead new segregation and inequality is created: “The areas can be seen as magnetic poles that attract poverty and social problems, and repel people and economic resources in a way that influences other parts of the urban space. They are the visible signs that cities are subject to special socio-spatial forces that create social and physical inequality, unstable conditions and sometimes destruction” (Andersen 2002, p. 154).

When visible signs of social and physical decay appear, such as graffiti, crime rates, and littering, these neighbourhoods' public image worsens. This again causes even more decay as the labelling of an area as deprived, excluded, exposed, or segregated often leads to its stigmatisation and an unfavourable public image (Legeby 2010, p. 2; Andersen 2002, p. 155). Bolt, Burger, and van Kempen speak of self-fulfilling prophecies in this regard: “Concentration neighborhoods can turn into breeding grounds for misery because they are labeled as such” (1998, pp. 87-88). This process' speed and development can differ between cities but is usually independent from the cities' overall development (Andersen 2002, p. 167). Thus, simply put, the initial perception of a neighbourhood as unattractive
leads to a homogenisation of its residents as only those who cannot afford something more attractive are compelled to stay. This makes the neighbourhood even more unattractive for wealthier people, leading to a downward spiral of socio-spatial segregation.

2.4. Consequences of urban segregation

While these accounts explain how urban segregation emerges and becomes more intense, the following part focuses on its effects. Ignatov and Timberlake (2014) assume that segregation usually harms citizens groups with lesser means but can benefit groups with high levels of capital. However, most of the scholars see segregation as having mainly negative impacts on cities and their inhabitants, such as the denial of basic infrastructure and public services, fewer job opportunities, intense prejudice and discrimination, and higher exposure to violence (cf. Feitosa et al. 2007, p. 300; Bolt et al. 1998, p. 84). Just the same, Smets and Salman (2008) focus on the notion of exclusion: they distinguish between social-cultural, economic and financial, and political and judicial exclusion from the city that will happen to those living in segregated neighbourhoods. Ruiz-Tagle also proposes different dimensions of exclusion: “physical exclusion as residential segregation; functional exclusion as denied access to opportunities; relational exclusion as indifference and denied participation; and symbolic exclusion as imaginary construction of otherness” (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 402). Other scholars also stress that segregation diminishes the opportunities to participate in civil society as there is no or little contact to relevant individuals and institutions (cf. Bolt et al. 1998, p. 85): “When inhabitants have no opportunity to interact with others anymore and become isolated and stigmatised, problems will develop. The theory says that children who grow up in these environments run the risk of socialising in the ‘wrong way’. If unemployment is regarded as normal in such an environment, children might start to think that way too” (Musterd 2003, p. 638).

The clustering of poverty, unemployment, and welfare dependency can create a local climate that generates attitudes and practices that further deepen the social and economic isolation of the local residents (Bolt et al. 1998, p. 85). Moreover, a concentration of lower-income residents can have negative effects on the presence of commercial and non-commercial facilities, especially when the residents of the area in question are not very capable of standing up for themselves and demanding public facilities as, for instance, health care, police surveillance, or adequate schools (Bolt et al. 1998, p. 87). Besides, homeowners may have no money to invest in their dwelling and landlords may not keep up their properties setting off a self-reinforcing cycle of decline (Bolt et al. 1998, p. 87). Other frequent associations are with school dropouts, drug and alcohol abuse, lack of political participation, unequal access to education, erosion of the economic base, lack of spatial mobility, activity segregation, consequent lack of social mobility, and a magnification of poverty due to its concentration (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 390).

However, other authors find also positive aspects regarding the segregation of districts: drawing on other studies, Ruiz-Tagle states that segregation can be beneficial as anonymity within the segregated group is decreased while a local culture as well as local social support networks can be developed (2013a, p. 391). Moreover, it facilitates ethnic entrepreneurship as the concentration of ethnic minority groups within one district creates the opportunity to
open ethnic-specific shops (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 391). In other words: “The development, existence, and nurturing of social contacts made possible by the physical proximity of like-minded people can be seen as an extremely useful aspect of spatial segregation and concentration. Social contacts can lead to the emergence and preservation of a culture that is not based on the norms and values of mainstream society but on those of a specific group” (Bolt et al. 1998, p. 88). Also Young states that “the clustering of people who feel particular affinity with one another because they share similar difficulties and stigmas which they can resist together, is no more wrong in the European context than in the American. Residential clustering can and often does offer benefits of civic organization and networking among group members” (2000, p. 220). It may be therefore useful to return to the aforementioned distinction between the voluntary concentration or clustering of like-minded people and their involuntary exclusion from the main society, i.e. segregation.

This means that while the concentration of certain social groups can have beneficial outcomes and should not be viewed as per se problematic, it becomes an issue when these groups are forced to live in a separated area of the city. Moreover, it is an issue if the voluntary or involuntary concentration leads to their exclusion from the rest of the city. Moreover, spatial segregation, that is the lack of accessibility, is in most cases problematic. Thus, segregation should be faced as it entails crucial parts of life, such as employment, welfare, and education. As it impedes communication and civic participation among the segregated groups, it violates basic democratic principles (Young 2000, p. 196).

2.5. Desegregation and integration

After having engaged in the definition, the causes, and effects of urban segregation, the question remains how the negative consequences of urban segregation can be avoided. Strategies to mitigate the negative effects and integrate segregated districts have been proposed in the literature and will be assessed in the remainder of this chapter. But to start with it should be defined what integration means. The Oxford dictionary defines integration as “the intermixing of people who were previously segregated” (Oxford English Living Dictionaries 2017b). Among the synonyms are terms such as combination, incorporation, unification, consolidation, blending, homogenisation, desegregation, and inclusion (Oxford English Living Dictionaries 2017b). The definition of integrating is to “combine (one thing) with another to form a whole”, to “bring (people or groups with particular characteristics or needs) into equal participation in or membership of a social group or institution” or to “desegregate (a school, area, etc.), especially racially” (Oxford English Living Dictionaries 2017c). Thus, just as segregation, integration is first and foremost a relational term: It describes the action of combining and consolidating one thing, an area or a group of people, with another. Integration can not occur purely on its own but there needs to be another area or group in which the segregated part can be included and incorporated.

Even though one of the synonyms of integration is to desegregate, Ruiz-Tagle detects a difference between desegregation and integration (2013a, p. 394). He argues that integration is not the opposite of segregation but desegregation is: “The physical proximity of different social groups (desegregation) would not lead to an integrated city “(Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 396). Thus, the delocation and restructuring of citizens will not do. Young,
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Even though the general concept of gentrification is widely accepted in academia, it is still unsettled if gentrification has positive, negative, or neutral effects on a city as a whole (cf. Kohn 2013; Slater 2009). Kohn, however, identifies five harms associated with gentrification from the academic literature: residential displacement; exclusion; transformation of public, social and commercial space; polarization; and homogenization (2013, p. 297). These effects are mainly caused by the increase in rents due to the higher interest in the area which former residents and business-owners cannot afford anymore (Kohn 2013, p. 299). Therefore, gentrification is not to equate with integration. Gentrification is always defined as a process – which is similar to integration - but just as the concepts of desegregation and social mixing, gentrification focuses mainly on the socio-economic characteristics of residents and not on their relationship with each other or the rest of the city.

In order to achieve integration the roots and not only the outcomes of segregation must be considered. Desegregation policies that focused solely on the mixing of incomes have generated disconnection of citizens from existing networks and, on a higher level, caused gentrification in high-poverty sites and increasing housing deficits due to the slow replacement of demolished units (Ruiz-Tagle 2013b, p. 5). Just as it is not enough to only create physical proximity it is not enough to only reverse poverty in order to fight the exclusion: “Segregation is an intervening variable in the production of poverty. This suggests
that if we treat just the social causes of poverty, we overlook the intensifying effect of physical concentration. In turn, if we deal only with the spatial enclosure, we would be treating only the intervening variable, not the causes" (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 392). Just the same, forced voluntary mixing only aims at one of the indicators of segregation but does not counter the actual issue of exclusion. However, Andersen states that social concentration of a specific social group, that is poor people, can lead to an increase in poverty and social exclusion (Andersen 2000, p. 768). He, therefore, claims that while in general social concentration is not an issue, so-called “pockets of poverty” are and should be countered by public measures - however, not necessarily by relocating and forced social mixing (Andersen 2000, p. 768).

Also other scholars call for public action in order to face the segregation in cities (cf. e.g. Musterd 2003, p. 638). As segregation is among other things a product of the choices people make regarding their living preferences, segregated districts must be made more attractive in order to integrate them (cf. Andersen 2002, p. 155; Andersen 2008, p. 80; Young 2000, p. 197). Factors that influence living preferences are the physical and social environment, access to transport, jobs, services and natural beauties, as well as status and cultural identity (Andersen 2002, p. 155). Thus, it is important to enhance the physical and social attractiveness as well as the accessibility of a segregated neighbourhood by improving the public transport system, embellishing buildings and facades, facilitating job accessibility, and ensuring access to schools, supermarkets, and public services. Musterd also calls first and foremost for policies in the domains of education and labour market access (Musterd 2003, p. 638).

Even so, it is important to not only enhance the attractiveness of the location on a physical level, but to also consider how to improve the attachment to the neighbourhood, the identity, and perception of the place: "The treatment of segregation should not be focused merely in terms of location, but in terms of a more complex sociology of place that includes human interactions and collective constructions" (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 392). In order to avoid that people who can afford it move away as soon as possible, it is crucial to strengthen the identification and social bond with the neighbourhood (Andersen 2008, p. 80). Andersen, hence, claims the importance of “supporting social activities that create social networks and establishing meeting places and facilities” (Andersen 2008, p. 99). He states that dissatisfaction with physical conditions in general has not much influence on the decision to move but that physical nuisance that mirrors social problems - like vandalism, poor maintenance, litter, and graffiti - has importance because it is a visible sign of social decay (Andersen 2008, p. 99). He also states the importance of the residents’ perception of the reputation and social status of the neighbourhood (Andersen 2008, p. 99).

In order to make their analysis more systematic, several scholars tried to group integration approaches into types of strategies. Smets and Salman (2008), for instance, detect three strategies that are used by politicians and administrations to mitigate the negative effects of segregation: mixing strategies, escapist strategies, and de-informalisation strategies. Mixing strategies aim at bringing different population groups together, for example by creating a differentiated supply of housing (Smets/Salman 2008, p. 21). While a forced mixing of population via de- and relocation is likely to fail, such indirect measures can at least make up
a part of integration strategies. In contrast, escapist strategies are not a public strategy but a coping mechanism of more well-off citizens: They may settle in their own isolated areas to escape unwanted poorer neighbours (Smets/Salman 2008, p. 21). This phenomenon, however, leads only to deeper segregation within a city and should be avoided. Lastly, de-informalisation strategies are the coping mechanism by the segregated population leading a life outside of the main society (Smets/Salman 2008, p. 25). As they are excluded from the main society, they live and work entirely or partly outside of the judicial system creating informal rules and customs, i.e. they de-informalise their own life as they cannot participate in the formal settings (Smets/Salman 2008, p. 25). This, again, leads to more intense segregation and should be avoided. So, what in fact can city administrations do when they detect segregation within their city?

