Haute Couture in a working class quarter

The way inhabitants and newcomers experience gentrification in their neighbourhood.
“Imagined reality and physical reality collide in gentrification. This process of neighbourhood change is often incomplete and fragmented even in its more advanced states.”

David Ley (1996: 8)

“The new urban glamour zones conceal a brutalizing demarcation of winners and losers, included and excluded.”

Gordon MacLeod (2002: 605)

“To date too little attention has been paid to the voices of ordinary citizens whose cities have been reshaped, who live with these landscapes every day and whose experiences would validate or refute the theses put forward by others.”

Tim Hall (2004: 71)
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Summary

As the quotes show in the beginning of the thesis, gentrification deals with the preferred and the actual reality of a neighbourhood: an upgrading of the urban space does not always suits local wishes and thus more attention should be paid to the voices of ordinary citizens. The quotes are part of a worldwide theory on gentrification and, as many theorists mention, every case of gentrification evolves in a different way. Klarendal is not the exception.

Klarendal is a small neighbourhood close to the city centre of the Dutch city Arnhem. The houses in some quarters and around the main roads remind you that the neighbourhood was built in the 19th century. However, most of the houses were (re)built in the 20th century. The local housing corporation owns a big share of the housing and so most houses are rental houses. In 2000, the liveability in Klarendal was at its lowest point. With help from the Dutch government and even the European Union, the local municipality and housing corporation started making plans for the regeneration of Klarendal. In seven years 80 million Euros were spent in the revitalization of Klarendal, half of which went to housing. In 2008, the Modekwartier was set up, in order to bring business back again into the main street of Klarendal; the local housing corporation invested 20 million Euros in this project. Within three years, this fashion quarter expanded to thirty shops offering a wide range of luxurious (fashion) design merchandise.

An investigation is conducted in order to understand whether Klarendal is a case of (state-led) gentrification. Keeping in mind that this could be the case, for both theory and policy, it was also very useful to know how local residents experience the progress in their neighbourhood.

The first part of the research involved gentrification. One could say that it is taking place in Klarendal, although, in its early stage. On the one hand, Klarendal is not a no-go area any more. On the other hand, it does not attract much middle class yet. The definition of gentrification in The Dictionary of Human Geography seems to fit perfectly the case of Klarendal: an older, inner-city district, occupied by a lower income population, with renovated or redeveloped properties. What powerfully caught attention is the transition from rent to private ownership in the last few years. According to Hamnett (1984), this is Klarendal’s major sign of a trend towards gentrification. So, the main issue open for discussion is: to what extent have lower income households been displaced in favour of middle class settlement? There are several issues to consider. Klarendal used to have a lot of vacant houses, a share of which is occupied by newcomers now. Besides, there are some authors who believe that gentrification does not automatically lead to the displacement of the working class and that lower income residents could even benefit from a trend of gentrification.

The second part of the research question dealt with how residents experience the process of gentrification. Respondents in the focus groups found it hard to put in plain words what a Klarendaller is like. Some do even see themselves also as newcomers or entrepreneurs in creative businesses. The families that have lived for decades in Klarendal consider themselves the true Klarendallers. They were first critical on the plans of urban renewal. Today, most people are content about the calmness and safety the Modekwartier has brought into their neighbourhood. It is an outcome that recurrently appears in the literature (Sullivan, 2007; Doucet, 2009). There are some issues inhabitants cannot understand about the Modekwartier. First, customers often stand before a closed door. Besides, the products are not interesting for the residents themselves; they do not vary much and are far too expensive as well. Brian Doucet (2009) reported about this phenomenon. In his words, flagship urban regeneration projects do not serve the long time residents, but serve the affluent residents of outside the neighbourhood. But that does not mean that the investments do
not help the residents. People can benefit from less crime and poverty. The advent of classy shops and bars within a neighbourhood, results in a deconcentration of poverty (Atkinson, 2002; Freeman, 2006). Inhabitants themselves do not foresee a gentrified neighbourhood, because the houses are inappropriate; too small. At the same time, some insiders know that house prices in Klarendal are rising rapidly. The existence of the Modekwartier, the renovated frontages and public realm, and advantages of centrality are making Klarendal a hip place to go and live.

Regarding the gentrifiers of Klarendal, the entrepreneurs of the Modekwartier started doing business three years ago and some only recently. At the beginning, the Modekwartier had to prove itself because its situation was a bit artificial, but fortunately the business has changed naturally and now offers a more diverse supply. In 2008, at the beginning, there was much distrust present. Today, inhabitants feel more comfortable. Designers are glad with the new fashionable bars and they frequent them often. Dwellers are not so much present in these cafes. Here, Klarendal turns out to be comparable to earlier studies (Butler, 2003; Butler & Robson, 2003). Another phenomenon was also applicable to Klarendal; in their day-to-day lives gentrifiers tend to live quite apart from non-middle class residents. Considering the process of gentrification designers seems to be unaware about their influence on the spatial environment. Similar as the inhabitants the entrepreneurs think that the small houses would prevent the arrival of people with capital. Here, people do not realize the existence of cultural capital and the rise of the young urban professionals, who also do not have much financial capital. Entrepreneurs do see that they are selling extraordinary luxurious merchandise and that house prices have risen since their arrival. Also, a lot of upstairs apartments are for sale and among peers Klarendal is a great place to go and live.
Samenvatting (Dutch version)

De citaten in het begin van de scriptie geven een goed beeld van het verhaal achter deze scriptie. Gentrification heeft te maken met de gewenste en de werkelijke vormgeving van een woonwijk, een verbetering van de stedelijke ruimte past niet altijd bij de lokale wensen en behoeftes, er zou meer aandacht moeten worden besteed aan de stem van de gewone burger. Deze uitspraken zijn onderdeel van een wereldwijde studie in gentrification. Veel wetenschappers merken op dat elk voorbeeld van gentrification weer anders is. Zo is Klarendal ook geen uitzondering.

Klarendal is een kleine woonwijk, dichtbij het centrum van de stad Arnhem. Woningen aan de hoofdstraten en in bepaalde buurten herinneren je eraan dat de wijk al oud is, verschillende delen dateren uit de 19e eeuw. Echter, de meeste huizen dateren uit de vorige eeuw. De lokale woningbouwcorporatie heeft een groot deel van de woningen in bezit, dit betekent dat de meerderheid van de woningen wordt verhuurd. In het jaar 2000 was de leefbaarheid van Klarendal op een dieptepunt. Met hulp van de Nederlandse regering en zelfs de Europese Unie konden de lokale gemeente en woningbouwcorporatie plannen maken voor de herstructurering van Klarendal. In zeven jaar tijd werd 80 miljoen euro geïnvesteerd in de wijk, waarvan de helft werd uitgebracht aan de woningen. Om weer bedrijvigheid te creëren in de hoofdstraat van de wijk werd in 2008 van start gegaan met het Modekwartier; de plaatselijke woningbouwcorporatie stopte 20 miljoen euro in het project. Binnen drie jaar werd het Modekwartier uit tot dertig ondernemingen. De winkels hebben een breed aanbod van luxe (mode) design artikelen.

Dit onderzoek is gestart om te weten te komen of Klarendal een voorbeeld is van state-led gentrification, oftewel de gereguleerde variant van gentrification, of juist niet. Met de gedachte in het hoofd dat dit proces wel degelijk plaatsvindt is het ook relevant om er achter te komen hoe de lokale bewoners deze lokale ontwikkelingen in hun buurt ervaren.

Wanneer men de eerste vraag bestudeerd, dan zou men kunnen zeggen dat gentrification wel degelijk plaats vindt in Klarendal. Echter, het is nog in een vroeg stadium. Klarendal is geen no-go-area meer, maar het trekt nog niet echt de midden klasse. Wanneer men kijkt naar de definitie van gentrification in The Dictionary of Human Geography lijkt deze perfect te passen op de case Klarendal; een oudere wijk in een binnenstad, bevolkt door een lagere inkomensklasse, waarvan een deel van het (woning)bestand is gerenoveerd en/of herontwikkeld. Wat in Klarendal de meeste aandacht trekt is de trend van wisseling van huur naar privaat eigendom. Volgens Hamnett (1984) zou dit de duidelijkste indicator zijn van gentrification in Klarendal. Er staat echter een onderwerp ter discussie: in hoeverre zijn de lagere inkomens verdrongen ten gunste van de vestiging van middenklasse?. Verschillende redenen zijn mogelijk. Klarendal had te maken met leegstand, een deel van deze huizen is nu bewoond door nieuwkomers. Daarnaast beweren enkele wetenschappers dat gentrification niet automatisch hoeft te leiden tot een verdringing van de lokale arbeidersklasse.

Het tweede deel van de onderzoeks vraag richt zich op de vraag hoe bewoners het proces van gentrification ervaren. Respondenten in de focus groepen vonden het lastig om in klare taal een Klarendaller te omschrijven. Sommigen zagen zichzelf ook als nieuwkomers of ondernemers in de creatieve industrie. De families die Klarendal al sinds generaties bevolken zien zichzelf als de werkelijke Klarendalers. Eerst waren zij kritisch op de plannen voor herstructurering, maar tegenwoordig zijn de meeste mensen tevreden met de rust en veiligheid die het Modekwartier in hun wijk gebracht heeft. Dit is een uitkomst die we terug zien komen in de wetenschappelijke literatuur (Sullivan, 2007; Doucet, 2009). Er zijn enkele zaken die bewoners niet kunnen begrijpen als

De groep van gentrifiers van Klarendal, oftewel de nieuwkomers die gentrification genereren, wordt grotendeels gevormd door de ondernemers van het Modekwartier. Drie jaar geleden waren de eerste ondernemers gestart, enkelen nog maar sinds recentelijk. Gedurende de start van het Modekwartier moest het zichzelf nog bewijzen. De situatie was nog wat kunstmatig, maar heeft zich op een natuurlijke manier weten te verbeteren doordat het meer ruimte kreeg voor diversiteit. Tijdens de start van het project was er nog veel wantrouwen vanuit de bevolking. Echter, tegenwoordig hebben bewoners er een goed gevoel bij. Designers zijn blij met de nieuwe hippe bars; zij komen er geregeld. Inwoners zijn er niet veel te vinden. Ook hier komt Klarendal sterk overeen met andere case studies (Butler, 2003; Butler & Robson, 2003). Een andere fenomeen was ook toepasbaar in Klarendal; in het alledaags leven hebben gentrifiers de neiging om apart te leven van de niet-midden klasse bewoners. Ten aanzien van het proces van gentrification zijn designers onbewust van hun invloed op de ruimte. Net als de bewoners denken ondernemers dat de kleine woningen de komst van kapitaal zullen afhouden. Mensen zijn zich hier niet bewust van het bestaan van cultureel kapitaal en het weinig financiële kapitaal van yuppies. Echter, ondernemers zijn zich er wel bewust van dat zij bijzonder luxe artikelen verkopen en dat huizenprijzen sinds hun vestiging zijn gestegen. Daarnaast weten zij dat veel bovenwoningen te koop staan en dat Klarendal onder collega’s een populaire plaats is geworden om te komen en zich te vestigen.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction
It was the 24th of May, 2008. The Modekwartier was opened officially. At five o’clock in the afternoon thousands of inhabitants were exhilarated by the arrival of the new fashion designers. With the music of Brand New Day, the new entrepreneurs threw fresh fragrant petals over the crowd, see Photo 2. Later on that day a fashion show and dress ball made the opening complete. Now, after more than three years the public space and frontages are refurbished, the streets are calm and safe, but there is doubt about the way to go. The inhabitants of Klarendal agree that the area is much more safe and liveable, now. However, the set up of a fashion quarter has brought in business with which inhabitants cannot identify themselves; it is not part of them.