Ruiz-Tagle proposes “a generalized non-exclusionary form of zoning (which would tackle both elite and ghetto segregation), and integrative policies that consider much more than location” (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 397). He, moreover, suggests a table of socio-spatial integration combining physical and social measures. All socio-spatial dimensions mentioned below should be fulfilled in order to achieve integration. Functional integration into the city might be achieved by enhancing access to public transport, public services, and other commercial and non-commercial facilities; to achieve symbolic and relational integration, strategies should focus on improving the neighbourhood climate and social cohesion within the district and with the remainder of the city; moreover, identification with the district and the city is important; the segregated district must be viewed as a part of the city in order to become an attractive living space. These measures are set to enhance the attractiveness of a neighbourhood and, thus, should lead to social mixing by itself. Although not mentioned in the table below, cleanliness and safety as well as a mix of tenures is crucial to make the neighbourhood liveable.

Table of socio-spatial integration (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro dimensions</th>
<th>Socio-spatial dimensions</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>systemic</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>Physical proximity between different social groups (defined by power and status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>functional</td>
<td>Effective access to opportunities and services in the territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social</td>
<td>relational</td>
<td>Non-hierarchical interaction between different social groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbolic</td>
<td>Identification with a common ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Andersen distinguishes between three strategic approaches: “(1) Efforts to combat the exclusion of neighbourhoods: initiatives that focus on how to stop and reverse the self-perpetuating processes that make some areas increasingly stigmatised and unattractive compared with the rest of the city. (2) Area-based efforts to combat social exclusion: as a supplement to general welfare policies, it can sometimes be relevant to have efforts concentrated in deprived urban areas for two reasons: to combat the special effects
produced by area deprivation that tend to increase social exclusion; and, because local private resources perhaps could be mobilised to support public efforts. (3) General efforts to combat segregation: initiatives that attack conditions which tend to increase segregation - for example, differences between tenures or rules for the allocation of dwellings in social housing” (Andersen 2000, p. 771). This distinction can also be used to categorise all the aforementioned measures from a public policy point of view.

All in all, there is, hence, no general strategy to successfully integrate segregated city districts or neighbourhoods that could be derived from the academic literature. The appropriate measures depend heavily on the specific characteristics and issues of the district and the city. However, the literature indicates that all the dimensions of segregation must be considered while developing an integration strategy. Since social and spatial mechanisms lead to the segregation of an area, influence, and intensify each other, a socio-spatial integration approach is indicated. It is not enough to only change the physical appearance of a district or trying to fight the local poverty. It is definitely not sufficient or efficient to force social mixing by relocating citizens as this leads to physical but not social proximity between social groups. Instead, comprehensive and long-term socio-spatial integration strategies should be exercised that take the residents into account. Overall, it is important to note that integration is always a relational approach. It is not enough to focus only on change in the segregated neighbourhood or the local population but the city and all of its citizens must be considered. Having, thus, made a theoretical research on the concept of urban segregation and integration as well as on possible governance measures, in the following, it will be looked at how the city administrations of Århus, Malmö, and Mannheim understand the concepts and approach the issue.

3. Methods

Before analysing the case studies, the following chapter elaborates on the research design of the study, the used methods, and the limitations of the research.

3.1. Selection of cases and used methods

In order to find answers to the research aims, that are

*How can city administrations integrate socially and spatially segregated mass housing districts in cities with an industrial past? and Why do cities have different integration approaches?*

it was decided to conduct a comparative case study. Three cases were chosen that would allow for a variation in policy-design but have otherwise similar characteristics in order to assess possibilities of counter-segregation policies. Thus, a “most similar” design was chosen with cases of the same phenomenon, that is urban segregation of European mass housing districts (cf. George/Bennett 2005, pp. 69/83). To ensure that the cases were analysed in similar depth and width and thus provide comparable data, a set of four questions was developed (cf. research questions in chapter 1; George/Bennett 2005, pp. 67/69).
The cases studies were therefore chosen due to their comparability. Having an initial interest in the case of Rosengård and Malmö, cities with similar characteristics were sought out. A preliminary analysis discovered that the cities of Århus and Mannheim not only have similar characteristics but similar segregated districts and also try to solve the issues present with public policies. A further investigation of the cases showed that the cities share a similar post-industrial history and consist of around 300 000 inhabitants. They all have at least one district that consists of mainly residential high-rise buildings constructed between the 1960s and 1980s which suffers from high unemployment and crime rates as well as a bad public reputation. However, different counter-segregation strategies are pursued that allow for a valuable comparison of the municipal scope of action in that regard.

The cases were then examined based on a content analysis of official documents as well as on in-depth expert interviews with representatives of the respective city administrations. By analysing documents issued by the city administrations, the underlying premises for the strategies as well as the city administrations’ perspectives were to be investigated. In order to get a better insight into the reasoning, it was decided to conduct additional expert interviews. These were also to provide knowledge on how the city administrations perceived the strategies after a couple of years and what they planned for the future. Semi-structured interview guidelines were developed in order to receive comparable data but also to allow for additional information that was not thought about before (cf. Appendix). The interviewees were chosen due to their position in the city administration and their knowledge on the district as well as the strategy. They were then contacted via e-mail and interviewed via telephone (Århus and Mannheim) or in person (Malmö). The interviews were recorded and transcribed (and in the case of Mannheim translated) in order to be able to listen to them again and not miss out on any information.

The knowledge gathered through the interviews as well as the content analysis is presented in this paper. As it is beneficial to have maps as well as pictures to understand the segregation and counter-segregation strategies in the cities, a supplementary website was set up: [http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/](http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/). The website is able to provide more in-depth information on the districts and illustrates especially the physical appearance and spatial location of the districts. It is moreover used to make linkages to the original city documents available to those who are interested.

### 3.2. Limitations of the research

This research faces some limitations due to the selection of cases, the choice and conduct of methods, and the overall framing of the research interest. Since only three cases are analysed, this study cannot claim general knowledge on urban segregation or all the possible counter-segregation measures. Although it provides some knowledge on how particular cities deal with a similar issue, this cannot be generalised to answer how the respective countries deal with the issue as a rule. Neither can it provide knowledge on if cities in general, especially cities in other parts of the world than Europe, suffer from segregation or what successful counter-strategies would look like. Moreover, the national settings of the analysed cases were not taken into account, that is for example the scope of
action municipalities have in these countries, or the state of the national economy. However, these are factors that may influence the cities’ decision to deal or not deal with urban segregation as well as their choice of measures.

Moreover, the outcome of the strategies were not a focal point of the study although the actual success of planned measures is a valuable factor in evaluating the approaches. In order to achieve this knowledge it is crucial to conduct the perception of residents of the area as well as making field trips to the districts. This could not be accomplished in the short timeframe. Furthermore, the research would profit from a higher number of interviewees in each case, as especially the analyses of Århus and Mannheim rely heavily on only one source of information in that regard. Overall, it has to be said that this analysis is an interpretation based on official documents and empirical material collected via interviews, that is made from an outsider-perspective, as it is not within the scope of this study to obtain a proper insight by visiting the districts or conducting more ethnographically oriented studies. To gain more knowledge in the matter an ethnographic study could be useful, e.g. a participatory observation or qualitative interviews with participants or organisers of the social initiatives, or possibly a survey with the residents in each respective district. However, the study can give some valuable knowledge on how different cities deal with urban segregation.

4. Presentation of case studies

The following chapter focuses on the description and analysis of the case studies. Firstly, the cases are described, then the counter-segregation approaches are illustrated, and, lastly, the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches are assessed.

4.1. Århus

4.1.1. Århus: description of the case

Århus is Denmark’s second biggest city, with 269 000 inhabitants. It is located on the eastern side of the peninsula Jutland by Århus bay. Århus has been known as settlement since the 10th century but was first formally recognised as a city in 1441. Due to its prime location in terms of maritime trading, the city grew exponentially and was quite an important centre for commerce in the medieval era. Along with the entry of industrialisation in the 19th century the infrastructure developed extensively, namely the road and rail network, as well as the harbour. Today it is Jutlands biggest centre for commerce, service, and industry. The second largest university of Denmark, founded in 1928, is located on a campus just outside of central Århus along with the university hospital (Lykke-Andersen 2017a).

Gellerup is a neighbourhood in Brabrand located on the western border of Århus, covering the neighbourhoods Toveshøj and Gellerupparken. Around 11 000 people currently reside in the area. Toveshøj and Gellerupparken combined are made up of more than 80 nationalities with 86% of the residents having a non-Danish origin. 80% of the population have a refugee- or immigrant background from a non-western country. Compared to the rest of Århus, the young population is relatively large, almost 40% are under 18 years, while in the municipality at large it is only 21%. Half of the residents in Gellerup are outside the official labour market, of which 25% have gone into early retirement and 20% receive welfare subsidies. The
average income is 151 000 DKK/year (Samvirket 2012), which is lower than average in Århus (179 000 DKK/year in 2006; Aarhus Kommune n.d. c).

The district was developed in the early 1970s within the framework of Gellerupplanen (Lykke-Andersen 2017b) as a way to solve the staggering housing crisis (Effekt n.d.). It was planned as an ambitious, prefabricated residential area consisting of smaller and larger housing blocks. The district was meant to function as an infill in between the old city centre of Århus and single-family houses and detached town houses built in the outskirts of the city between 1930 and 1970. The blocks in Gellerup have 4 to 8 storeys and were mostly directed to those who otherwise could not afford a decent home elsewhere (Van Aerschot/Daenzer 2014). The district was planned to enable residents to live their lives within the area, supplying them with various facilities: a library, schools, a swimming pool, and even the largest shopping centre in the whole region (Van Aerschot/Daenzer 2014). Today it is Denmark’s largest solitary modernistic dwelling and referred to as mono-functional, disadvantaged, and as having a general bad reputation (ibid.). Moreover the district has been described as a residential ghetto and is closely associated with high crime rates, socio-economic marginalisation, unemployment, and integration difficulties (Aarhus Kommune n.d. b).

4.1.2. Århus: description of the strategy

The following analysis is primarily based on the empirical data gathered in a telephone interview with Per Frølund on 9 May 2017, the official comprehensive plan for the project (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007), and other supporting official documents produced and/or published by the city administration. Per Frølund is a programme manager of the Master plan in Gellerup and works in the Mayor’s office.

Why and how did the city administration of Århus plan counter-segregation policies?

When asked about what the district of Gellerup was like before the Master plan was initiated, Frølund explains that it was experienced as closed and isolated. The residents (especially the female residents) would rarely leave the area and the only reason for people from the rest of Århus to visit was the public pool. In the media it was described as a ghetto and criminal incidents were reported nationally, e.g. as a kindergarten was burnt down. The road structure made it difficult to access the area, even by car, as many roads where one-way-streets (interview Frølund).

The Master plan identifies Gellerup as a socially deprived area that they want to make a part of the city by creating “anchors” or “magnets” to not only tie the residents to the area but also invite visitors to a greater extent (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 3). The aim is to make Gellerup an urban district and to enable people from different areas to meet and mix (interview Frølund). The municipality’s website on the project refers to research (both domestic and international) that indicates that to divert a negative development of isolation and deprivation, there needs to be a combination of social and structural/physical efforts, where the residents’ educational levels, working life, and income will be positively influenced (Aarhus Kommune n.d. a). Frølund emphasises the importance of having a holistic approach, also comparing this project to other similar projects in Denmark, which have been more one-sided and therefore fractured and not very successful. The key,
according to him, is making structural changes otherwise the more well-off residents will leave the area when they have the possibility to do so (interview Frølund).

The foundational idea of the project is that no urban development project can or should create a forced social mixing. However, in this project they do attempt to make structural changes, which will give all the residents of Århus greater possibilities of meeting and interacting and hopefully break down the barriers between the districts, i.e. physical structural changes combined with social efforts (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007). Frølund explains that it is important to not settle for one finished plan but to have the political patience to develop the plan over the years. Moreover the plan should start strong so everyone can see that the municipality really means business. The plan has to be developed from there as one cannot do everything in just one big blow. It is not possible to do everything at once as there is not enough funding. Furthermore, it would be a bad idea because the municipality has gotten wiser throughout the process: “We are creating a small city within this district and we are not the only ones who want to develop in the area right now, a lot of people are starting to get involved. However, we cannot create everything. We invite people in and they don’t always do what we want them to do, so we talk about it and find a solution. Creating a small city life is not something you can plan or control, you can simply make a foundation for it. We do not have a recipe for it, but we have done quite well so far. We are definitely not there yet” (interview Frølund).

The project was initiated by Brabrand Boligforening (housing organisation) and the City of Århus, and was funded by the Danish Ministry of Social Affairs. The foundation Landsbyggefonden has set aside 911 million DKK in the form of direct funding and subsidised loans are earmarked for Brabrand boligforening, more specifically for the housing development (SmartAarhus 2015).

*How are the concepts of segregation and integration perceived by the city administration of Århus? What are the underlying thoughts and premises?*

Gellerup’s mono-functional character and uniform physical expression in combination with the residents lack of connection to the labour market, the low income, and a large number of children without a supporting role model, puts the district at risk of becoming a secluded parallel community to Århus (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 5).

The fundamental vision of the project is to create a “unique and diverse part of the city with its completely own character, architectural structure and city life” (Åarhus Kommune n.d. a). The stakeholders aim to develop a new part of the city where social and physical problems of isolation are solved by creating diversity in the city life and the composition of the residents. As the area has been considered segregated it is important to lift the general standards and adapt the rates of education, health, and crime to match the rest of Århus (Aarhus Kommune n.d. a).

When asked whether he would consider the Master plan as an integration strategy, Frølund claims that it is not in the sense of integrating immigrants or newcomers, but it is a way of integrating and connecting the district of Gellerup with Århus, as it has been one of the more
deprived areas in Denmark and has been quite isolated in the past. The concept of integration (in the sense of integrating Gellerup, not immigrants) is very present in the city administration’s day-to-day agenda and Frølund claims that the Mayor talks about it frequently. It is not only important that the residents of Gellerup feel that they have the opportunity to leave, but also that non-residents have an interest in visiting Gellerup, something the “A taste à la Gellerup”-project (“Smag à la Gellerup”) was very successful in achieving. It is a small way of opening the area up mentally. The final vision is that one will not know where one district starts and another stops, it will simply be an uninterrupted flow (interview Frølund).

Frølund himself is primarily involved with the more spatial and physical changes, but talks at length about the importance of the participation of the public. This is highlighted in the Master plan (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 4), but in our interview Frølund explains that this is a point where they have struggled slightly: the participation has been less than what they had hoped for, possibly due to the language barriers and lack of interest. Currently they are producing a brochure that will be sent to 50 000 households, informing them about the project, the intentions, and the progress (ibid.).

*What measures are planned by the city administration in Århus (and what are the taken measures and their outcomes)?*

The following initiatives are all within the framework of the Master plan. The stakeholders and financiers differ slightly between the projects, e.g. most of the housing initiatives are done by the housing organisation, while the city administration is responsible for the public participation efforts, in cooperation with various interest organisations.

There are 319 youth housing units planned, which will be located in close proximity to the main road. Frølund and his colleagues believe that offering housing to students and young people will be the start of a differentiation process of the population. According to him one cannot expect people with an established career and a good financial situation to choose to move to Gellerup now, considering its reputation.

Another effort to achieve a greater diversity of residents, is a greater variety in tenure and housing forms. Many of the pre-existent housing blocks are being renovated and new housing will be built as infill in between the pre-existent blocks in order to attract new socio-economic groups. In addition, the city administration has in cooperation with the housing organisation extended the already existing ‘combined renting’-scheme (Kombineret udlejning). That means that not only empty apartments are being transformed to house other functions, but also that certain social groups are prioritised as long as there is a general demand in the housing market in Gellerup (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 14). Moreover, residents that will be relocated due the rebuilding of the area have a sort of ‘safety guarantee’, i.e. they are sure to be offered housing of the same standard, either in the same neighbourhood or in a different part of Århus if they wish (ibid, p. 16).

A phase in the plan that is close to be finished is the restructuring of the road network and opening the area up - also symbolically. An important part of this is the establishing of a new
main road from Bazar Vest (shopping centre) to City Vest. It will serve as a connection of Gellerup with the rest of the city, starting at the border of the western part of Århus and stretching through the heart of Gellerup. The idea is to develop the area along the main road to make the area more vivacious and active. Moreover, a large proportion of the city functions and jobs in the public sector will be situated in close proximity to the main road (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 8). Another important aspect in this process is making room in for the light-way tram that will run through the centre of Gellerup and further connect the district with the rest of Århus. The municipality has their financing in place, but is waiting for the funding from the state to be confirmed. The space for the rail has already been included in the new road structure and Frølund is convinced that it will happen (interview Frølund).

Århus, moreover, provides some more socially oriented efforts, that aim at strengthening the residents’ sense of community by offering places where they can meet and mingle, and provide outsiders with a reason to visit the district. Firstly, the local library will be renovated which is another effort that is to activate the main road. Secondly, there are plans for a facility that will work as a common space for all the local associations. Frølund calls it a “union house” (“samlingshus”) (ibid.). It is referred to as functioning as a cultural anchor in the Master plan document (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 10). Moreover, to meet the needs of the more ‘active’ residents there will also be a large sport and leisure campus with both sport and culture facilities open to the general public (ibid., p. 7). There are also a number of more temporary projects that aim to create a more positive image of the district and attract more visitors, for example ‘food projects’ where the locals gather to cook and sell food for the visitors to buy - “Smag á la Gellerup” (interview Frølund).

4.1.3. Århus: analysis of the strategy

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy? What are the risks and benefits?

Machado Bógus (n.d.) defines segregation as the concentration of a group that is involuntarily and spatially isolated. This separation is caused by social reasons, one of these reasons being poverty. The same logic applies to the case of Gellerup: there is a concentration of the local society’s weaker socio-economic groups, which some have referred to as poor (DR Nyheder), although this is of course a relative term in a global setting. Both Andersen (2016) and Ruiz-Tagle (2013a; 2013b) consider spatial separation to be a central, but not complete, explanation for the causes of segregation. One can argue that Lima’s (2001) reasoning concur with this, since he points to urban form and provision of public transport being determinants of segregation, i.e. a spatial separation is emphasised by distance, or experienced distance, which is in turn enhanced by the lack of (public) transport. According to Frølund, there has been limited accessibility to and from Gellerup, which is further indicated by the choice of investing in a new road structure and the establishing of the light-way tram. In addition, Andersen (2016) suggest that the urban poor tend to concentrate in the least attractive parts of the city, i.e. a modernist mass housing district, like for example Gellerup, and that when it has received a label of stigma, the more wealthy people flee. In the interview with Frølund, he stated that this is something that has occurred in Gellerup and that they are working consciously to make the area more attractive.
in order to avoid this. He also stated that he can see a limited access to opportunities and a tendency for the residents not to complain as much as residents in other areas would, or really stand up for themselves. Andersen (2016) determines this as consequences of segregation.

As mentioned previously in this chapter, Frølund as a programme manager, would consider the Master plan as some sort of effort to integrate Gellerup as a district with the rest of Århus. This seems to be in accordance with the theoretical framework presented in this paper: a general view of integration is that it aims at merging or consolidating one area with another. The grand of majority of the authors referred to in the literature overview concur on the importance of a combination of social and spatial/structural efforts: “[...] if we treat just the social causes of poverty, we overlook the intensifying effect of physical concentration. In turn, if we deal only with the spatial enclosure, we would be treating only the intervening variable, not the causes” (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 392). The Master plan presents efforts of both characters and when asked about the essence of the project, Frølund declares very clearly that the objectives are structural changes in combination with social efforts.

Although some of the measures in Gellerup aim at achieving social mixing and people have to move out during restructuring efforts, the Master plan does not entail a forced relocation of residents as these residents have a guaranteed right to return. However, a bigger variety of housing forms and tenures is to be offered in the future and youth housing estates are built. Thus, the city administration does indeed try to attract other social groups to the area, but has in fact no real expectations that well-off people will move to Gellerup (cf. interview Frølund). The effort of attracting younger people with cultural capital as well as the transformation of tenures can however be seen as a first step towards a planned gentrification of the area.

Segregation is an effect of living preferences, so in order to integrate an area it needs to be made attractive. In practice, this means, according to Andersen (2002), to improve the aesthetics and social attractiveness of the area by e.g. offering good accessibility: in form of public transport, access to the labour market, embellishing of buildings and facades, and access to public services like schools and health care. As mentioned before, there are transport efforts in place in the Master plan for Gellerup. Moreover, the large mass housing blocks are being restructured and the facades renovated to give a more unique and varied impression of the area and to increase the attractiveness of Gellerup. The relocation of 1 000 jobs in the public sector is supposed to create an inflow of people from other parts of Århus, but also to increase the accessibility for the local residents to the labour market. In addition, some of these jobs also involve various public services, which will with then be more accessible to the residents of Gellerup.

Ruiz-Tagle’s (2013a) reasoning on functional integration incorporates similar ideas, but also refers to softer aspects of social cohesion, improving the neighbourhood climate and the identification with the district. These aspects are important to also keep the more well-off residents in the area and thereby avoid a magnification of poverty. He claims that this would lead to social mixing occurring organically, i.e. trying to create a more varied composition of the population in the area. Social mixing is frequently referred to as possible indicator of
integration, both in theory and concrete planning, although the consensus is that it is not the sole solution to integration. According to both Frølund and authors like Young (2000), social mixing cannot and should not be forced. Smets and Salman (2008) identify three categories of strategies, out which one can be used in the context of public policy: namely mixing strategies. This goes in line with the relocation of jobs in the public sector creating an inflow of visitors from other parts of Århus. In the Gellerup project it is hoped to be achieved also by making the area more attractive and thereby appeal to new, socio-economically stronger residents.