1.2 Background
To understand the current situation of Klarendal it is useful to take a look at the past. What have been the experiences for the neighbourhood and its inhabitants until now? Which events have been influential for the Klarendal of today? Klarendal is a neighbourhood in the city of Arnhem, the Netherlands. Within the city, it is located at the north from the inner city of Arnhem. The district houses 6,765 people, out of Arnhem’s total population of 147,018 (CBS, 2011).

History of Klarendal
The first houses of Klarendal were built in 1830 (historischklarendal.nl, 2010). Before 1860, an expansion of more than eighty houses took place. After that until the beginning of the 20th century, the neighbourhood went through a state of calm enlargement. The municipality got more and more property and built once in a while new houses in combination with the building of a mill, a cemetery, schools, a hospital, sewerage and roads. The housing corporation Volkshuisvesting Arnhem already obtained houses in Klarendal and a neighbourhood association was established. In 1968, the condition of houses reached its nadir. At this point, the 600 houses out of the 1,500 that existed in Klarendal, owned by the municipality of Arnhem, were destined for demolition. Urgent sanitation measures took place along some with refurbishment measures. Due to difficulties in obtaining houses and in finding an affordable replacement a lot of uncertainty grew among local inhabitants.

In 1970, uncertainty was replaced by anger when rebellions arose against the downgrading of the neighbourhood. Every day, new houses were walled up and later set on fire, which gave the fire department constant action (historischklarendal.nl, 2010). To improve the liveability, which was the thinking of that time, the municipality demolished in the 1970s and 1980s a big share of the houses and replaced them by more modern dwellings, closer to the housing standards of that time (Kei-centrum, 2009). Another extraordinary event was the drug revolts of 1989. Due to the well known reputation of Klarendal in the drug trade, many people from the city, outside and even Germany came over to the neighbourhood. The bustle of cars and drug users irritated the quality of life of the inhabitant and the ‘scene’ seemed to rule the neighbourhood in which it imposed its own rules; German cars were smashed and set on fire (EenVandaag, July 2010). Inhabitants refurbished one of the houses and offered it to the police as a policy office, as a request for constant supervision. In 1999, the police office was transformed into a police ‘living room’, to get in touch with people in an informal way. This idea was innovative and copied to other places in the Netherlands (Netwerk, 2007).
In the year 2000, the living conditions in Klarendal reached a new lowest point. The local politics described Klarendal at that time as follows (Gemeente Arnhem, 2000):

“Klarendal deals with problems of poverty, social isolation and is characterized by a poor social infrastructure. There are also problems of maintenance of houses and streets. The public space is a run-down impression. There are troubles in the public order, visible in significant problems with groups of young people, which are also expressed in various forms of drug crime and nuisance. The simmering intolerance between and within different groups of native and ethnic citizens also deserves the highest priority. Confidence in the government and other agencies in recent years have declined considerably. We are dealing with a cynical atmosphere where many people have lost their hope in a better future.”

Kei-centrum, an online Dutch knowledge centre in urban renewal and (data)centre of the forty disadvantaged areas in the Netherlands, provides some more useful facts about Klarendal anno 2000 (Kei-centrum, 2009). For instance, 40% of the housing in Klarendal was built before the Second World War, implying that they were constructed for other life standards than the current ones. Also 62% of the housing fare of small single family and multifamily houses, furthermore, 79% of the housing is of the rental sector. These factors have a big share in the group of people that are attracted to these houses, mainly low income. Finally, some numbers are useful about the people that were actively involved in the neighbourhood improvement and the people that actually messed it up for the others: 24% of the inhabitant were actively involved in neighbourhood improvement and only a small core of people, living in about ten until fifteen streets, was causing relatively much nuisance (Kei-centrum, 2009).

The cry for a better liveability resulted in the project Klarendal kom op! (Klarendal come on!) that started in 2000. Its four leading principles were: clean streets, safety, education and social cohesion. The work on these principles was spread out over three phases: first year (try to do what is possible), first four years (develop what is possible) and until 2015 (the future of the neighbourhood) (Kei-centrum, 2009). In 2004, participants of the project felt that they had done a good job, but there was still much to do. The project of improvement was continuing, but with another name: Klarendal gaat door! (Klarendal goes on!). In 2005, inhabitants explained that the quarter used to be more lively with a lot of commercial activities going on, but since then had left the neighbourhood because security issues and because of the changing image of the neighbourhood. Together with the help and financial support of the local housing corporation and a consultant, the municipality came up with the idea to bring in business by giving young graduated fashion designers of the local academy a change of setting up their own enterprise. In August 2006, a fashion quarter in Klarendal was officially established.

In 2007, Klarendal was marked as one of the forty Vogelaarwijken, forty neighbourhoods in the Netherlands that, according to the national government, deserve more attention for renewal. Being nationally noticed as a disadvantaged area meant more openings for financial support. According to the website of Kei-centrum Klarendal had earned, until 2007, approximately 2.5 million euro of financial aid (Kei-centrum, 2009). With the start of the Vogelaarwijken the sum of 250 million euro was divided over forty districts every year. The exact amount of money that Klarendal receives is not public, but for sure it is about a few million Euros every year (NRC Handelsblad, 2007). At least sixteen million euro have been provided to fund in the Modekwartier by the housing corporation and it will invest, until 2013, another fifteen million Euros (EenVandaag, July 2010).
The rise of a difficult plight

In this section an explanation will follow of the actual plight that needs to be investigated. In the six years of existence of the Modekwartier, see Appendix I, the name of the fashion quarter of Klarendal, the young project had to defend itself fiercely. Not all inhabitants responded enthusiastically to the plans of the government. Despite, the fact that the initiators had shared their plans extensively, still a small group of people was suspicious towards the project. When looking to the newspaper articles of the last few years that were published in De Gelderlander about the project, heavy critique is raised by several inhabitants. What is important to mention is that many comments on the Modekwartier cannot be taken seriously; some people wrote disrespectfully and without the understanding of the (inside) knowledge. However, some comments come up many times, such as: doubts about the costs and benefits, uneven grants, inhabitants will not go to the new shops (too expensive and not fitting their demand), shops are only open half days, etc. (Ploeg, 2010; Gelder, 2011; De Gelderlander, 2011).

Recently, sad news came out about the Modekwartier, where continuous vandalism occurs towards new shops (De Gelderlander, 2011). The owner of a damaged shop was thinking: “Is it that people perhaps hate our design snobs?”. A journalist took the initiative to study shortly the attitude of inhabitants towards the Modekwartier (Kool, 2011). An inhabitant who lived for fifty years in Klarendal said that the destruction was most likely not committed by irritated inhabitants, but by vandals. She does not like fashion, but she is not against it. Moreover, the Modekwartier has made the neighbourhood proper and liveable. Another person, the journalist interviewed, said that he did know people who are against fashion in their neighbourhood. They simply cannot believe that the government is investing in the project, while they are left helpless. Vandalism does occur more often, but it is also elsewhere, for instance people are also spitting on the shop windows of the local police office (Kool, 2011).

Within the group of designers that constitutes the Modekwartier there is also some rumble. A recent threat for the economic development of the Modekwartier is some disunity in the project. One of the pioneers (Marck&Mo) has quit working within DOCKS, the local entrepreneurs association, and moved over to another association (Gelder, 2011).

Taking all issues together the situation in Klarendal is as follows. The neighbourhood is in a state of revitalization where because of ambitious investments newcomers are settling. Those newcomers are focused on setting up an enterprise, selling fashion products to wealthy clients coming from elsewhere. The inhabitants are not really a target group for sales. Buyers come mostly from the upper class, while the shops are located in a poor working class district. There are several questions that come up. How do elitist shops position themselves in a working class neighbourhood? How can both classes work together? How are newcomers welcomed? How quick does gentrification take place?

1.3 Relevance

Scientific relevance

In terms of theoretical relevance the master thesis will build further on the works ‘Gentrification theory’. Klarendal, nationally known as a disadvantaged area, has received massive funds in for refurbishment in the last decade, many projects has been set up to improve the poor situation of the neighbourhood. One of the key projects, the Modekwartier, has converted several parts of the quarter radically; not only in terms of infrastructure, but also in terms of everyday life. In theory,
qualitative data is missing about the inhabitants of (Dutch) neighbourhoods that are dealing with changes of gentrification.

Especially, the phenomenon of state-led gentrification is relevant to study. Places as Kreuzberg (Berlin), Barnsbury (London), Brooklyn Heights (New York City), are studied already intensively, but there gentrification took place in a more or less natural way. It was artists who had chosen to settle for financial reasons, or the new middle class attracted by the inner city life. Instead, in Arnhem it was the local municipality who supported in the settlement.

Furthermore, there is no proper translation for the concept of ‘gentrification’ available in Dutch. Uitermark, Duyvendak, Musterd and Smith are the main scientists in the Netherlands doing research on this topic. Most of the few cases that are studied are carried out in a quantitative way, from an economic perspective. Although gentrification is fundamentally related to economic change, such transformation exerts a substantial impact on identity, behaviour and the atmosphere of coexistence. In the (Dutch) gentrification narratives a focus on these social themes has been particularly welcome.

Policy relevance
This project has relevance for policy on different levels. At the very bottom, it may inform local organizations such as Wijkplatform (an association for Klarendal) and DOCKS (an association for fashion entrepreneurs) about the different positions of the neighbourhood’s inhabitants and businesspersons. Certainly, it is difficult to talk about hard identities because everyone has got more than one identity, that spans from inhabitant to designer, a butcher, a father, a neighbour, a friend, and so forth. However, a critique from these neighbourhood’s insiders may be articulated as a result of the researcher’s effort to make the implicit explicit. Second, this study may help the municipality of Arnhem and Volkshuisvesting Arnhem to take a look at the underlying structures of one of the areas under their jurisdiction. Regarding the private sector, this research could help potential investors to estimate the effects that their activities could produce upon the local atmosphere. Finally, at the national level, this study will provide Klarendal, one of the Vogelaarwijken and one of the leading creative hotspots in the Netherlands, with a fresh analysis of its recent developments that exposes both the good and bad practices that have taken place. Furthermore, this could help other places in the country that are experiencing similar problems and ambitions.

1.4 Objective and research questions
The formulation of the objective and research questions explains how the research in Klarendal is approached.

Objective
This section addresses the essence of the research by formulating the plight Klarendal faces. By focussing on Klarendal we do not deal with a problem but with the potential problems and strengths of this neighbourhood. For some years now, Klarendal has dealt with the new phenomenon of the Modekwartier or, as it has also been called, the project 100%Mode, which has had an increasing impact on the neighbourhood. The developers of the project (Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, Gemeente Arnhem, Hogeschool ArtEZ and Adviesbureau Seinpost) envisioned a bright future for Klarendal that consisted in making it lively and safe again by attracting fashion designers. Now that this project has been unfolding for some years, its main financial investor, Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, wants to know which have been the results.
Plainly stated:

“The objective of this research is to understand the effects of the project the Modekwartier on the neighbourhood of Klarendal, Arnhem, by investigating the experiences of its current population, in order to make explicit their implicit thoughts and actions and to contribute to (Dutch) gentrification theory on social issues”

Formulation of Questions
In line with the objective, the following research question is follows:

“Is a process of gentrification taking place in Klarendal (Arnhem, the Netherlands)? And if so how is this process experienced by the inhabitants and the gentrifiers?”

In order to give an answer to the research question, the following sub questions need to be answered:

1. **What do statistics say about Klarendal’s situation during its lowest point of decay and today?**
2. **What do statistics say about the gentrified neighbourhood of Spijkerkwartier (at the south of Klarendal) in the past and today?**
3. **What policy has been applied to the urban renewal of Klarendal? How forceful has it been?**
4. **How do the inhabitants of Klarendal experience processes of gentrification?**
   - Has it improved their life quality? (f.i. wealth, employment, safety, built environment, health, education, recreation and leisure time, social belonging, freedom, human rights, happiness, etc.)
   - Has it changed the income/outcome of households and local enterprises?
   - What is the attitude towards the Modekwartier? or other ‘newcomers’?
5. **How do gentrifiers (the newcomers) experience the gentrifying neighbourhood?**
   - Has it improved their life quality? (f.i. wealth, employment, safety, built environment, health, education, recreation and leisure time, social belonging, freedom, human rights, happiness, etc.)
   - Has it changed their income/outcome?
   - What is the attitude towards the inhabitants?

1.5 Methodology
Except for a case study with a neighbour district, the research was fully focused on Klarendal. Two groups were studied who were directly involved in the redevelopment of Klarendal, namely: the entrepreneurs of the Modekwartier (i.e. the newcomers) and the already existing group of inhabitants. As a first step, the background story and quantitative data available for Klarendal were researched and collected: statistics about inhabitants, households, income and liveability. These numbers were used to compare the neighbourhood with an already gentrified part of the city. In the search for information about how these two different processes of urban regeneration took place, two expert interviews were conducted. Besides, some strolls through the neighbourhood yielded photographs that contribute to telling the story of Klarendal, a gentrifying neighbourhood, in a more visual way. The strategy of urban renewal in Klarendal was investigated by visiting several neighbourhood events and doing desktop research on fundamental reports and articles. After that, four focus groups were organized in order to grasp the experience of both inhabitants and
entrepreneurs of the Modekwartier concerning the integration of gentrifiers in a (formerly) run-down suburb. Finally, the conclusions were synthesized and summarized in the final section and directed to spurring a further discussion.

**Case study: Statistics & Expert interviews**

The first part of this study is mostly the product of a desktop research. A statistical analysis between Klarendal and Spijkerkwartier was carried out to compare the progress of both neighbourhoods to Arnhem. Several indicators were used as indicators for change: (dis)placement of various kinds of households, the ratio between rental and private housing, the average income and the rating of housing and the neighbourhood. The main source for local statistics was the *Statistisch Jaarboek* (Gemeente Arnhem, 2006, 2007b, 2008, 2009, 2010).

Subsequently, two expert interviews were organized in order to gather the experience of two specialists in the topic who are living in Spijkerkwartier: one is member of the Neighbourhood Board Spijkerkwartier and the other is a renowned researcher in urban planning. Both enriched the case study by answering the following questions: “Is a case study on these two districts a fair one?”, “In what manner took gentrification place in Spijkerkwartier?” and “Is Klarendal also in a stage of gentrification?”. One interview was conducted face-to-face for about one hour. The other was, due to the interviewee’s busy schedule, conducted by telephone during about half an hour. Although for this reason the second interview could not be recorded, notes were made. The first interview was recorded and transcribed. A subsequent content analysis highlighted and labelled important quotes.

**Observations and visual analysis**

During the investigation hundreds of photos were taken. About a dozen photos are used to show signs of (de)gentrifying processes in Klarendal. A case study yielded much information, but at the end an illustration of the actual situation visually shows what we are talking about. The selection and ordering procedure of the pictures was a highly subjective job and for that reason much space has been left for their interpretation. Only the more objective facts were brought to the front. Despite the fact that the researcher has been lead by his assumptions, the photos show the story of a highly dynamic neighbourhood. Observations have contributed to illustrate its development.

**Secondary documentation**

After obtaining the statistical material, a background about earlier and present developments in Klarendal was researched. Much of the improvement in Klarendal was achieved by the work of local authorities. For this reason it was easy to find sources on decisions regarding policy making, because most of them are published. Various reports and (news)articles were used as the basis for the description of the regeneration of Klarendal, which constitutes an external process of policy making.

**Focus groups**

In order to get an idea about the internal process of how people have experienced the developments in Klarendal, there is chosen to make a divide between the original inhabitants and the newcomers to the Modekwartier. While a lot of professional research focuses on the outcomes of surveys, this study has the aim to gain ‘real life insights’ from the people involved in the process under examination. The choice to conduct the research in a qualitative way meant that two major methods were available: interviews and observations. Because the research aim is to condense the experience of a whole neighbourhood, there is chosen to draw upon *focus groups*. This approach follows the
interpretative qualitative approach that has emerged as an alternative to the positivist approaches that have dominated the social sciences (Mason, 2002).

According to Flick (2009: 213) this method has the following advantage, it is a: “Simulation of the way discourses and social representations are generated in their diversity”. Whereas, a semi standardized interview or an expert interview is only focused on one person, the focus group exposes the local thinking in a forum where people share their ideas and search for confirmation. At the same time, people also correct statements if they think they are wrong.

But at the same time, there is also a big disadvantage: How to sample groups and members?” (Flick, 2004: 213). When setting up the focus groups the aim was to hold replicate the actual composition of the neighbourhood, which is not present in the local associations: Wijkplatform and Bewonersgroep. Around one third of the inhabitants has lived here for generations, another third is made of students and artists, and the final group comprising approximately 38% of the citizens of Klarendal has a foreign background, of which 17% is Turkish (Kessels, 2009; CBS, 2010). When finding oneself in a meeting of the present associations, one notices that the group is made up of about ten men and women, of an age varying between thirty and sixty years; partly original inhabitants and partly living in Klarendal since a few years. Unfortunately, during the selection procedure it turned out to be very difficult to find people willing to take part in a focus group. When asking people on the street, inhabitants say often that they are not interested and not familiar with this topic. Especially, the group of non-Western migrants, was not interested. At the end, a consult about potential, interested and involved people at the neighbourhood centre, Wijkwinkel, was very fruitful.

Because a response of the entire population is impossible to achieve with the available resources, a split of the population is asked to share their experiences about the Modekwartier and other developments in Klarendal. In fact, participants were selected as part of a select stratified sample. According to this sampling strategy the population gets divided into various classes who do not overlap. Every person that becomes part of the sample is selected, according to the composition of the future focus group. In contrast to surveys where these statistical terms originally come from, a focus group contains only a small set of people. Although a true representation of reality is impossible to achieve, by organizing multiple meetings with different participants a sense of reality is attainable. Issues that pop up more than one time are interesting for research, because a significant share of the people perceives them as important. Focus group one, consisted of six participants, of which three had lived in Klarendal for nearly their whole lives and the other three were relatively newcomers. Focus group two and four will be elaborated in the next section. Focus group three, was made up of four people, one of them a Turkish inhabitant, two elders, formerly active inhabitants; and a young, active dweller.

The selection procedure of participants for focus groups with entrepreneurs occurred in a different way. Whereas, for the focus groups with inhabitants one has to pick some people out of a total population of about a few thousand people, the focus group with entrepreneurs meant that the spotlight had to be set on a marginal group of people behind the creative industry of Klarendal: the shops of the Modekwartier. Within this particular group there are no significant differences among people as there are among the group of inhabitants. For this reason there is been done an a select sample for the first focus group of entrepreneurs, focus group 2. However, at the beginning of the session it turned out that the group was made up of three designers aged around fifty, all of whom started years ago. The focus group results were satisfying, however, this group suggested to organize a new focus group with young, starting designers. Focus group 2, existed out of three women of around fifty years, all busy with fashion design, of which two of them are born and raised in Arnhem.
Focus group 4 was made up of one man and three women of around thirty years, three of which were specialized in fashion design, and one of which originated from Arnhem.

The sessions with every focus group took around one hour during which three to four propositions derived from the formulation of research questions were discussed. First, “Klarendallers and fashion designers go well together!” Here, the research tries to understand the identity of the neighbourhood. It should answer questions like, “Which people occupy Klarendal?”, “What character has and has had Klarendal?” and “How do people stand towards new creative entrepreneurs?” Second, “Investments in Klarendal by Volkshuisvesting Arnhem (Goed proeven, Modekwartier, Design hotel) do not fit in Klarendal!” This proposition questions how inhabitants respond to the revitalization of their neighbourhood; as a bridge to the final proposition. Third, “Klarendal will not become like Spijkerkwartier!” During the district conference Klarendal 2021, April 21st of 2011, this quote was made by an inhabitant and had influence on the research in such a manner that a case study had to be conducted, see paragraph 3.3. Spijkerkwartier, is an adjacent district what has gone through a process of gentrification; a process that Klarendal could also be prone to. The focus group with fashion designers had a different third proposition: “Klarendal will become the Jordaan of the east!” This proposition questions if the business climate is healthy enough to succeed. Finally, they also got a fourth proposition to discuss: “Clustering of shops is good for business!”

The discussions of all four focus groups were recorded with permission of the participants. Then, every meeting was transcribed. A content analysis highlighted and labelled important quotes. When implementing in the text, a selection analysis was carried out based on the principles of usability, reliability, validity and efficiency. Due to their inherent subjectivity focus groups produced some questionable statements. However, this was offset by an advantage of focus groups: correction is made by other participants of the meeting. Moreover, the filter of the content analysis could remove questionable passages.

1.6 Book marker
Chapter 2 is all about the chosen theory of gentrification. The chapter is intended as theory in its chronological context of development. However, the various viewpoints that have arisen were all subject to change. As a consequence a fully chronological text was impracticable. First, there is a description where the phenomenon are introduced and recognized. Second, the used definitions of the phenomenon is discussed. Third, gentrification will be explained according to all the existing viewpoints. The floor is open for the main contributors of the discourse. Fourthly, the present Dutch discourse on gentrification will be elaborated, because it brings the subject closer to the chosen case study. Subsequently, an essential text is elaborated on theory about how people experience gentrification in their neighbourhood. Finally, a conceptual framework explains which concepts are studied and how they are embedded in theory building.

Chapter 3 answers the question whether Klarendal is in a process of gentrification or not. In here the opinion of the inhabitants is not included. First, photo series show the actual state of gentrification in Klarendal. Second, a case study with, the recognized gentrified neighbour district, Spijkerkwartier is conducted. There is chosen to combine hard statistical data with the opinion of ‘experts’.