In conclusion, the Gellerup Master plan follows the directives of integration by: considering the social as well as the spatial and structural aspects, by highlighting the importance of social mixing but implement efforts that will make it happen naturally, i.e. making the area more attractive for different socio-economic groups, tying the disintegrated district to the rest of Århus by increasing accessibility and by attempting to build uniformity by breaking the area up in smaller neighbourhoods. A possible point of critique is that the project seems to be organised according to a top-down structure. Even though it is stated clearly in the project’s comprehensive plan that the public should be involved - “it is important that a great effort is made to involve the people” (Århus Kommune/Brabrand Boligforening 2007, p. 20) - most of the planning and implementation takes place without any involvement of the residents. According to Frølund it is true that efforts have been made, but that the involvement of the public has been one of the greatest struggles in the project. He states that only few residents turn up to most events and meetings and that these are usually the same 100 to 150 people. Moreover, the city administration had expected more discontent with the project, which could indicate a lack of engagement within the neighbourhood. A possible reason for this is that Gellerup being a segregated area means that the residents do not identify with or feel as invested as residents in other districts.

4.2. Malmö

4.2.1. Malmö: description of the case

Malmö is a city with around 300 000 inhabitants, located in the southern part of Sweden. For a long period in the 20th century the city was an industrial hub and an important port. When the industries collapsed in the 1990s, it was decided to change the image of Malmö, to use a creative niche and make it innovation-based. Therefore the university was created along with the new districts of Western Harbour and Hyllie. From the early 2000s on, the city is connected with Copenhagen by the bridge and is perceived as a part of the greater Öresund region.

During the industrial past of the city, there was a deficit of decent housing for workers, so the district of Rosengård was created in the outskirts of the city as a part of the Swedish Million homes programme (Hall/Vidén 2006). The district was created on the principles of modernism, i.e. high rise mono-use housing buildings with unified and simple facades, a lot of green space between dwellings, and wide roads aiming at car usage rather than other

---

1 Learn more about Århus at http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/segregationarhus
modes of transport. Moreover, the district was planned to be a ‘city in the city’, so that it had its own centre with the shopping mall, a hospital, a library, schools and so on. At the beginning perceived as modern and comfortable housing, with the passing of time, Rosengård has faced decay. As the initial residents were leaving the area if they got an opportunity, the area was losing its prestige (Parker/Madureira 2016). Therefore the vacant apartments were occupied by less wealthy residents, many with a migration background. At the same time stigmatisation and segregation processes in the area became very clear, so the municipality initiated several projects to overcome these problems.

It is vital to have counter-segregation measures as the district of Rosengård is hard to ignore on the city scale: it has 23 600 inhabitants and occupies 332 hectares, what makes it one of the city’s largest neighbourhoods. The young population is rather large in the area: 16% of the population is between 16 and 24 years old. The average disposable income amounts to about 132 000 SEK/year, which is lower than average in Malmö. According to Listerborn (2007), Rosengård is not homogeneous - there are different types of housing, mostly high-rise buildings, but also relatively well-off villa areas. The population is also very diverse - 60% of the inhabitants are born abroad and 88% have a migration background. Thus, today the area is facing several challenges, that is very high levels of unemployment, low income levels, a low percentage of people with a higher education and high levels of child poverty (Parker/Madureira 2016).

4.2.2. Malmö: description of the strategy

The analysis presented here is based on the Comprehensive plan of Malmö (“Översiktsplan för Malmö 2014”) and other official documents of Malmö stad. Moreover it is based on two interviews with Malmö stad employees: Magdalena Alevrå, an architect in the planning office, who has been working with Rosengård for many years, and Jonna Sandin Larkander, who is an employee at the strategic department. Alevrå was interviewed on 12 May 2017, Sandin Larkander was interviewed on 9 May 2017. The analysis stems also from secondary data from the articles of Parker and Madureira (2016) as well as Listerborn (2007).

In an attempt to cope with the stigmatisation, the municipality has taken action in diverse directions in cooperation with housing and public transport companies, local actors, and private firms. However, there is not a general overarching plan for redevelopment. According to one of the respondents, this was a result of limited financial means, as the city of Malmö does not receive the financial support from independent funds like e.g. the Danish case presented in the previous section. Therefore different strategies implemented in the area will be analysed below. Not all of them are proclaimed to be unifying the area with the rest of Malmö, but if they have promoted integration of the district, they have been included in the research.

Why and how did the city administration of Malmö plan counter-segregation policies?

Malmö is characterised by a geographical proximity between neighbourhoods of different character, but at the same time it has many significant barriers that make the differences between the neighbourhoods visible. These barriers sometimes also reinforce mental lines
of division and contribute to a more disjointed city. The various parts of the city need to be healed and linked to create the conditions for a less segregated Malmö (interview Alevrà). In addition, according to Sandin Larkander, many people, whose main income is social subsidies, are 'locked' in some areas and do not have an option to move to other places as the property owners do not accept that mean of income. Alevrà stated that even when people from other parts of the city come to Rosengård, there is a lack of interaction between them and the local residents.

Moreover, the area suffers from a bad reputation, created to some extent by the media. Nonetheless, in reality the situation is not that terrible. Listerborn (2007) assumes that the negative image originates from two smaller areas, Örtagården and Herrgården, and then has spread over the entire district. Örtagården and Herrgården, being made up of rented flats and social housing, have gained such a negative image because of the badly maintained houses, so that the neighbourhood has deteriorated physically and socially (Listerborn 2007). Moreover, in Rosengård there is a narrow range of housing options, what was stated by Parker and Madureira in their article (2016), as well as articulated by Alevrá. Furthermore, Parker and Madureira (2016) mention that the closed physical structure of the area fosters the alienation of the area from the rest of the city.

However none of the respondents provided us with clear answers to why and how the policies were initiated. Moreover, Malmö has many different projects and the reasons for starting them are diverse.

*How are the concepts of segregation and integration perceived by the city administration of Malmö? What are the underlying thoughts and premises?*

Through the interviews it became possible to grasp the understanding of concepts of segregation and integration as perceived by the local authorities. The importance of defining them can not be underestimated as it shows how the city is dealing with its problems. As it is stated in the Comprehensive plan of Malmö, “the various parts of the city should be combined and both physical and mental barriers have to be broken” (Malmö stad 2014b, p. 13). The term 'segregation' is directly used in the plan, as it is proclaimed that all parts of the city should be attractive to settle in and an important goal is to reduce segregation and exclusion.

Segregation is also implicitly directed in the city plans of densification. Even though, as was mentioned by Alevrà, Malmö does not have natural borders, like woods, rocks, or water barriers dividing the city - it is rather compact - districts are experienced as disconnected. Densifying the neighbourhoods, that is bringing more people together, is seen as an efficient way of dealing with it as well as a way to become more environmentally friendly. Amiralsgatan is one of the main arteries for this effort.

According to the Comprehensive plan of Malmö, the physical environment is a framework for social interaction in a city and is thus a fundamental prerequisite for the city’s life. At the same time, many essential aspects of socio-economic development are largely beyond what physical planning in itself can achieve and the underlying problem must be solved primarily
through social and/or political efforts. The city’s physical structure - its spatial organisation - as well as the design of streets, squares, parks, and residential neighbourhoods, the location of venues and so on, will contribute to a good social development. Physical structure and housing has an impact on housing patterns and there are opportunities to create, through physical measures - in collaboration with other initiatives - the conditions for a socially more cohesive city (Malmö stad 2014b, pp. 15f.).

From the Comprehensive plan (Malmö stad 2014c) and the part for Bokalerna from “Planprogram för Törnrosen och av Örtagården” (Malmö stad 2014c) it becomes clear, that one of the perceived aspects of segregation is health. Therefore providing equal public health for all city districts is one of the key principles for the new development of the city. Health is understood as not only absence from illness, but it also incorporates factors like feeling involved, having trust in your own surroundings, having a decent income, and growing up in an environment that benefits children and young people’s prospects (Malmö stad 2014c). With the physical planning the city is striving to improve the health as it is vital to ensure positive development, welfare, and growth as well as to build a good future life for everyone.

The City of Malmö also intends to create a gender equal society and addresses this issue in urban planning as well, making it one of the milestones for the Comprehensive plan: “Gender and diversity issues should be considered when planning and designing new meeting places” (Malmö stad 2014b, p. 22).

Another underlying concept is social mixing (blandstaden). Sandin Larkander explains that social mixing in Malmö is understood as a mixture of people, of functions, of those who are living in the area and those who also want to use the area. It goes hand in hand with the creation of public spaces, the ones that a lot of people want to use. It is a matter of making public places accessible for different groups, but also considering what kinds of functions need to be created in the area. A good mixture of working places, schools and preschools, residential areas, parks, etc. is desired.

According to Sandin Larkander, mono-use areas are perceived as lacking in safety. It could be a result of non-active street life. Such places turn into ‘sleeping areas’ that are just active during certain times a day and remain rather empty the rest of the day. Also the separation of pedestrian, bike, and car flows with different leveled roads could prevent emergence of car crashes, but it also means going through tunnels and other isolated places, which could be seen as unsafe. Moreover it makes it difficult to orient yourself, which is especially striking in Rosengård. However Alevrå mentioned that there is no easy solution for it - such multi-leveled streets as Amiralsgatan are very hard to transform because of the investments needed for that.

Public spaces are also essential in the eyes of the city authorities as they not only make people interested in visiting certain areas, but also bring people together that do not meet usually. Sandin Larkander mentioned an example of playgrounds, which due to their uniqueness were able to attract parents with children from all around the city. She explains the significance of such public spaces because people are more open to establishing new
relations through children. At the same time she highlighted that public spaces that are designed around some activities, like the skatepark in Western Harbour or the Red Carpet project in Rosengård, tend to be more successful. However, she stated that dominance of the ‘public’ in the area, like in Western Harbour, can take away a feeling of ownership of the area from the local residents.

All of the sources analysed emphasise the role of accessibility. It should be possible to reach the whole city and its various attractions by public transport, walking, or cycling, instead of taking a car. Sandin Larkander also articulates that it should always be possible to have a sustainable way of transporting yourself to any point of the city. One of the tasks of the municipality, as it perceives it, is to make daily commuting easy and sustainable. Therefore transportation is a really important aspect of urban development in Malmö.

*What measures are planned by the city administration in Malmö (and what are the taken measures and their outcomes)*?

Rosengård was a rental housing area from the beginning. Several years ago some estates in the northern part have been turned into apartments for sale (cooperatives). The municipality did not directly contribute to that as it does not own the estates. They belong to MKB (the municipal housing association), which is an independent company. However, MKB could not sell the properties without the approval from the city council (Parker/Madureira 2016, p. 7), so the City of Malmö generally affirms such a change. That caused a shift in the residents structure as not all of those who lived in these apartments could afford to buy them. The more recent approach is that now, according to one of the respondents from Malmö City, developers are obliged to give 10% of the new housing, regardless of the location, to social appartments in order to foster social mixing in the entire city.