Chapter 4 goes further into the described background of Klarendal. An image will be built of the way the government and housing corporation have addressed the urban renewal of Klarendal. Various recent events show again, but in more detail the locally applied approach.
Chapter 5 starts off with the obtained experience of inhabitants on the gentrifying booster of Klarendal: the *Modekwartier*. A range of topics comes to the front: the identity of the citizens and newcomers, integration and the rise of the yuppies.

Chapter 6 describes the acquired experience of the new entrepreneurs their selves. During sessions other themes were discussed, such as: the start of their shop, customers, the attitude of inhabitants, the bigger goals of the *Modekwartier* and gentrification.

Finally, chapter 7 gives a general conclusion on the obtained knowledge during the period of research. Based on the new knowledge it reflects critically on present theory of gentrification. However, one remains critical on the fieldwork itself and thus a respective evaluation is included.
2. **Theory of gentrification**

2.1 **Introduction to gentrification**

Klarendal, the chosen research area, is a neighbourhood with a problematic past and a future of potential gentrification, due to the investments of governments and other institutions and the input of newcomers, see 1.2. The goal of understanding the effects of a rising gentrification in the neighbourhood will be pursued by building on previous literature on the topic.

2.1.1 **Emergence of gentrification**

The demolishment of lower class buildings in order to give the floor to the more ‘civilized’ middle or high class is a phenomenon of all time. The group in power chooses where and how to live. However, there is a consensus on the first evidences of gentrification. In Paris of the 1860s, some sort of new-built gentrification took place in the former residential areas of the poor in Central Paris. Embourgeoisment developed itself, due, to the wholesale destruction of neighbourhoods inherent to the modernization scheme of Paris (known as Haussmannization). It was Baron Haussmann, a member of Napoleon III’s court, who demolished housing of the low class and displaced them to make room for the city’s now famous tree lined boulevards, which served as a showcase to the famous monuments and zone of wealth. These happenings in Paris, but also in central London, were exceptional, though they were meant to strengthen bourgeois control and to profit from rebuilding (Harvey, 2003; 2005)

However, the first identified gentrification was found in Georgetown, Washington, and Backon Hill, Boston, during the 1930s. It was brought in to the city by bureaucrats to assist in the administration of New Deal programs. Decades later, in the mid 1960s, gentrification started occurring systematically in metropolitan cities, such as London, New York, Vancouver and Toronto. Protests were raised by architects and historians but later tempered by young, middle class families who bought and lived at ease in renovated houses in deteriorated neighbourhoods. American analysts felt uncomfortable with the term gentrification, with its obvious class connotations, preferring instead labels such as back-to-the-city movement, neighbourhood revitalization, and brown stoning (Smith & Williams, 1986: 65).

It was Ruth Glass who first mentioned the term gentrification, to describe a process of class based neighbourhood change in a handful London neighbourhoods (Glass, 1964: xviii-xix, appendix 2):

“One by one, many of the working class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle-classes - upper and lower. Shabby, modest mews and cottages - two rooms up and two down - have been taken over, when their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive residences. Larger Victorian houses, downgraded in an earlier or recent period – which were use as lodging houses or were otherwise in multiple occupation – have been upgraded once again. Nowadays, many of these houses are being sub-divided into costly flats or ‘houselets’ (in terms of the new real estate snob jargon). The current social status and value of such dwellings are frequently in inverse relation to their seize, and in any case enormously inflated by comparison with previous levels in their neighbourhoods. Once this process of ‘gentrification’ starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed. There is very little left of the poorer enclaves of Hampstead an Chelsea: in those boroughs,
The description Glass gives of the situation in central London is what we now call traditional gentrification. Which started in the 1950s when bohemian enclaves started to develop neighbourhoods in several cities including London. The term was chosen to portray the appearance of a new urban gentry, who was not interested anymore in the suburban way of life of the rural gentry in the 18th and 19th century. Literally, gentry-ication, means the replacement of an existing population by gentrify. As this suggests, gentrification is intimately related to social class (Jager, 1986; Smith, 1996).

2.1.2 Definition of gentrification
Over time there has been a shift in meanings on the definition of gentrification. For a long time Glass’ definition offered some form of unity in the field, but when time passed away different scientists of disciplines and theoretical traditions got involved in the debate about gentrification and its definition. The outcomes of this debate are visible in the description of gentrification that changes over time in The Dictionary of Human Geography. In 1994 (Johnston et al., 1994: 216-217), the definition was quite similar to the one by Glass; gentrification as a clear social ecological approach of urban development. Darwinian terms of invasion and succession of the human ecology approach of the Chicago School were at the very present. In 2000 (Johnston & Smith, 2000: 294) the approach towards gentrification got more ‘nuanced’ and directed towards a contextual macro level approach (Denkers, 2009: 19-20). The latest version of The Dictionary of Human Geography defined gentrification as (Gregory et al., 2009: 273-274):

“Middle class settlement in renovated or redeveloped properties in older, inner-city districts formerly occupied by a lower income population. The process was first named by Ruth glass, as she observed the arrival of the ‘gentry’ and the accompanying social transition of several districts in central London in the early 1960s. A decade later, broader recognition of gentrification followed in large cities such as London, san Francisco, New York, Boston, Toronto and Sydney undergoing occupational transition from an industrial to a post-industrial economy. But more recently gentrification has been identified more widely, in smaller urban centres, in Souther and Eastern Europe and also in some major centres in Asia and Latin America”

In comparison to former explanations, this definition uses residents as main actors on the macro level. Furthermore, the context is taken more seriously on the city and country scale. Also, in the newest edition, the word displacement is left out, emphasizing only that the area was earlier populated by lower class residents.

Other definitions were mentioned as well. For instance, leading gentrification scientists such as Neil Smith (1982;1987), Chris Hamnett (1984) and Daniel Hammel (2009). Many of the definitions
come close to what was said before, differences can be found in the weight of housing stocks, which is a remainder of the traditional gentrification.

In 2006, Tom Slater, a researcher in urban studies, brought a critical lens to the debate on gentrification, in which this phenomenon was increasingly being considered as a positive development. Slater himself was a victim of gentrification. In 2004, he was evicted from a flat in Tooting, London, because of a rent increase (Slater, 2006: 739). In urban studies, gentrification tends to be a ‘cool’ term, frequently used by journalists, policy makers, real estate organizations and consultants. Now, because of this positive and popular use of the term, there seems a lack of good practice and appropriate understanding of the debates concerning gentrification. Slater’s critiques ironically assess current gentrification studies: “the perception is no longer about rent increases, landlord harassment and working class displacement, but rather street level spectacles, trendy bars and cafes, i-Pods, social diversity and funky clothing outlets” (2006: 738). The understanding of gentrification as a positive term has come about as a result of economic perceptions that promote experience, creativity and culture (Denkers, 2010: 15).

**2.1.3 Multiple theoretical perspectives and contributions**

In the past decades several perspectives on gentrification have arisen within spatial science and urban studies. To understand the position and critique of a range of scientific critics it is useful to understand through which lenses they perceive this phenomenon. There are five acknowledged angles to view gentrification: sociological, economic, integral, cultural and hybrid (Weinstein, 2006).

The sociological perspective was developed in the 1960s and is also called the urban-ecological approach. Ruth Glass introduced the term gentrification to emphasize the invasion of middle class into poor working class neighbourhoods close to the city centre. In 1979, Gale added in later studies the term back-to-the-city-movement, emphasizing the middle class that moved out of the suburbs to the city centre. Most urban ecological research is focused on the middle and high class moving to old city neighbourhoods, the battle between different classes, conflicts within the district and the displacement of low income households. In 2004, the discussion around gentrification was boosted by the doctoral dissertation of Jason Patch. His paper “The embedded landscape of gentrification” employs a visual sociological approach in which conflicting images show how much the new landscape of gentrification is embedded and bound by industrial and ethnic landscapes (Patch, 2004). In 2008, he stimulated the discussion around the integration of gentrifiers in a (former) decayed suburb with his article “Ladies and gentrification”. According to Patch gentrifiers show the same characteristics of previous residents, they only bring in new public characters.

The economic perspective, started in the 1970s and 1980s when political economist started intermingling in the field of gentrification. Neil Smith (1979, 1982, 1986) was the leading figure. As a Marxist he explained gentrification according to the supply side of the market. While the middle and high class chose to go to the suburbs, the lowest class remained living in the city, due to the rent gap (Smith, 1982). The rent gap is the difference between the potential land prices and the current real estate value. When the gap between both values is high enough developers start to speculate over the land prices. Urban neighbourhoods become more appealing when the value of houses rises. House prices increase when housing corporations, governments or pioneers, such as young artists or graduates, start refurbishing derelict houses. A renewed interest opens a path for a process of gentrification. From an economic perspective, it is real estate developers who enable gentrification by creating landscapes that favour high income groups.
The integral perspective was launched at the end of the 1980s and beginning of 1990s. In an attempt to change the ongoing debate between the sociologic and economic approaches Rose (1984) and Hamnett (1984) developed an integral theory, trying to combine the sociological and the economic viewpoints, in order to get an overall image of the process of gentrification. Together with other scientists they found out that gentrification is both a sociological and economic phenomenon as well. In this sense, now, gentrification could also be studied in two ways at the same time: the supply (housing) and demand (needs and requirements of the gentrifiers).

The cultural perspective unfolded by the end of the 1980s. Today, collectively with the hybrid view, they are still popular in doing research. Ley (1986, 1996) and Zukin (1989, 1991) raised a new angle in the debate around gentrification. Ley believes that the Pre-professionals, the New middle class has got a clear cultural and political orientation, with an affinity for urban life (Sassen, 1991). Here, Ley talks especially about artists who are lacking economic wealth, but are willing to use their cultural capital to encourage the valorisation of ‘mundane’ and shabby areas (Hubbard, 2006: 45). He argues that the resurgence of the middle class in downtown areas is linked to the growth of professional and managerial employment in service industries and favourable governmental policies (Ley, 1996). Zukin argues that deindustrialization and gentrification are two sides of the same process of landscape formation: a distancing from basic production spaces and a movement towards spaces of consumption (Zukin, 1991: 269). Florida combines the cultural orientation with the economic advantages for the city. He believes that the creative class, a group of young urban professionals (YUP), is a class of a high economic value, for which cities should work on, in order to remain economically vital (Florida, 2002). Those young people willing to set up an enterprise often chose to settle in gentrifying neighbourhoods, for reasons of low rent. From a cultural perspective, it is the pioneers, the new residents themselves, who gentrify a neighbourhood. Finally, according to cultural oriented geographers, other actors have been identified as important, not least female headed households and single women in paid employment (Bondi, 1991; Mills, 1993). In many instances, gentrifying households are dual income couples who have remained childless for personal or career reasons, with gay and lesbian groups often depicted as instrumental in creating geographies of gentrification (Lauria and Knopp, 1985).

The hybrid perspective arose in the 1990s and is also seen as the global view. Within this theory gentrification is coupled with larger structural processes, such as the Global City Theory. Influential works come from Munt (1987) and Sassen (1991). Sassen studied both the gentrifier culture and the supply-demand situation within the market of gentrified housing. In line with Florida’s thinking, Sassen believes that a competition will go on in metropolitan areas, where creative highly educated urban people will be a trigger for gentrification processes. Munt rebutted the work of Smith, with the fact that people do not respond passively to capitalist movements, they have individual preferences regarding their place of residence. He also thought that we should pay attention to wider urban economic restructuring as a factor in the production of the pool of gentrifiers.