In an attempt to make Rosengård more accessible by public transport, the city has established a new bus line 5, taking people from the area up to the city centre and further to the Western Harbour in a short time (Västra Hamnen i Malmö 2013). At the same time the project of a train station in Rosengård is actively discussed and is to be brought to life in December 2018. The station will be a part of a Circle Line, connecting districts in the outskirts of Malmö with the Central station, Triangeln, and Hyllie (Malmö stad 2017). The symbolic meaning of it is stressed by Alevrâ: residents of Rosengård will feel appreciated by the rest of the town. The station is a part of the overarching project ‘Amiralsstaden’, which is aimed at the redevelopment of Amiralsgatan - the street, connecting the district with the inner city (Malmö stad n.d. a). The project is working toward the improvement of the urban and living environment and the creation of a more lively street that is more suitable for pedestrians.

The other overarching project is Rosengårdsstråket. According to Alevrâ, it is a “path” for pedestrians and bicyclists that goes from Rosengård, passes Triangeln station, and connects Rosengård to the Western Harbour. At the same time it is a city-wide connecting project - Malmö authorities have planned to create various public places along it, as a way to increase safety and also to turn Rosengårdsstråket into a meeting place and a transport link for the citizens of Malmö (interview Alevrâ; Malmö stad n.d. b). In order to make this track
What are the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy? What are the risks and benefits?

4.2.3. Malmö: analysis of the strategy

Örtagårdstorget is a square, located in front of Bokalerna, that once used to be a parking lot (Malmö stad n.d. b). Now it has been turned into a meeting spot, that is also used as a market, and sometimes transformed into an event venue. Today there are some permanent board games and seats open for everyone and space for smaller cultural events on the other side of the bicycle path. Moreover, more greenery and lighting was brought into the place as it was demanded by the local residents.

Bokalerna is a product of a mixed-use approach. It is a long single-storey building that has been redeveloped to house local businesses (Parker/Madureira 2016). The architecture is thought to allow more interaction between residents, strengthen the local trade as well as reviving the “public life” in the district. A protruding ceiling have been put up, allowing shop owners to keep their products outside, slightly protected from rain and sun, or for café owners to make a small seating area for their guests. It is also designed to provide the feeling of an oriental bazaar.

The Red Carpet project is another point of attraction of Rosengårdsstråket (Björnson 2013). It is an “activity space”, which was developed with the help of several local girls. The project is mainly aimed at musical and dance events, but has also some elements of a playground (e.g. the climbing wall). The Red Carpet is supposed to attract both youth and adults. It is a unique project based on the cooperation of the residents and the officials.

Yalla Trappan is a social enterprise designed as a cooperative of women. It is aimed at integrating female immigrants into the labour market. Started in 2010 on financial support from the European Social Fund, the City of Malmö, and ABF Malmö, it has developed into a self-contained social enterprise with 15 female employees. It operates in three business spheres: café and catering, a cleaning and conference service, and a sewing and design studio. Yalla Trappan also provides newly arrived female migrants with the opportunity to have an internship there (Yalla Trappan n.d.).

One other ambitious project, created in cooperation between the municipality and the housing company MKB, is a 22-floor tower, the Culture Casbah (MKB n.d.). The project is designed to symbolise the renewal of Törnrosen, the oldest part of Rosengård. At the same time, as it is brought up by Alevrå, the tower is believed to have a strong symbolic meaning for the residents of the area. It is supposed to create a landmark for Rosengård, put in line with the Turning Torso. However the Culture Casbah is not going to be a duplicate of the Turning Torso - it is meant to be inviting and open to everyone with diverse facilities that it has to offer - from a library to the roof-top cafe. The tower is planned to be finished in 2021.

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy? What are the risks and benefits?
In this section the measures taken by the municipality of Malmö will be analysed according to the theories proposed in the second chapter.

To prove that in Rosengård the municipality has to cope with segregation, the definition of Machado Bógus (n.d.) can be used. In her opinion urban segregation is connected with involuntary concentration of particular people, which can be observed in the district as residents do not have options to move to other places. According to Lima (2001), the physical dimension plays a crucial role in the creation of segregated areas, that is (the perception of) the architecture of the place and the (perceived) accessibility. Indeed, Rosengård was created for car transportation and embraces those features, it is often referred to as a far-away ‘urban fringe’. At the same time its modernist architecture is seen as monotonous and rectangular (Parker/Madureira 2016). Moreover, the estates in the area do not provide enough spaces for commercial activities, which is supposed to be changed within the Rosengårdstråket project, as well as by the creation of the Culture Casbah. Lima (2001) also speaks about the lack of employment opportunities as one of the indicators and also problems of segregated areas. The issue is present in Rosengård, but the municipality is trying to solve it in various ways through physical planning. The project Yalla Trappan is tackling the issue, providing job opportunities for local women and seeking to integrate more women into the labour market.

At the same time the municipality is fostering commercial facilities, which goes in line with the ideas of Bolt et al. (1998). According to that article, the lack of commercial facilities is one of the reasons of the deepening of social and economic isolation of the local residents, so the city is trying to break that circle and supports the development of businesses and services in the area. As Ruiz-Tagle (2013a) articulates, the segregated areas create a good climate for the growth of ethnic entrepreneurship. In Rosengård the authorities were trying to bring oriental feeling in the appearance of Bokalerna. It is also reflected in the name of Culture Casbah. However, it is done in a top-down, institutionalised way, which could be noticed in both of the projects, as the community was not involved in the planning. Therefore it looks like the projects were based on the ideas of the planners about those cultures.

One other popular strategy to counter segregation is social mixing. Ruiz-Tagle (2013b) argues that pure mixing of people with different incomes cannot solve segregation - people can be physically close but still remain separated socially. That problem is taken into account by the authorities in Malmö as stated in one of the interviews. Local residents of Rosengård and other citizens do not interact in the area as much. Therefore the city is aiming at creating such spaces like Red Carpet, the Culture Casbah, and Bokalerna that should be attractive for all the city residents and make them interact.

At the same time Malmö stad projects together create an impression, that they are mainly oriented at attracting people from outside of the area to come, or move to it. It can be traced in all the development ideas in Amiralsstaden, Rosengårdstråket, but especially the train station and Culture Casbah projects, as they will increase the prestige of the area as well as possibly the housing prices. However, it is hard to address it as a gentrification process as it does not involve an inflow of people with high cultural capital in the first place. On the other
hand, it is definitely supposed to attract more businesses and services, as well as to trigger social mixing by drawing new more wealthy people to Rosengård.

Young (2000) proclaims that segregation emerges when people are forced to live in a specific area, if they do not have other options. Therefore, it could be concluded, that it is important to make anti-segregation policies not locked in the neighbourhood, but on the city scale. In Malmö that could be observed in the idea that at least 10% of apartments in newly build estates goes for social renting. Therefore, social mixing could be reached not only by bringing tenants from other city areas to Rosengård, but also by opening the opportunity to choose the area where to live to residents of Rosengård.

Accessibility is another key point, mentioned in accordance to counter-segregation theories (cf. Lima 2001). The city officials have also made it one of the milestones of the Comprehensive plan and it is also reflected in several projects run in Rosengård. Rosengårdsstråket is aimed at making pedestrian and bike transportation easier, safer, and faster, Amiralsstaden has a train station, connecting the district to the centre as well as to the other neighbourhoods as a core of the project. The creation of bus line 5 also made the area more connected to the rest of the city.

A change in perception is another point that the municipality strives to reach. According to Andersen, if neighbourhoods are seen as bad it leads to decay. So if the reputation would be improved, it could benefit the residents in general. This principle is reflected in basically all of the projects - Culture Casbah, Bokalerna, Rosengårdsstråket. The area should be perceived as creative, safe, and attractive to live in. Identification is also one of the crucial point in coping with segregation, as it stops residents once they get a higher income from escaping from the area. This point was highlighted by several authors (cf. Andersen 2008; Ruiz-Tagle 2013a) and is dealt within the Rosengård area. As articulated in one of the interviews, the Culture Casbah is tended to create a point for identification and for cultural pride of the local residents.

Musterd (2003), as aforementioned, places emphasis on the children’s socialising in stigmatised areas. The municipality of Malmö is working in that direction - it is one of the principles for planning mentioned in the planning documents on Bokalerna as part of health. It could also be noticed that the municipality is trying to engage young people into the planning - like it happened in the Red Carpet project. Moreover, it also shows that the city seeks to create spaces, where young people will have a feeling of belonging and ownership.

To sum up, Andersen (2002) proclaims that to stop segregation cities have to make deprived neighbourhoods more attractive for both locals and other citizens to live in. The City of Malmö is working in that direction: the new train station and the bus line number 5 make it more accessible in terms of transport, while Rosengårdsstråket is supposed to make the district more accessible from the central areas for cyclists and pedestrians. The Culture Casbah and the related development is awaited to become new points of attraction and
possibly bring in new businesses to the area, as well as provide more services in Rosengård. Therefore the general change of the area is awaited².

4.3. Mannheim

4.3.1. Mannheim: description of the case

The city of Mannheim is located in the south-west of Germany. With around 305,000 inhabitants it is the third biggest city in the state of Baden-Württemberg. It is situated on the eastern side of the river Rhein, just opposite its sister city Ludwigshafen. It was first mentioned in documents in 776 (Stakelbeck/Weber 2011, p. 69). During the industrialisation, Mannheim became an important centre for trade and industry, especially in the domain of electric and mechanical engineering (Stakelbeck/Weber 2011, p. 70). Since half of the city was destroyed due to the second world war, the late 20th century was characterised by restructuring and rebuilding efforts (Stakelbeck/Weber 2011, p. 70). In 1967 the commercial college which has been in Mannheim since 1907 became officially a university, consisting of 12,000 students today.

Herzogenried is part of the greater district Neckarstadt-Ost in Mannheim, located north-east from the city centre and the neighbouring city Ludwigshafen. It has a population of 9,000 inhabitants from 127 different nationalities (Stadt Mannheim 2017). Nearly 60% of the inhabitants have a migration background (Stadt Mannheim 2017). The residents who are between under 18 years old amount to 17,8% in Herzogenried while 15% of Mannheim’s population is under 18 years old (Statistikatlas Mannheim 2017). The population between 18 and 25 years is also slightly overrepresented in Herzogenried with 11,6% versus 9,6% for the whole of Mannheim (Statistikatlas Mannheim 2017). The average disposable income per year and person is 20,374€ (Stadt Mannheim 2016, p. 5).

The district was originally planned as urban development measure on the occasion of the nation-wide state horticultural show 1975 (Stadt Mannheim 2017). It was a model for "Wohnen im Grünen" (~living within nature) aiming at lots of green areas within the district as well as being a family-friendly and traffic-calmed neighbourhood. Following the modernist tradition of the time, these aims resulted in a typical mass housing neighbourhood with 1,746 newly-built dwelling units. The district was planned as mainly residential and thus lacks in cultural offers. Therefore, the district faces typical problems of mass housing today, such as a high degree of anonymity and only few relations among the residents. Hence, the inhabitants have been not very attached to or engaged in their neighbourhood (Stadt Mannheim 2017). Due to reports on burglaries and violent attacks, the district suffers moreover from a bad public reputation compared to the rest of the city (cf. Mannheim24 2017; Presseportal 2017).

² Learn more about Malmö at http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/segregationmalmo
4.3.2. Mannheim: description of the strategy

The following analysis is primarily based on the empirical data gathered in our interview with Andreas Ebert on 11 May 2017 via telephone and the official documents provided by the City of Mannheim and the district of Herzogenried online. The main sources of information for this research are the integrated action concept from 2010 (QM Herzogenried 2010) and the annual report from 2015 (QM Herzogenried 2015). The interviewee Andreas Ebert works as a social planner in the department of labour and social affairs in the city administration of Mannheim.

Why and how did the city administration of Mannheim plan counter-segregation policies?

Although Herzogenried was initially planned and built as a model project and citizens identified with the area, reputation waned soon after (interview Ebert). The design of the estate, that is mainly residential high-rise buildings within a relatively small area, led to a high degree of anonymity between the residents (interview Ebert). The initial high amount of civic engagement ceased and the civic association “Bürgerverein Herzogenried” had to be dissolved in 2001 (interview Ebert). Moreover, the location of the estate, situated between a park, a prison, and an industrial area, as well as a bad connection to the public transport system resulted in the seclusion of Herzogenried (interview Ebert). As a consequence, many better-off people moved away and the estate suffered from high vacancy rates (interview Ebert). In the following years, Herzogenried has been characterised by high crime rates, vandalism, a high unemployment rate, a high share of social welfare recipients, and a low voter turnout, for example 30% in 2010 (interview Ebert; QM Herzogenried 2010).

Therefore, the Quartiermanagement (QM) was initiated in Herzogenried in 2004. One of the main initiators was the municipal housing association GBG which also financed the QM in the beginning of the project. They had a relatively high interest in redeveloping the area as they own approximately half of the housing estate (interview Ebert). Therefore, the QM in Herzogenried is not entirely a strategy developed by the city administration. However, the QM project on Herzogenried is one out of five in the city of Mannheim and has always been supported by the city administration in terms of planning and financing. It is set to be on-going for the time being. The main objective of the QM in Herzogenried is to establish and strengthen social cohesion within the district and, in general, to make the district more attractive (Interview Ebert). Since 2011, these efforts are financed through the city-wide association “Mannheimer Quartiermanagement e.V.”, which consist of the housing association GBG, the city administration, the Diakonie, and other city-specific actors (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 1; interview Ebert). Reasons for restructuring the financing were, on the one hand, to be able to ensure a long-term perspective for the QM and its financing and, on the other hand, to enable a stronger administrative steering by the city as well as a better cooperation with the responsible departments of the city administration (interview Ebert).

How are the concepts of segregation and integration perceived by the city administration of Mannheim? What are the underlying thoughts and premises?
The main issue in Herzogenried as seen by the city administration is the lack of civic engagement as well as the lack of social networks in the area (interview Ebert). Therefore, it is one of the main objectives of the QM to establish these networks and structures. Moreover, the aim of the QM is to make itself obsolete by enabling the district to manage itself in the future (interview Ebert). Although some projects of the QM focus on connecting the district spatially and socially to the rest of the city, for example the establishment of a nearby tram line, the main focus of the QM is to work on issues within the district. Although the spatial isolation of the district is considered to be a factor of the issues present in Herzogenried, the district is less perceived as segregated than as lacking social cohesion in itself.

The concentration of immigrants in the district is not considered an issue, but the concentration of social welfare recipients is (interview Ebert). In order to face the inequality within the city on a structural level, the only way Ebert sees, is to use instruments of the housing market. He states that a housing market policy is needed that is oriented towards a mix of income and tenures. A quota of 25% affordable housing per newly constructed building is currently discussed in the City of Mannheim (interview Ebert). However, the housing market is neither within the responsibility of Ebert’s department nor within the reach of the QM (interview Ebert). Thus, neither social mixing or gentrification are seen as appropriate to deal with the issues in Herzogenried. Ebert stated that is indeed very difficult to incentivise people to move to Herzogenried since the public reputation is so bad and that there is no municipal strategy to achieve gentrification on purpose.

The QM does not claim to be an integration approach itself and neither sees Ebert it completely as one. As he states that integration relies mainly on providing education and employment and that QM cannot cope with these large-scale issues, he understands the QM approach as integration on a network but not on a structural level. It also focuses on connecting Herzogenried with neighbouring district as well as integrating the residents into the district, so that he understands it also as integration on a neighbourhood level. The underlying assumption of the strategy is that there first have to be measures to strengthen the social cohesion within the district, and that then integration within the rest of the city may happen (interview Ebert).

What measures are planned by the city administration in Mannheim (and what are the taken measures and their outcomes)?

As the main objective is the establishment of social cohesion within Herzogenried, the measures planned and implemented by the QM aim mostly at the development of contact between the residents. In this regard, the QM sees itself as central contact point for the residents, as a coordinator of district activities, as a mediator between district actors, municipal politics, and the city administration, networker, and as facilitator for public participation (QM Herzogenried 2010; QM Herzogenried 2015). According to its own job description, the QM, represented mainly by the district office, deals with suggestions, enquiries, conflicts, and problems within the district, bundles issues and interests in the district, offers short and fast connections to the administration, captures important topics in the district, formulates objectives, initiates projects, offers professional support for civic
engagement and initiatives from the district, and ensures participation of local actors and the residents regarding planning and projects that deal with the district (interview Ebert; QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 1). The resident is understood as the expert on the district and, thus, civic participation is considered a requirement for a successful job in the district (“Stadtteilarbeit”) (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 4).

The QM’s mission statement is „Herzogenried - Für eine Zukunft in Gemeinschaft“ (for a future within community) (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 1). To achieve this aim, the QM developed seven fields of action into which the particular measures and projects are categorised: establishment of district structures, strengthening communal life and identity, promotion of district culture, shaping the residential and public environment, sport/recreation/health, ensuring local trade and amenities, and improving the public image (QM Herzogenried 2010). However, most of the projects fall into more than one of the categories.

In order to establish sustainable and self-supporting district structures the QM organises residential assemblies, district meetings, a regular district conference, and working groups on family friendliness and culture (QM Herzogenried n.d.). Moreover, the civic association was re-established as “Interessengemeinschaft Herzogenried” and meets every first Tuesday every month (interview Ebert; QM Herzogenried n.d.). It also issues the re-established district newspaper “herzog” (interview Ebert). The newspaper is issued four times a year since December 2005 and is at no charge (Herzogenried n.d.). The communal life and communication is aimed to be strengthened through district events, a website on the district (www.herzogenried.de), the aforementioned newspaper, and networking activities (interview Ebert; QM Herzogenried n.d.). Meeting opportunities, such as a public boules square, a running place for dogs, a district choir, and a public bookcase have been established (QM Herzogenried 2010; QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3). Associated with these measures, the QM wants to enhance cultural events in order to strengthen the district identity and enabling the residents to meet each other. There have been, for instance, a Christmas market, a creative market, a district festival, and a new year’s eve reception (Interview Ebert). Furthermore, the QM provides the opportunity to artists to present their work within the district at the events (QM Herzogenried 2010, p. 5).

The QM also aims at making the district safer and cleaner (interview Ebert): so-called “Angsträume”, that is public spaces that seem to be dangerous, are aimed to be eradicated, for example through better lighting (QM Herzogenried 2010, p. 6). Guide posts for the district have been erected and a district map, specially designed for children, has been issued (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3). Moreover, several projects in order to clean and/or pretty up the district have been launched, e.g. the painting project “Mehr Farbe für das Herzogenried” (more colour for Herzogenried; QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 6). An urban gardening project has been initiated by “Interessengemeinschaft Herzogenried”, the QM, residents, and a Waldorf school (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3). The objective of the „HerzogenGärten“ is to offer activities across generations and cultures (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 14). Furthermore, the establishment of a gambling hall within the district has been prevented by the QM (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3).
Already existing play and sports grounds are improved and sport events and tourneys initiated in order to further communal recreational activities, for instance the recurring event “Sport statt Gewalt” (sports instead of violence). All 4th-graders of the district participate in this tournament (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3). There has also been an information evening on crime prevention for the elderly and self-assertion classes for women are offered through the QM (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3). On the occasion of the anniversary „40 Jahre Herzogenried“, the „Interessengemeinschaft Herzogenried“, the district library, the Kinderhaus (children’s house), and the QM organised a district rallye: 19 institutions in the district were to be found and a specific question was posed there, to help residents to feel more familiar in their neighbourhood (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 17). A few hundred residents participated (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 17).

In order to make the district liveable, the QM also tries to ensure local trade and amenities. Existing supermarkets are to be made more attractive and their marketing is to be improved. In order to achieve this, the labelling and signs of the shops are to be made more noticeable and striking and the mall is to be redeveloped and modernised (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 16). Moreover, the establishment of a discount supermarket in Herzogenried is discussed (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 16). Other ideas to ensure the local shops are joint advertisement, discount campaigns, a delivery service, and publicity events, such as markets for Christmas, Easter, summer, and autumn (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 16).

Furthermore, the QM aims at improving the public image of the district via the aforementioned district events and the artistic design of facades (interview Ebert). Moreover, a touring photo exhibition on Herzogenried was established on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the district, a documentation on art in public space between 2004 and 2014, and a catalogue called “Kulturen in Farbe - Nationen in Frieden“ (cultures in colour - nations in peace) (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 3). The photo exhibition was also published as a book in 2016 (QM Herzogenried 2015, p. 17). Although not mentioned in the fields of action, the QM also worked on a better connection of Herzogenried to the public transport system: as a result a new tram line was introduced that connects Herzogenried to the rest of the city (interview Ebert). Moreover, the QM also tries to establish a better social connection to the other neighbouring districts, for example through the invitation to district events and a joint “Stammtisch” (regulars’ table) (interview Ebert; QM Herzogenried 2015, pp. 13-14).

4.3.3. Mannheim: analysis of the strategy

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy? What are the risks and benefits?

Just as Gellerup and Rosengård, Herzogenried can be perceived as segregated. Social groups, that is in Herzogenried people with migration background as well as people with lesser economic means, have been concentrated in the district. Herzogenried is one of the mass housing districts which Andersen (2016) defines as least attractive part of the city and its reputation and public image has, among other things, led to a high degree of stigmatisation of the area. However, the percentages of people with migration background as well as social welfare recipients have approximated the shares of the rest of Mannheim during the past years. Moreover, it is difficult to assess in how far this concentration has
occurred involuntarily which is a major element in Machado Bógus’ (n.d.) definition. In contrast, the spatial segregation according to Lima (2001) can be confirmed completely. Herzogenried’s location, the urban design, as well as the low degree of accessibility cause the social exclusion of the district (cf. interview Ebert). This is, however, not the main concern of the QM approach in Herzogenried.