2.1.4 Gentrification in the Netherlands
Because gentrification in the Netherlands can be expected to possess its own particularities a theoretical framework that takes into account Dutch processes will be elaborated. Many Dutch urban policies are attempts to promote gentrification by encouraging middle class households to move into working class neighbourhoods (Uitermark, Duyvendak and Kleinhans, 2007: 126). These
neighbourhoods, surrounding inner cities, comprise a large stock of inexpensive, owner occupied dwellings (Kempen and Weesep, 1994: 1052-1053).

In Dutch cities two main variants of gentrification take place. First, *Traditional gentrification* in the inner cities occurs when, without any interventions, an area becomes popular among high income residents. Second, at the edge of the inner cities real estate developers start developing the *New constructions for the better-off*, expressed in new and renovated buildings (re)constructed as (luxury) apartment complexes (Ent, 2010: 16). *New constructions for the better-off* is a part of the *Third-wave gentrification*, the latest kind or generation the phenomenon displays. Third-wave implies that prophecies of de-gentrification appear to have been overstated as many neighbourhoods continue to gentrify while others, further from the city centre begin to experience the process at the first time. Gentrification in this wave seem to be more linked to large-scale capital than ever, as large developers rework entire neighbourhoods, often with state support (Hackworth & Smith, 2001).

Jamie Peck, once, called this kind of development “*Cappuccino urban politics, with plenty of froth*” (Peck, 2005: 760).

The Dutch government stimulates the development of liveable, balanced neighbourhoods with a low level of crime and a sizeable share of middle class households. Many neighbourhoods in a social crisis have become a high priority of the state and it launched some drastic *urban restructuring* plans, in the name of *Vogelaarwijk*, related to the name of the former Minister of Housing (VROM, 1997: 2000). Neighbourhoods designated for restructuring are the most disadvantaged within Dutch cities, where restructuring policy tackles the share of social rental dwellings with a decline from around 62% in the year 2000 to 45% in the year 2010 (Uitermark, Duyvendak and Kleinhans, 2007: 125). State-led gentrification is a mean through which governmental organizations and their partners lure the middle classes into disadvantaged areas with the purpose of improving and controlling these neighbourhoods (Uitermarkt, Duyvendak and Kleinhans, 2007: 126).

### 2.1.5 Experiences of people in gentrifying neighbourhoods

When coming to the actual focus of the research it turns out that there is not very much theory present. Especially, to a case in Europe, in the Netherlands, with a view from of the gentrifiers and the inhabitants as well. Atkinson (2002: 6) shows the amount of systematic reviews about gentrifying neighbourhoods around the world: in Europe only three studies were conducted, whereas in North America seventy-three and in the United Kingdom thirty-two, respectively. Most studies focusing on individuals and households in gentrifying neighbourhoods have concentrated on the choices, satisfactions and habits of the gentrifiers (Bridge, 2007; Butler, 2003; Butler & Robson, 2003; Hamnett, 2003; Ley, 1980, 2003; Tallon & Bromley, 2004). Fewer studies, partly due to the difficulty in tracking them down, focus on those displaced (Atkinson, 2000; Freeman & Braconi, 2004; Lyons, 1996; Slater, 2006).

**Quantitative studies**

It is wise to take into account the quantitative research because it widens the view. For example, the results of the CURA research project (Community-University Research Alliance) indicate that the residents commonly have a mixed set of experiences with the effects of gentrification. The effects in the great Canadian cities have been perceived as positive in some ways and as negative in others (CURA, 2006).

According to Daniel Monroe Sullivan, an Associate Professor of Sociology at Portland State University, in the United States, qualitative studies have focused on the proponents and the
opponents to gentrification, but have not provided a clear picture of the opinions of a truly representative sample of residents (Sullivan, 2007). Sullivan had chosen the city of Portland as area of investigation. Two neighbourhoods were selected for the sample: Alberta and Eliot. Sullivan came to the following results (Sullivan, 2007: 589-590). First the majority of residents, after weighing all of the advantages and disadvantages of gentrification, overall like how their neighbourhood has changed and are optimistic that it will continue to improve. Second, ownership status is more important than education in predicting approval of neighbourhood change. Homeowners, benefit from increasing house values, whereas renters are vulnerable to rent increases and eviction. Third, both neighbourhoods have changed from being mainly black to mainly white. Black newcomers, who settle during gentrification are just as likely as whites to approve of neighbourhood changes, but long time black residents are less likely to approve of them. At the end Sullivan pointed out that findings are more suggestive than definitive, because the findings produced similar results, while the involved neighbourhoods differed technically in much respects, also, only two neighbourhoods were involved in the same city.

**Doucet: voice of the residents and the failure flagship regeneration projects**

According to Brian Doucet, PhD. in Urban Geography at Utrecht University, more empirical evidence is needed to understand the viewpoints of ordinary residents (Douchet, 2009). Few studies are elaborated regarding the inhabitants, those living in a neighbourhood before it gentrifies, who do not immediately become displaced or are able to resist displacement. In his view the debate is too much about the ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ of gentrification. He is right, if one takes a look to the literature about gentrifiers and the inhabitants of a gentrifying neighbourhood most of the times it is about issues such as: the conflict between the two groups (Smith, 2002; Butler, 2003); local resistance to gentrification (Wilson et al., 2004); but also about the theory that residents could benefit from a tendency towards gentrification (Freeman & Braconi, 2004; Freeman, 2006).

In an attempt to obtain the point of view of residents in a gentrifying quarter Doucet investigated the neighbourhood of Leith, Edinburgh (Doucet, 2009). In total, forty-two in depth interviews were carried out. Leith turned out to be a good example of third-wave gentrification (Hackworth and Smith, 2001), which is characterized by less opposition to the process, residents had no tensions with gentrifiers and were very content about the recent development what have changed the image of their neighbourhood fundamentally. However, residents felt that the boom and new developments was both not intended for them. The same was true with regards to some new amenities, particularly the bars and restaurants. People appreciated the entrepreneurs who helped to change the image of Leith, yet lower income residents did not visited them very often. A similar response was found by Atkinson (2000). Many of the changes were for an outside audience. Doucet is a pioneer when it comes to the issue of the experiences of residents in a gentrifying neighbourhood, also he experienced that residents experience gentrification in both a positive and a negative way.

With his study of flagship regeneration projects Doucet (2007) comes very close to the situation in Klarendal. The Modekwartier could very much been seen as a flagship regeneration project, because it has got all its features. What was once a derelict or underused urban space, is now regenerated by creating high profile and high end retail and residential spaces. Besides, it is used as part of an aggressive city re-branding or marketing campaign: Made in Arnhem. Also, it is seen by planners, developers and local politicians as a panacea for the problems of regional economic stagnation. However, scholarly literature is in stark contrast to the support of civic leaders.
and planners. Rather, than contributing to overall economic growth, it is argued by many that flagship regeneration actually creates a new form of spatial division within cities (Healey et al., 1992; MacLeod, 2002; Vicario & Martinez, 2003). The central point of critique is that flagships are unable to adequately address issues of poverty and inequality. Doucet, goes even further: “those who will benefit and enjoy these new flagships represents only a select group of urban residents, and that these benefits will not ‘trickle down’ to all levels of society” (Doucet, 2007). One of Doucet’s scholars studied another run-down area in the Netherlands; Ondiep in Utrecht. Here, the same conclusion was made; “the interventions that were planned and carried out by the governments did not serve the original population of Ondiep in any way. Most of the improvements merely benefitted the new residents” (Boer, 2011: 52). Although, the Modekwartier has got most of the features of a flagship project, one could temper the critique by saying that the project is incomparable with industrial and waterfront sides, such as: Rotterdam’s Kop van Zuid and Glasgow Harbour megaprojects. The neighbourhood Ondiep is certainly not a prestige project, most interventions are simply focused on demolition and new building. But here, we are dealing with another well known Dutch run-down area besides Klarendal, where long time inhabitants are saying that interventions are not planned to serve the original population, but a new population.

**Smith versus Freeman: conflict versus benefit**

One of the big theorists and founding father of *The rent gap*, Neil Smith (Smith, 1982), also investigated the viewpoint of the ordinary residents, but as it is said before, focused on the conflict between two groups. Coincidentally, Smith was born in 1954 in Leith, in a period Leith was not gentrified yet, but was a working class dockland. According to Smith, the second wave of gentrification, in the 1980s and 1990s, was matched by the rise of myriad homeless, squatting, housing, and other anti-gentrification movements. As a response *The revanchist city* emerged (Smith, 1996). Zero-tolerance, and anti-squatter or anti-homeless campaigns were carried out by many cities in the world in order to make the streets safe for gentrification (Smith, 2002). In his article, Smith remained very brief about anti movements and the experiences of residents.

Lance Freeman’s aim for research, on the other hand, an Associate Professor in Urban Planning at the Columbia University in New York City, comes very close to the approach and viewpoint of Doucet: “to explore how gentrification was experienced by the indigenous residents of affected neighbourhoods” (Freeman, 2006). According to Freeman, “in general, when residents perceive that in-migration presents a threat to their neighborhood, they will react by exiting or joining forces with other neighbors to resist the change. The stronger the social organization of the neighborhood, the more likely it is that local residents will select the voice option and take steps to keep the area stable”. What becomes clear in this quote is that Freeman focused in his research on the perception, meaning and interpretation of residents on changes in their neighbourhood. Also he studied their social interaction with the gentry and the implications thereof. Freeman boosted the gentrification debate by saying that instead of being displaced, residents can also benefit from the process of gentrification, because of improved neighbourhood qualities. Freeman (2006) is one of a couple scientists (Anderson, 1990; Kasinitz, 1988), who have studied the alienation of long time Black residents by changes in neighbourhood identity, especially if Whites move into previously minority neighbourhoods.
**Experience of gentrifiers**

Butler (2003), on the other hand, investigated the position of the gentrifiers. Butler interviewed seventy-five gentrifiers living in Islington, London. Barnsbury, a quarter of this neighbourhood, is one of the most investigated gentrified areas in the world, where a process of Re-gentrification was going on. The study demonstrated that in their day-to-day lives almost all respondents lived quite apart from non-middle class residents. Unlike the pioneers of the 1960s and 1970s, current gentrifiers were unwilling to invest social capital in the area, also their relationships were almost entirely with ‘people like us’. In Barnsbury, gentrification has not so much displaced the working class, gentrifiers simply blanked out those who were not like themselves.

However, Butler finds out that gentrification and the attitude of gentrifiers can vary very much (Butler & Robson, 2003). In their article *Negotiating their way in*, Butler and Robson describe five London neighbourhoods, three models of neighbourhood gentrification were present, which have each produced their own patterns and narratives of settlement. In one area, there is been a general accommodation for global culture based on The City, yet in their own distinct homogenized form. Other places have responded to the same forces by a withdraw form of *Enclavism*, yet celebrating diversity. The anxiety of social reproduction has lead also to a third model; the formation of a form of elected affinity, in reaction to, the working class authenticity of the area. By the end of the paper, the two authors acknowledge that it is difficult to find any equivalent to Brixton, one of the London neighbourhoods, in North America and Europe as well. Perhaps there are places so mixed as Brixton, but are there any as (relatively) stable? With this, the authors explain that comparative research in gentrification is hard to accomplish. Gentrification is a chaotic concept; even so are the neighbourhoods we study.

### 2.2 Conceptual Framework

In the previous chapters a case was selected on the basis of a worldwide established theory and the methodology is explained. Now, it is useful to see in what sense theory is present in practice. It is important to notion is that one of the main research questions is whether the theory is applicable on Klarendal or not. It seems to be that Klarendal is an example of gentrification, but is that true?

In order to start an inquiry a conceptual framework was needed, see Figure 3. In the scheme the actual areas and concepts of study are elaborated; the schedule gives an overview of all parts of research. The dependent variable is the actual research topic. When asking individuals about the effects of the *Modekwartier* the answers vary, however, the use of a wide range of input should bring the outcome as close as possible to the reality. Within this range three independent variables are used: statistics about Klarendal, external processes around Klarendal and internal processes from within Klarendal. Statistics are all about the numbers; it supplies the available genuine hard data. Similar to most studies on gentrification the variable external processes is basically focussed on the concepts of production and consumption. Finally, the variable internal processes, elaborates the present experiences of the local people who are involved in the process of gentrification, which is seen as a gap in the (Dutch) theory on gentrification, see 1.3.
### Figure 1: Conceptual framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Modekwartier on Klarendal</td>
<td>Statistics Klarendal</td>
<td>Liveability, Economy, Demographics, Labour, Income, Enterprises, Social Security, Education, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External processes</td>
<td>Policy, economy, market &amp; state influence, trends, help programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal processes</td>
<td>Experiences of Designers vs. experiences of inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration / liveability / income / norms &amp; values / attitude / creativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Klarendal: a gentrifying neighbourhood

3.1 Introduction
Before the investigation of Klarendal can start it is useful to display the theory of gentrification besides the presence of the neighbourhood of study. Districts always deal with economic, social and cultural changes, however, the process of gentrification, which differs in shape and structure in every city and nation state, cannot be labelled on every neighbourhood transformation. There is a sum of variables that gentrification theorists repeatedly utilize in their description of the phenomenon gentrification, such as: physical renovation, former working class neighbourhoods, settlement of middle class, change from renting to owning and the displacement of the lower class population. Chapter 3 attempts to come to grips with a possible trend towards gentrification in Klarendal. First, a walk through Klarendal is simulated; photo series show the current state of Klarendal. Second, a case study will be applied with a truly gentrified neighbourhood in Arnhem, by doing a comparative study with available statistics and interviews with experts.

3.2 Sightseeing in Klarendal
In order to show the reader the current state of Klarendal, several strolls are made with photo camera. During research many times a stroll is made to come to grips with the neighbourhood. Before carrying out research there were plans to do ethnographic observations, but due to the higher confidence in a case study and focus groups, observations were put aside. After empirical exploration there was again a call for a visual analysis of the neighbourhood. The obtained information of interviewees and other involved people urged for some extra strolls, to see where and in which sense gentrification takes place. In this paragraph numerous pictures will come forward and will be explained briefly. The explanations will be short, because there is a high chance of interpreting them wrong. The photo selection procedure is already a highly subjective job, so it is better to leave some more room for interpretation.

Where to begin with? There is a picture used in a Office Powerpoint presentation of Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, which gives an interesting view of Klarendal before the rise of the Modekwartier, see Photo 2. The local squatters scene, symbolized with the circle and lightning arrow at the right bottom, was clearly not happy with the plans of the local housing corporation. They say for example: “We can see the dollar signs in your eyes, they have betrayed us so often! Despite of the facts, social housing is not part of your plans.” (...) “Volkshuisvesting, you should build something for the people!”. Although, much inhabitants would have agreed with these quotes, it is not the people speaking here. It seems to be that squatters have tried to use the inhabitants as comrades in their battle with the local housing corporation. At the end it did not work out, while much of the squatted houses are demolished together with their cries.

Photo 2: A protest of the local squatters scene (Kessels, 2009)
In May 24th of 2008, the fashion quarter in Klarendal was officially opened. Photo 3 shows the junction of Sonsbeeksingel and Klarendalseweg with the former mail distribution centre at the background. On the foreground one can see the crowd watching the people of the Modekwartier; it is unknown what share of the crowd was citizen. Designers and other people involved, throw enthusiast petals in the air, as a symbol of what? To make Klarendal more colourful and lively? Or to change the trend of decline? What is obvious is that the event is well organized; there is an idea behind this happening.

![Photo 3: The opening of the Modekwartier in 2008 (Wamelink, 2008)](image)

Again but from a different angle the crowd is watching a performance, see Photo 4. This time models show the work of arrived fashion designers. A catwalk is set up in the middle of street, where people look up to.

![Photo 4: A demonstration of fashion design at the first Nacht v/d Mode (Kessels, 2009)](image)
Photo 5, shows a look inside of one of the new shops, representing the Modekwartier. It must have been one of the first pictures of the shop. Now, a few years later the shop looks different, but it has the same style. The Modekwartier has got a few dozen shops, at the beginning it was intended only for fashion, but today there are also shops selling illustrations and accessories. Every shop has a different entrepreneur, therefore they all have another charisma.

![Photo 5](image-url)

Photo 5: A look inside one of the shops of the Modekwartier (Kessels, 2009)

As a counter picture for Photo 4 the next photo shows that in Klarendal a major share of the population cannot afford to spend much money in clothing. At the mall of Klarendal there is a clothing outlet, but also a second hand shop, selling clothes for only one Euro, see Photo 6.

![Photo 6](image-url)

Photo 6: Second hand clothing (own picture)
Klarendal consists of various, little characteristic quarters, f.i. Vogelwijk, Mussenwijk, Peterbuurt, et cetera. Also Spoorhoek, the quarter in between Spijkerkwartier en Klarendal use to be part of Groot Klarendal (Focus group 3, personal communication, July 11th, 2011). There is a variety of architectural styles spread out over different sizes of houses. In Photo 7 and 8 the characteristic styles are visible in combination with modern influences.

Photo 7: Different styles present at street, Noordpad (own picture)

Klarendalseweg is the aorta of the Modekwartier. At the southern part there is a high concentration of haut couture shops, when moving upwards a few shops are present, but in the northern part towards the Menno Coehoorn Kazerne there is again a high concentration of shops. At the moment, these shops have a more diverse supply than only fashion. There are several reasons why not the entire Klarendalseweg consists of shops. First, the street is simply too long, about thousand meters (Studio Scale and Stipo, 2011:20). Second, a significant part of the houses along the street are rebuilt and are not suitable for fashion shops. Photo 8, shows one of the exceptions. This house is used by an artist, who makes fun of the McDonald’s icon. Klarendal houses a lot of artists, more than you can see at street level. As one can see this building is in a good state and has got a remarkable style.

Photo 8: One of the artists at Klarendalseweg (own picture)
Recent efforts of policy makers in Arnhem starts to become visible in the streets of Klarendal. For example, in 2010, an artist got the assignment of Volkshuisvesting Arnhem to restyle the exterior of railroad station Velpenpoort, see Photo 8. Station Velpenpoort is in a bad condition and is known as a sinister place by night. To welcome visitors of the Modekwartier more warmly, the station is decorated with photos of fashion design, see Photo 9.

When walking from the city centre of Arnhem to Klarendal, one has to choose the Hommelsestraat. This street is officially part of Spoorhoek and not of Klarendal, but the Modekwartier is already visible; trendy bars and stores start to arise here. It is a real mixed street, with a supply of multiple cultures. To enter Klarendal one has to pass a railroad overpass; the Hommelse poort. Since April 2011, this overpass is decorated with tiles showing the name of the neighbourhood you enter. All people could sponsor the project by buying a tile. The artist was inspired by the Parisian subway, see Photo 10.
Since August 2011, the northern part of the *Modewartier* has been enriched by a new cafe, see Photo 11. The bar is popular among young urban professionals. *Volkshuisvesting Arnhem* was a big supporter of the new establishment (Hoogers, 2011).

![Photo 11: Restaurant/Cafe Sugar Hill (own picture)](image)

In 2011, a lot of new initiatives were realized. For instance also the *Arnhem Mode Incubator*. Since August 2011, at the Sonsbeeksingel, there is a new facility of ArtEZ in Klarendal who supports talents in fashion design in setting up their own business, see Photo 12.

![Photo 12: A placement for fashion talents in Klarendal (own picture)](image)
In line with the theory of gentrification the next picture becomes interesting. Photo 13, shows an upstairs apartment for sale. During a stroll, a nice apartment for sale was frequently visible. Nevertheless, it is hard to say if it there are more apartments for sale than on the average. Also, within Klarendal there is a lot social housing which is not interesting for gentrifiers, but is still for sale.

The fact that Klarendal is still very much a run-down suburb is visible in Photo 14. For some reason the owner was obligated to put electrified fences with some razor wire in addition. Also other private fences and video cameras were spotted. When taking a side path of Klarendalseweg customers of fashion shops enter passages they do not expect.
3.3 Case study: Klarendal and Spijkerkwartier

3.3.1 Signs of gentrification in Klarendal

To begin with, it is important to mention that the transformation process going on in Klarendal is not simply a ‘redevelopment’. It is Neil Smith (1982: 139) who says that redevelopment involves the construction of new buildings on previously developed land, not the rehabilitation of old structures, that is common within processes of gentrification. Speaking with the words of Smith, it is clear that, in the 1970s and 1980s, the municipality of Arnhem was redeveloping Klarendal, through the demolition and new building of houses (Kei-centrum, 2009). Since the understanding that these interventions in Klarendal did not improve the liveability as hoped for, other projects have set up later, such as the Modekwartier. In other words, a major difference to the redevelopment of the 1970s and 1980s is that old structures are rehabilitated, now.

Furthermore, when reading the definition of The Dictionary of Human Geography (Gregory et al., 2009: 273-274), the key words of the definition of gentrification are all visible in the changes of Klarendal: middle class settlement, renovated or redeveloped properties and older inner city districts, formerly occupied by a lower income population. Klarendal is from origin an older (inner city) district, a working class neighbourhood, occupied by a lower income population. However, it is since recently that much investments have been made for the revitalization of the neighbourhood. Now, forty new fashion entrepreneurs are settled in Klarendal, there is only space planned for ten more (Studio Scale and Stipo, 2011: 11). The fashion ateliers are all renovated with help from the owner: the housing corporation. The minor group of fashion designers, is what Richard Florida calls, the Creative class. They are even part of the Super-Creative Core; a group of people creating innovative commercial products and consumer goods. Only the jobs in science, engineering, IT, media, art and design are part of this group (Florida, 2002: 69). The small group of fashion designers is or will be part of the middle class, in terms of their income, though it is only a small group of people. Until now, no information is available on the exact number of middle class incomes that have settled in Klarendal. More information about migration in and out of Klarendal is at the end of this paragraph.