Overall, the QM approach is quite comprehensive in describing its objectives and how they are supposed to be achieved. It is, moreover, evaluated every year and the evaluation made public on the website of the City of Mannheim (cf. QM Herzogenried 2015). According to the last evaluation of 2015 and also according to Ebert, the measures seem well chosen in order to accomplish the objectives: The events are well-known and participation is up and the civic engagement and identification with the district is also growing again. Different social groups are targeted within the projects, e.g. children, the elderly, or artists, and are well represented in the QM. However, the aim of having self-supporting structures in the district will not be achieved in the short- or mid-term (interview Ebert).

Although integration approaches are seen as appropriate counter-strategy to urban segregation, the QM is not fully perceived as one - neither by Ebert nor according to the theoretical framework discussed in chapter 2: Ebert defines integration as mainly relying on the provision of employment and education of the residents. These are not objectives of the QM, but, however, needed to integrate socially segregated groups into society (Musterd 2003). Moreover, the QM does not target the social or spatial inclusion of Herzogenried into Mannheim. The QM did indeed lead to a better accessibility of the district via public transport, but this is not one of the objectives of the strategy nor included as a field of action. Although the QM aims at having a better social connection to the two neighbouring districts this is not sufficient in order to match the definition of integration as combining “(one thing) with another to form a whole” (Oxford English Living Dictionaries 2017c). The QM is not a desegregation strategy either as it does neither state social mixing as an objective nor does it use measures of social mixing (cf. Ruiz-Tagle 2013a). Although social mixing may be a byproduct of the QM approach.

Overall, the QM in Herzogenried is an ongoing and long-term area-based effort (cf. Andersen 2000) that fulfils some of the counter-segregation approaches proposed in chapter 2.5., e.g. focusing on “supporting social activities that create social networks and establishing meeting places and facilities” (Andersen 2008, p. 99), but neglects others. In line with Andersen’s (2002; 2008) and Ruiz-Tagle’s (2013a) demands for counter-segregation measures, the QM tries to make Herzogenried more attractive in a social as well as partly in a physical perspective: The attachment of the residents to as well as their identification with the neighbourhood are central to the strategy. In contrast, there is considerably less focus on enhancing the physical attractiveness. However, the improvement and design of the facades as well as providing better lighting and more benches in the district are part of the strategy. Regarding Ruiz-Tagle’s (2013a) table on socio-spatial integration, the focus is clearly on the social dimensions, that is symbolic and relational functions, while systemic dimensions are mostly neglected. Comparing it to the requirements on an integration approach, stated in the academic literature on segregation and integration, the QM in Herzogenried is very strong in regard to enhancing social
attractiveness and identification with the district but lacks in city-wide and spatial measures. Thus, it can be understood as a first but on its own insufficient step towards fully integrating the district into the city.³

5. Comparative analysis of the cases

The following chapter will be dedicated to a discussion of the aims presented in the beginning of the paper, namely:

*How can city administrations integrate socially and spatially segregated mass housing districts in cities with an industrial past?* and *Why do have cities different approaches? Do they have a different understanding of the concept or different circumstances?*

The former will be treated by comparing the strengths and weaknesses of each respective city’s strategy. Thereafter, the second research aim will be handled by considering the following perspectives; a) the reasoning from the previous section, b) the descriptions of each respective case, and c) the interpretation of each city’s understanding of the concepts of segregation and integration.

5.1. Possibilities of counter-segregation

*How can city administrations integrate socially and spatially segregated mass housing districts in cities with an industrial past?*

To be able to conclude how the city administrations of the studied districts have implemented counter-segregation strategies, it is pivotal to clarify whether the districts are in fact segregated and if the strategies in question can be classified as an attempt of integration. Starting with Gellerup in Århus, the case seems to fit the description of a segregated area: it is spatially and socially separated from the rest of Århus, the residents are limited in terms of opportunities and accessibility and are involuntarily isolated, the crime rates and unemployment levels are higher than average in the city, there is a concentration of low-income levels, and the general image of the area is quite stigmatised. Rosengård in Malmö shares many of these characteristics and is, just like Gellerup, treated and labelled as a segregated district by the city administration of Malmö. The context of Herzogenried is slightly different: like the other two examples Herzogenried is the result of a modernist approach, which rendered a mono-functional residential area, lacking in cultural offers. However, Herzogenried is not framed by the city administration as a clear case of segregation, but it does indeed lack civic engagement and social networks, i.e. social cohesion, and is also spatially isolated from the rest of the city. Thus, all three analysed districts can be considered as segregated from the respective cities.

According to the literature, a lack of accessibility is a contributing factor to segregation and its improvement can promote integration as it is mode of connecting the deprived area with

³ Learn more about Mannheim at [http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/segregationmannheim](http://nosegregation.tilda.ws/segregationmannheim)
the rest of the city. Exempting the light-way tram, increasing physical accessibility is not prioritised within QM in Herzogenried. Contrarily, in Gellerup, integration is much invested in by altering the infrastructure so that it is perceived as more accessible. The same applies for Rosengård where the development has a wider approach: the area is made more accessible with new bike and pedestrian paths making sustainable transportation easier and within a few years the train station is to be completed, which will increase the connectivity via train. Thus, increasing the accessibility of segregated districts via public transport and infrastructure is to be seen as very important even if the focus of the counter-segregation strategy lies somewhere else (as is the case in Herzogenried).

A problem for all the districts is the anonymity and the residents’ lack of attachment to the area, since it is one of the primary causes for more well-off residents ‘fleeing’ from the district when they have the opportunity to, leaving vacancy for lower-income groups and furthering poverty - not only in monetary terms. A possible and natural remedy for this issue would then be to reverse the process by involving the residents, both in the decision-making, but also in the implementation of the projects (Ruiz-Tagle 2013a, p. 392). Out of the three cases, Herzogenried is probably the example that best illustrates public participation: the resident is considered to be an expert on district matters and, thus, civic participation is considered a requirement for success. The design of the QM strategy rests on the premise that the district eventually will be managed by the residents. This is not only a clear example of direct civic involvement, but also of sustainability. Involvement of the public is also described as an important component in the integration strategies of Rosengård and Gellerup. In the latter the involvement is supposed to extend through all phases of the project: the residents have been invited to take part in events and public meetings and information has been sent out to the households in the district. Though, it is not completely clear how involved the residents have been, due to lack of engagement on their part. It might also result in the Master plan as a whole being thought more of as a top-down. The development of Bokalerna and the Culture Casbah in Rosengård are indications of a more top-down planning approach as well, as the residents were not involved. Thus, although public participation has been detected as important in the literature, it seems to be difficult to execute in practice.

Furthermore, this touches on the matter how identification with the district can be a sign of integration. In the planning of the Culture Casbah, MKB decided to implement what they consider to be an oriental feel (even in the name) as they thought this to be a reflection of the community of Rosengård and possibly make them feel a greater sense of ownership as there is a relatively large population of middle-eastern origin. From a critical point of view, the fact that this idea came from a housing company could be seen as cultural appropriation and maybe not a true reflection of how the residents of Rosengård would like to see their community presented. There are other examples of these kinds of aesthetic elements around the district. Although health is a priority of urban development in Malmö, there are no efforts to work on sports centres in Rosengård. In Gellerup, the attempts of tying the residents to the area are more activity-based, e.g. the sports and leisure centre, the library, and the “union house”. This model is similar to Herzogenried, where the QM tries to strengthen the sense of identification by improving communal life and identity, promoting district culture, shaping the residential and public environment, ensuring local trade and amenities, and improving the public image. There are, hence, different approaches to
improving the attachment to and identification with the district. To do so, has, however, been a focal point of all three cases.

All three cases, furthermore, aim at making the district more attractive for residents as well as other citizens by social and spatial measures. In all areas the residential property is renovated to make it more visually attractive and more suitable to live in. All three also have adopted some attempts in changing the housing tenure: in Gellerup there is the combined renting-scheme in cooperation with the involved housing organisation Brabrand boligforening, in Rosengård the housing organisation MKB has converted some buildings into ‘cooperatives’, and it is moreover officially stated that the purpose of changes is to encourage social mixing in general. According to Ebert, similar efforts are required in Herzogenried to create integration on a structural level and a quota of 25% affordable housing per newly constructed building is currently discussed in the City of Mannheim. It has, however, not been set in motion yet and, if it does, will not be within the scope of the QM. In both Gellerup and Rosengård social mixing is an important component in their integration efforts, although in the Gellerup Master plan it is more implicit, and in Malmö “the mixed city” (blandstaden) is an outspoken strategy and well-marketed concept. The point is though to attract new socio-economically stronger residents as well as visitors, as there is a concentration of residents with less financial capital today. In accordance with the literature, neither of the city administrations has the intention of forcing social mixing, but rather view deliberate social mixing as a long-term goal. Therefore they are doing projects to improve the appearance of the areas, and thereby make it more attractive. The focus in Gellerup is more activity-based, in Herzogenried the focus is on events, and in Rosengård the city is creating more places to meet, such as public squares. Thus, although the three cases all try to enhance the social mix within their district - Mannheim less explicitly than the others though, while it is a main concept in Malmö (cf. blandstaden) - it can not be considered forced social mixing or even gentrification. Even though, for example, the idea in Gellerup to build youth housing, can be considered a stepping stone towards gentrification, none of the city administration perceive gentrification efforts as the solution towards segregation.

5.2. Strengths and weaknesses of the strategies

Gellerup has adopted the combined approach of both social and spatial efforts, although the Master plan seems to be more focused on the spatial restructuring of the area. What is not discussed in the literature, are the benefits of a holistic approach, which we deem the Master plan to have. The redevelopment of the area is treated within one strategy, that extends over a long period of time, but divided up in shorter phases so that the development and current state of the area can be evaluated as the project progresses. The risk is that the planning and instrumental decisions are made on higher organisational and political levels, i.e. top-down, which limits the public’s opportunity to participate. Even though it is stated in the Master plan that the civic involvement is a central aspect of the project, it seems that the involvement of the public has not been as successful as the initiative takers had hoped or planned it would be.

Rosengård, is as suggested in previous sections of this chapter, similar to the Gellerup Master plan in some aspects. It is quite different in its organisational setup though: the main
stakeholders are, like in Gellerup, the city administration in cooperation with (in certain cases) MKB (the local housing organisation), however, the redevelopment is composed by many smaller plans following the general directives and visions of Malmö’s Comprehensive plan. According to one of our respondents in Malmö’s city administration, it could probably be beneficial to have a more complete, focused approach, but there is not enough funding to support that. It is however a continuous development, meaning that the area is not ‘done’ at a certain point when the plan is completed. Another merit of the Rosengård approach is the width of the integration approach: it is not assumed that the high unemployment rate can be rectified with only social efforts like Yalla Trappan, but it is also supported by a more spatially oriented project like Bokalerna, functioning as space for commercial activity and an opportunity for local potential entrepreneurs. However, like in Gellerup, it is suggested by our respondents that the civic involvement is not as influential on the final result as they had expected. Lastly, Malmö stands out from the other cases as they focus on public health in relation to urban structure and culture. This approach reflects the valuing of the public well-being and the intention of equality in the city as a whole, integrating Rosengård by raising the standard of living and quality of life in the district.