The transformation of Klarendal is still fresh. The fact that changes have occurred, does not mean that they will continue. Although, what is certain is that Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, the owner of 1,750 houses (Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, 2011), approximately 50% of the total housing, is the central figure in the development of Klarendal. The Dictionary of Human Geography of 2004 (Johnston et al., 2000: 216-217) noted property developers as key players in the process of gentrification: “Real estate agents and property developers may participate in the process as they seek to enhance the exchange value of an area and to reap substantial profits from promoting uneven development at the intra-urban scale.”

Finally, in addition, the definition of Hamnett (1984: 284) provides extra variables: gentrification results in a degree of tenure transformation from renting to owning and also many of the original occupants get replaced or displaced. For certain, a trend of residence transformation is visible in Klarendal, see Figure 2. Whereas in 2006 Klarendal 22% of the total housing was private owned, today it is 28%; a significant increase within only four years. The trend within the housing stock of Arnhem as a whole is similar: tenement is making place for private owned, but a substantial difference is the fact that Arnhem holds almost a double amount of private owned houses. In Klarendal, practically all houses use to be private or public rent. When focusing on the property of the houses for sale or rent, it becomes obvious that Klarendal experiences a growth of private owned houses at the expense of corporation property, see Table 1. Arnhem experiences a similar trend,
however, here private rent increases, a trend that is not visible in Klarendal, see Table 2. Whereas the municipality of Arnhem is building every year hundreds of new houses, in the district Klarendal there are no houses built or rebuilt in the last few years. The lack of space or will to expand could be the cause. One could say that the increase of private owned in Klarendal has nothing to do with new building, but with the sale of corporation property to the house market.

Figure 2: Klarendal housing: rent and sale. (Statistisch Jaarboek 2006-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Klarendal housing</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change in 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>private rent</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private owned</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporation property</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>2.486</td>
<td>2.430</td>
<td>2.397</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Klarendal housing: property. (Statistisch Jaarboek 2006-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arnhem housing</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change in 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>private rent</td>
<td>11.960</td>
<td>11.594</td>
<td>12.447</td>
<td>11.799</td>
<td>11.972</td>
<td>12.674</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporation property</td>
<td>27.503</td>
<td>27.637</td>
<td>26.369</td>
<td>27.120</td>
<td>26.477</td>
<td>25.190</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Arnhem housing: property. (Statistisch Jaarboek 2006-2010)

Hamnett’s description of the replacement or displacement of the original occupants is hard to study in Klarendal. According to the Department Statistics of Arnhem there is no information available about the income or class of people that settle and move out of Klarendal. However, the neighbourhood monitor states that there is a trend viewable of an increase in the settlement of highly educated people in Klarendal. The monitor itself relates this trend with the phenomenon of gentrification (Gemeente Arnhem, 2010: 71).
For years, Klarendal experiences little decline in its population. In 2006, there were 7,555 inhabitants, today there are living approximately 7,235 inhabitants. For the reason that a major part of the people that leave, move to low income neighbourhoods, such as Presikhaaf West and Arnhemse Broek, one could assume that low income people are displaced. However, it is the same story the other way around (Gemeente Arnhem, 2006-2010). While Klarendal is known as a working class neighbourhood, with a hard core of indigenous inhabitants, there is this trend present that people use to live in Klarendal as long as they do in other Arnhem’ neighbourhoods.

3.3.2 Statistical analysis: Klarendal and Spijkerkwartier

During meetings, such as 10 jaar wijkvernieuwing in Klarendal, it became clear that Spijkerkwartier was the gentrified area of Arnhem. The average opinion of the consultants and inhabitants was that Klarendal should not become such a yuppie neighbourhood, as well. Now, an overview of the statistics will show the recent developments in both neighbourhoods. First, a description will follow of both neighbourhoods in their current state. Second, statistical developments of the years 2006 and 2010 will be analyzed. Third, the interviews with Kwee and de Ridder will give extra information and confirmation in the gentrification processes in Klarendal and Spijkerkwartier. Figure 3 shows the geographical location of the neighbourhoods: in red the inner city of Arnhem, in black Spijkerkwartier and in dark grey Klarendal.

**Case 1: Klarendal**

Klarendal is one of the oldest and most central areas of Arnhem. The district has a residential function. Most of houses date from the late 19th and early 20th century. In the seventies and eighties of the last century, due to large scale urban renewal, much housing in the southern part of the district was demolished and replaced. The housing stock consists mostly of (small) single family and multifamily houses in the rental sector. Traditionally there was a mixed environment and relatively much business. Demolishment in the previous century resulted in a decline. The development of a fashion quarter should bring liveability in the neighbourhood to another level. There are two primary schools in the district, a secondary school for special education and the ROC Rijn-IJssel (vocational education). In terms of facilities, there are shops (including the nearby Winkelcentrum Klarendal), restaurants, a sports hall, playgrounds, and socio-cultural facilities (Gemeente Arnhem, 2010: 178).

**Case 2: Spijkerkwartier**

The Spijkerkwartier borders at the northeast side of the inner city. The district consists of three neighbourhoods: Hommelstraat, Spijkerbuurt and Boulevardbuurt. It is a very lively district with a premier residential and work function. Relatively many houses in the district dates from the 19th century. Besides, relatively luxurious residences there is also facade construction. In the 1980s, the worst housing improvements were made (in Rietenbeek, Spoorhoek). In the recent past, the district
area was known for its prostitution and drug related nuisance. These are completely or largely disappeared. The district has a fairly mixed environment, consisting of a population with many starters and youth. This is shown by the high proportion of single households and the young age structure of the population pyramid. There is gentrification. Arrangements are evident in the district, including shops, restaurants and other activities. It is a densely built up area and there is relatively little green in the streets. In the last years, residents of Spijkerkwartier have experienced less deprivation and see progress in the area (Gemeente Arnhem, 2010: 168).

**Situation neighbourhoods in 2006 and 2010**

When taking a look at the statistics of Klarendal, Spijkerkwartier and Arnhem of 2006 several issues show much dissimilarity, see Appendix II. To begin with, in the slightly more inhabited neighbourhood Klarendal, the population was far more populated with Non-western people, 28% of the population, whereas it was 12% in Spijkerkwartier. In Arnhem, the average percentage of children in the population was 17%; Klarendal came close with 15%, whereas Spijkerkwartier had relatively few people with the age between 0-14 years, only 8%. This score is also viewable in the percentage of families in the neighbourhood population of Spijkerkwartier; 20%. In Klarendal it was 40% and the city average was 52%. In 2006, Spijkerkwartier was clearly a district with many singles, about 72%, in Klarendal it was 50%. Spijkerkwartier is a district with far more singles on one address. A final remarkable score, is that Klarendal contained more house for rent: 78%, where in Spijkerkwartier it was 68% and in the town on average 60%.

When analyzing the development in 2010, several items get attention. First, in Klarendal the number of inhabitants declined, whereas in Spijkerkwartier and Arnhem there was an increase. In both district there was an increase of the number of houses, in Spijkerkwartier a somewhat higher increase. Furthermore, Klarendal experienced a little decrease of the number of Non-western inhabitants, in Spijkerkwartier this score remained equal. Another interesting detail is the growth of the number of singles in Klarendal with approximately 3%, in Spijkerkwartier and Arnhem this score did not change much. Where in Arnhem and Spijkerkwartier there was a clear increase in the number of singles on one address, Klarendal experienced the other way around. For all areas the percentage of unemployed people decreased, Klarendal had the record with cut of 5,5%, still 3% higher than the average of Arnhem. Finally, Spijkerkwartier had a remarkable better evaluated neighbourhood, in 2006 with a 6,4, for years later with a 7,4. However, the houses are bad evaluated, first with a 7,2, later with a 6,6.

**3.3.3 Expert information and confirmation**

According to de Ridder, member of the Neighbourhood Board Spijkerkwartier, the case study between the Arnhem neighbourhoods Klarendal and Spijkerkwartier is a fair one (Y. de Ridder, personal communication, May 3rd, 2011). Both quarters have experienced times with much problems. In the case of Klarendal poverty and vacancy was present with drugs related nuisance. Spijkerkwartier had the same problems, but was also widely known as the red light district. A major difference between the two neighbourhoods is that Klarendal has got a bigger group of indigenous inhabitants that mostly live in social housing. The neighbourhood Spijkerkwartier is traditionally more or less in transit, where people come to live only for a short time. Despite, still it is a fair comparison, because experts say that both neighbourhoods are in a process of gentrification. Even though, the removal of prostitution in Spijkerkwartier was accomplished at the same time of the arise of the Modekwartier, Spijkerkwartier is further in its development.
A remarkable fact is that these steps of development in Spijkerkwartier are taken without the financial support that Klarendal has received for its renewal. Lex Kwee, director of BNSP (an Association of Dutch urban designers and planners), researcher and inhabitant of Spijkerkwartier, thinks that there are two reasons why Spijkerkwartier could revitalize itself without governmental (financial) support (L. Kwee, personal communication, April 28th, 2011). First, there is a planning cause. The houses in Spijkerkwartier are older and bigger than in Klarendal. This makes it much easier to fight vacancy. Second, the neighbourhood is located next to the city centre, and a railroad station as well. Spijkerkwartier has always been ‘a neighbourhood of entry’. Lex Kwee is also one of the newcomers from the Randstad, who have settled in Spijkerkwartier recently. Compared to the Randstad houses are more affordable, when looking to the more expensive houses in Arnhem neighbourhoods Burgemeesterswijk, Schuytgraaf or Spijkerkwartier, people often prefer the last one, because it has such an urban atmosphere. A negative impact of this flow of in and outgoing people is that people do not build up strong ties with the neighbourhood (L. Kwee, personal communication, April 28th, 2011).

De Ridder confirmed that in Spijkerkwartier there are far more households, or singles, living on the same address. There is much protest from of the inhabitants towards the plans of many real estate developers, who want to split single family houses into multiple family houses. By selling single floors of houses, developers earn much more money for sale. In June 2010, the municipality of Arnhem announced that from of January 1st of 2011, permits need to be applied for the refurbishment of single family houses into multiple family houses (Tiemens, 2010). The reason for this new regulatory was that the municipality wanted to make sure that all neighbourhoods have enough opportunity for family housing and to prevent problems related to densely populated districts and increasing traffic and parking pressure. When people read the news about the future permits there was a boom of building applications. As a response, Egbert Bouwhuis, the secretary of Werkgroep Spijkerkwartier stated that, within Arnhem, Spijkerkwartier has already the highest percentage of inhabitants older than thirty. If nothing will be done, a yuppie neighbourhood will arise, with few families and children (Tiemens, 2010). De Ridder is also afraid for this happening. In the past Spijkerkwartier use to be a very lively, diverse neighbourhood with many artists and students. Due to the increase of rent prices these subgroups get displaced, because they search for a more affordable place for living. In Spijkerkwartier there have always been a lot of enterprises without a staff, ZZP-ers, but when more and more students left the neighbourhood the population became increasingly uniform. A group of middle class people starts to dominate the local housing, when living in newly created studio houses. De Ridder, also owner of a café and manager of the community centre, experiences that these people are less concerned with the neighbourhood as a whole. She describes the group as follows (Y. de Ridder, personal communication, May 3rd, 2011):

“Well, you know, they are always busy. Much of them are working outdoors, coming back home at 6 or 7 pm. and hurry then to the local supermarket or specialist at the Steenstraat. They also buy ready made food or are going out for dinner with their private or work relations. Afterwards, they go to bed and wake up in the morning. In the weekends they have something else to do in a different place.”