Since the problems in Herzogenried are considered to be more of a social character, the strategy to solve these problems is much more orientated towards social initiatives and efforts than the other studied cases. Moreover, the QM is not intended as an integration strategy, the purpose is to integrate on a network level, not on a structural, city-wide level. However, they also try to attract visitors to the area by hosting public events and try to establish social and spatial relations to the neighbouring districts. It is recognised that some of the contributing factors to the exclusion and deprivation of the district is of a physical character, but according to Ebert and the official documents, it is not a main problem, which explains why it is not prioritised. However, there are structural issues relating to segregation or social exclusion of the district that are not being addressed. The increased social cohesion and integration on a network level is set to lead to improved standards of living, which will make the district more attractive and bring it up to par with the rest of the city, which in turn might have integrating effects. However, more social and spatial projects are needed to connect the district to the rest of the city and make the strategy an integration approach.

Overall, different approaches are used by the city administrations to counter the issues caused by urban socio-spatial segregation: Mannheim focuses mainly on the strengthening of social cohesion within Herzogenried and less on the connection to the rest of Mannheim. It is first and foremost an area-based approach. Malmö focuses more on the spatial connection of Rosengård to the city but also tries to implement social integration approaches, such as Yalla Trappan, in the area. However, the issue of developing social networks within the district is not a focal point. Århus also focuses more on spatial aspects, such as the restructuring of the area and the new tram line, but has also social measures that mainly aim at strengthening the social networks in Gellerup, such as the “union house” (samlingshus). However, the public participation in the planning and implementation of projects is fairly low.
5.3. Conceptualisation or circumstances?

As it could be assessed that cities pursue different approaches, the question is:

*Why do have cities different approaches? Do they have a different understanding of the concept or different circumstances?*

The findings in this study suggest that all three cities seem to have a clear understanding of their context, i.e. segregated or not, and there is a clear strategy in place to rectify what each administration considers to be their problem. Regarding the circumstances, the three cases have a similar industrial past and a similar context as modernist, mass housing districts with problems typically associated with deprived and segregated areas, for example, high crime rates and stigmatisation. The urban form, infrastructure, and accessibility are contributing factors to segregation, clearly argued by the majority of the authors referred to in the literature overview and indicated by all of the cases presented in this study: there is a general lack of cultural offerings and even lack of space for such activities, as all the districts were built for mainly residential purposes. The massivity of the housing blocks and their uniform appearance further the anonymity of the area, leaving the residents not being as attached to their districts. The infrastructure was built for the car being the prime mode of transportation. However, every case is contextual and thereby unique, meaning there are differences between the cities which will have an impact on the choice of strategy, such as political history, organisational structure, individual influential actors, and culture.

That being mentioned, we find that the perceptions of segregation and integration as concepts largely seem to correspond within the city administrations, also in relation to the literature - what differs is how they connect it to their respective case and how integration is or is not realised. More specifically, the cities of Århus and Malmö admittedly treat their deprived districts from the standpoint that they are segregated, and that the solution to relieve problems of segregation would be to integrate the area with the rest of the city. However, the actual integration strategies differ not only regarding stakeholders, financing, and timeframe but also regarding the focus of the projects. In the case of Mannheim, integration is not chosen as measure to improve the district. This could not be traced back to the characteristics of Herzogenried but rather to the conceptualisation of the solution. Integration is not considered to be an inefficient strategy. In fact, Ebert admits that integration on a structural level could be useful and even necessary, but this is not the objective of QM.

To sum up, although the issues in the districts seem to be fairly similar and more or less the same issues are detected by the city administrations, the cities’ strategies vary. However, the approaches in Århus and Malmö are quite similar. Thus, an explanation might be that the city administrations conceptualise the main issue of the area differently, for example, lack of accessibility in Rosengård, lack of social cohesion in Herzogenried, and lack of interaction with other residents of Århus in Gellerup. However, there may exist other factors influencing the choice of strategy that were not analysed in this research. Among these could be the respective operational mode of the city administrations, their financing, and their scope of action.
6. Conclusion

Segregation is a common problem for many European states where mass housing areas, constructed between 1960 and 1980, now have fallen into decay and stigmatisation and face alienation from the rest of the city. This paper was aimed to investigate how city authorities can cope with downsides of segregation and, more specifically, unify segregated districts with the remainder of the city. This taken as a general idea, it was scrutinised on the examples of three cities, sharing similar characteristics, e.g. population and industrial past. The counter-segregation policies implemented (or planned to be implemented) in Gellerup (Århus, Denmark), Rosengård (Malmö, Sweden), and Herzogenried (Mannheim, Germany) were studied and eventually compared.

In order to make the analysis possible, the theoretical literature on the topic was studied. The paper appropriates concepts and ideas of Andersen, Lima, Ruiz-Tagle, Young and others. Urban segregation is therefore understood as involuntary social, spatial, or social and spatial separation of a district from the rest of the city. However segregation and concentration should be differentiated. Concentration is not viewed as purely negative phenomenon, although it becomes an issue if it is involuntary and people are not able to move out of the area. Different authors propose different ways of coping with segregation. Summarised, they form a set of socio-spatial measures, which in general include better accessibility, social mixing (but not a forced one), stronger identification with the area, a sense of belonging, variety of commercial facilities and services, the creation of points of attraction for citizens from around the town to be interested to come, and physical upgrading of the area, so it is more attractive to move to.

The presented findings were based on the analysis of official documents and empirical data gathered via interviews and are restricted by certain limitations which occurred due to the lack of time and resources. To develop the knowledge on the topic, one could take into account national settings and the economic situation to get a deeper understanding of the context. Moreover, if the resources allow, one can conduct more interviews as well as grasp perceptions of the local residents about the projects in attempt to evaluate the outcomes, which was out of focus of this paper. It is also important to keep in mind, that the findings were made with the perspective of an outsider to the districts.

It was revealed, that in Århus mostly spatial measures are implemented that are, however, accompanied by social ones. It is planned to renovate the old housing estates as well as to build new ones, with an emphasis on student housing, and to prevent forced relocation by making sure that the residents of the apartments under reconstruction are proposed accommodation within the area. One other major point is accessibility: the area is supposed to get both physically and symbolically connected with the new road going through the entire city and Gellerup as well. Another measure aimed to increase accessibility is a new tram line. The development also includes the creation of attraction places for a broader public, such as a library, a “union house”, and a sports and leisure campus. There are also many temporary projects initiated to increase the public participation in the area. At the same time
a high number of jobs from the public sector is relocated to the area, so that residents from outside of Gellerup have a reason to visit and/or commute to the district.

In Malmö, the planned projects can also be seen as combining social and spatial measures. However, unlike Århus and Mannheim, the city does not have an overarching strategy for changes in Rosengård. The main underlying idea is to bring the area to the same level with the rest of the city and health as well as sustainability are the milestones that all the projects are based on. It could be noticed, that still mostly spatial measures are planned, involving reconstruction of existing housing for commercial activities (Bokalerna) or the general upgrading of housing, as well as the erection of new buildings (Culture Casbah). Most of the projects also entail the creation of meeting points or points of attraction in the district for locals - but also to attract citizens of the rest of Malmö to visit the area. Accessibility is also considered to be of high importance and, therefore, bike lanes and pedestrian paths are made more attractive (Amiralsstaden project, Rosengårdstråket). The city has invested into public transport in the area and also strives to create places that local residents can relate to, like the Culture Casbah. However, this point seems questionable as the project is based on the ideas and perceptions of the architects about the people living there, so the symbolic meaning of this project might be overestimated. At the same time all the measures taken into account together, create a feeling that the changes are not about improving the area for the local residents, but more targeted at attracting new, wealthier citizens instead. The municipality admits that they contemplate to increase the value of housing and land in the area through planned development projects and the creation of the train station. These measures as well as the concept of social mixing (blandstaden) can be interpreted as being steps towards gentrifying the area.

Mannheim, on the contrary, is working towards social cohesion within the area as the lack of civic participation and social networks in the area are recognised to be the main issues. The QM, which was initiated by the housing associations in the beginning, strives to establish self-sustaining structures in Herzogenried. Therefore, the QM has initiated mostly social measures trying to create a local community. Some of the examples are: social events, a regular district conference, a district choir, a neighbourhood newspaper, which is issued every quarter, and many small local events like markets and festivals. However, some changes in the physical dimension have also been done - a new tram line was established nearby Herzogenried. Moreover there are projects aimed at spatial improvement of the area, such as painting projects for prettying up the district, the artistic design of the facades, and an urban gardening project. The QM also tries to keep the area liveable by supporting local trade and amenities as well as initiating sport events and tourneys. On the city scale the authorities discuss to foster social mixing, without causing gentrification in Herzogenried, by giving 25% of new housing in all the districts for affordable housing.

To sum up, although the issues that all of the cities face in their deprived mass housing districts seem rather similar, they do not have the same strategy. However, it has to be admitted that Århus and Malmö share more similarities with each other than with Mannheim. This might be a result of a different conceptualisation of the main issue in the cities, different financial capacities, or different ways how the city administrations operate.
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8. Appendix

8.1. Interview guideline

1. What is your function in the city administration?
2. Please explain your role in the project.
3. Please describe the district before the project(-s) were initiated?
   a. What was the relationship between the district and the rest of the city?
4. Why was the project initiated?
   a. What was the main aim?
5. Is this an integration policy that the city is doing in the district?
   a. Please explain your understanding of integration (in this project) from a social and/or spatial approach.
   b. Have you considered integration to be the solution in this project? And if so, why do you think it could solve problems of segregation?
6. What about concentration of social groups being a natural pattern or possibly having positive outcomes?
7. What is your opinion on social mixing and is that something that you are trying or hoping to achieve?
8. Please describe some of the spatial efforts and the purpose/aim of them.
9. Please describe some of the social efforts that have been initiated and the purpose/aim of them.
10. Are there any “bridging approaches” to connect the district to the rest of the city. What do you hope to achieve with this?
11. Who were the initiators of the project and who are the current stakeholders?
12. What does the setup look like? What is the relationship between the different stakeholders?
13. What is the essence or foundation of this specific policy?
14. What is the relationship between the district and the rest of the city now? How did the relationship change?
15. How has the progress of the project been so far?
   a. Have there been any specific problems?
   b. In hindsight, would you have done something different?
16. Is there anything else you want to mention?

8.2. List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Interview date</th>
<th>Interview form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Frølund</td>
<td>Århus</td>
<td>Mayor's office</td>
<td>09 May 2017</td>
<td>telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonna Sandin Larkander</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Planning office</td>
<td>09 May 2017</td>
<td>in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena Alevrä</td>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>Planning office</td>
<td>12 May 2017</td>
<td>in person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Ebert</td>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>Office for social planning</td>
<td>11 May 2017</td>
<td>telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>