De Ridder remains saying that diversity is important for the well being of the neighbourhood. Therefore, at least a share of the houses must be social housing, otherwise it will become another Burgemeesterswijk. Here, she refers to one of the wealthiest parts of Arnhem.
When asking questions about the processes that are going on in Klarendal several issues become clear. First, Kwee says that there is not so much displacement taking place in Klarendal, because at beforehand there was a lot of vacancy that is now filled in. Furthermore, Kwee is critical on the project Modekwartier. There is only a theoretical change that the project succeeds, they can never compete to other fashion capitols in the world. He sees the project not as a sustainable investment. It does not matter how the project turns out, the outcome is negative. If the project works well, designers will leave, because they are ready for a step further. However, when it fails, investments are still needed. Spijkerkwartier, on the other hand, has developed itself slowly, but steadily. The foundation of the new Spijkerkwartier is more sustainable than in Klarendal, partly because there was already knowledge capital present, useful for future success in inhabitants labour careers. But also, in Kwee’s words, social capital was present. In contrast to other disadvantaged areas in the Netherlands in Spijkerkwartier almost no houses are demolished, meaning that a lot of people could keep on living in their neighbourhood and therefore could maintain their web of friendships (L. Kwee, personal communication, April 28th, 2011).

Kwee is critical on the Modekwartier. For instance, the artificial move of fashion designers into a working class neighbourhood is hard in terms of creating a sufficient community. De Ridder agrees with Kwee on the lack of social ties with Klarendal. She knows that only a few inhabitants of the neighbourhood go to Goed Proeven, the new booming café/restaurant, opened as a trigger for the development of the Modekwartier. What Kwee also cannot understand is that Volkshuisvesting Arnhem is initiator and investor in the building of the new three star Fashion and Design Hotel Klarendal. The main aim of an housing corporation is to maintain the available housing stock, building hotels is not their core business.

3.4 Concluding remarks
To conclude this chapter an answer should be given to the central question: “Is Klarendal a gentrifying neighbourhood?” The current situation of Klarendal is described by photos and applying a case study with the neighbour district Spijkerkwartier, for the reason that much people see Spijkerkwartier as a gentrified area. Within this case study the statistic data of both neighbourhoods are compared with the past. Also, two interviews are conducted to obtain real life knowledge on the experience of insiders and to find confirmation in collected data. According to the five, widely adopted, signs of gentrification, one can say that Klarendal is going through a process of gentrification. However, compared to Spijkerkwartier it is in a much younger stage of gentrification.

To begin with, Klarendal is not a former working class neighbourhood. Although, much Klarendallers have moved out during the urban renewal of the previous century, the working class is still very much present. Whereas in Spijkerkwartier middle class people live close to each other, in Klarendal it is the other way around. The rise of the amount of studio houses in Spijkerkwartier is not present in Klarendal. This is also related to different house plans, and the less number of singles.

Another variable of gentrification, a change of rent to private ownership, is visible in Klarendal. Statistics have shown that in the last years a big share of the housing stock in Klarendal turned into private owned. It is a trend in the city as a whole, but in Klarendal the change is exceptional.

A third sign of gentrification is the settlement of the middle class. A group of people with a higher income. In the case of Spijkerkwartier this trend is certainly going on. Statistics and interviews show that yuppies are clearly present in the neighbourhood, visible in the sale of studio houses, refurbished frontages and present shops. However, in Klarendal, this group of people is still a
minority. People who classify the new fashion designers among yuppies or middle class, while they sometimes earn less than the working class inhabitants. The fashion designers who have settled in Klarendal is only a small group; they work and live on location. While the yuppies in Spijkerkwartier are present for much longer and often work at home or elsewhere.

A forth sign that is often used as a variable is physical renovation. As mentioned before, in Spijkerkwartier this is clearly the case. In Klarendal there is not such a strong trend going on, but for sure the government and housing corporation are investing a lot in the physical renovation of houses and public space. In this way, there is more or less state-led gentrification going on in Klarendal. Whereas in Spijkerkwartier the previous situation was already fertile for development, with the presence of big, historic houses next to the city centre.

Finally, the trend of displacement is always linked to gentrification. In the case of Spijkerkwartier interviews have shown that the neighbourhood was populated by much students, but due to increasing house prices, Spijkerkwartier becomes more and more populated by the middle class. In the case of Klarendal, there is not so much this trend visible. It has much to do with fact that the neighbourhood used to deal with a lot of vacancy. Vacant houses became populated by newcomers, or inhabitants of Klarendal. Although, when new people move into houses for rent, house prices rise, due to refurbishment of the owners. Until now, there is not spoken about this trend.

The main conclusion is that Klarendal is in an early stage of gentrification. While the developments are similar to the processes that Spijkerkwartier has experienced before, Klarendal is another case. It is a neighbourhood with an exceptional high population of migrants and a huge presence of social housing. While Spijkerkwartier was also a neighbourhood of national attention and was also a place of intervention by the municipality, gentrification in Klarendal takes place in a different way. The local situation had a more fertile foundation, with the presence of business, central location and attractive housing. Until now, Klarendal is not dealing with displacement, but the physical renovation and positioning of the Modekwartier have resulted in a neighbourhood where people of the city come to again. The settlement of young people with fresh ideas and a bright future, brings in an atmosphere what paves the way for a future of gentrification.
4. A top-down strategy of urban renewal

4.1 Introduction
As what is been said before, one could still discuss if there is a gentrification process going on in Klarendal or not, yet the reality is that the local municipality and corporation are investing millions of Euros in the renewal of the neighbourhood through: the rehabilitation of old buildings, public open space and the development of a new industry. It is obvious that the corporation makes an effort in refurbishment to increase the value of their property, what results in a higher profit when it comes to sales. In theory they make use of The rent gap, see 2.1.3. Multiple factors play a role in the transformation of Klarendal from of a run-down suburb towards a good place to live, but the major factor is the plans from of a higher level. A share of the Klarendal inhabitants would say that their place meets the standards, however, the Dutch government uses standards of life that do not allow citizens to live in particular conditions. In paragraph 4.2, the governmental impact on Klarendal is showed. Various governmental projects have given way to processes that originate from outside Klarendal. In paragraph 4.3, a symposium about a disadvantaged area in Duisburg is exemplary for the approach in Klarendal: state-led gentrification. In paragraph 4.4, three unique events describe the current state of Klarendal, as an example of progressive Dutch urban renewal. Finally, the concluding remarks summarize the findings of this chapter.

4.2 Investments in Klarendal: 80 million Euros in 7 years
About eleven years ago, the municipality of Arnhem wanted to intervene in the situation of Klarendal. In December 2000, the council of Arnhem agreed with the start of a new project called Klarendal kom op! (Klarendal come on!). The project was a result of the, by PvdA (Labour Party), proposed Speerpuntenaanpak Klarendal, in June 2000. The goal of the new project was to ensure that inhabitants would be willing to take their own responsibility for their own neighbourhood. Its four leading principle were: clean streets, safety, education and social cohesion. The work on these principles was spread out over three phases: first year (‘try to do what is possible’), first four years (‘develop what is possible’) and until 2015 (‘the future of the neighbourhood’) (Kei-centrum, 2009). In the first stage, the political job was to win back the confidence in Klarendal. In the following stages, after regaining confidence, a ‘streetwise’ approach (in conversation with inhabitants), would support the people in taking care for their own neighbourhood. The first three years would cost approximately €680.000; all funded by MOP (Multiple Year Development Program Arnhem). An extra year was added, funded by GSB-Buurt aan Zet, a national program (Gemeente Arnhem, 2000).

Four years after the start of Klarendal kom op! the progress was investigated. The aim to regain confidence in the neighbourhood was mostly fulfilled. However, doubts were raised about the success of the other goals to improve the liveability and security. The national monitor, GSB-Monitor, showed that almost no improvement was made on liveability and security, although, there was an upgrading in comparison to the city of Arnhem (Gemeente Arnhem, 2000).

After understanding the results of the project, a request was made to go on with the upgrading of Klarendal. The Neighbourhood Board Klarendal and Steering Board both pronounced the start of Klarendal gaat door! (Klarendal goes on!). In 2004, the new project started with the same four principles. However, education was put under the principle ‘social cohesion’ and was replaced by ‘spatial and economical development’. At this point, already suggestions were made to realize a fashion square or street in Klarendal. In the following years, €200,000 was made available for investments, every year (Gemeente Arnhem, 2004; Keicentrum, 2009).
In 2007, Klarendal became part of a new national policy. The Dutch government selected about forty districts to turn from an Aandachtswijk into a Krachtwijk (focus area, towards a strong neighbourhood) (VROM and Gemeente Arnhem, 2007a). Klarendal came also under attention of the national project of neighbourhood refurbishment. In 2007, the government asked the municipality of Arnhem to set up a plan of what and where to invest in, to improve the life standards. As a response the municipality generated the Wijkactieplan Klarendal (Gemeente Arnhem, 2007a). In this plan seven issues got attention: living, working, learning & growing up, sports & culture, integration, security and ‘behind the front door’. On every topic problems were analyzed, goals were formulated and measures supposed. In Appendix III previous investments and required investment, anno 2007, are displayed.

From 2000 until 2007 the municipality and housing corporations have spent about 80 million Euros in the development of Klarendal. Housing corporations had invested more than 42 million Euros in Klarendal, of which 40 million Euros were meant for housing. According to the manager of housing, Berry Kessels, Volkshuisvesting Arnhem has not invested all this money in the Modekwartier. In this particular project they have invested about 20 million Euros, and that may increase to a 30 million Euros later on (B. Kessels, personal communication, 18th October, 2011).

In total, the municipality invested more than 37 million Euros. They invested in a lot of social issues, in particular in ‘working’ and ‘learning & growing up’, each with a sum of about 14 million Euros. ‘Living’ and ‘sports & culture’ earned several million Euros each, the other issues got a relatively small amount of money. From 2007 until 2011, the municipality together with the housing corporations had requested the Dutch government for approximately 40 million Euros. The municipality requested especially a lot of money for development of a multifunctional centre, approximately 10 million Euros and 5 million Euros for the refurbishment of the public space.

In a charter, concerning the improvement of Arnhem’s krachtwijken Klarendal, Het Arnhemse Broek, Presikhaaf and Malburgen, the Dutch government confirmed the plans for improvement and did agree in the call for investments (VROM and Gemeente Arnhem, 2007a). However, due to economic disturbances the government has decided to bring financial support for run-down areas to an end by the beginning of 2012. Because investments in run-down areas turned out to be successful, the involved partners in Arnhem have decided to continue (Gemeente Arnhem, 2011a). Namely, out of the forty Dutch neighbourhoods Malburgen/Immerloo and Klarendal turned out to be the districts with the fastest improvement in liveability (Leidelmeijer et al., 2011: 20). According to the Director of Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, Gerrit Breeman, these two neighbourhoods were able to revitalize quickly thanks to quick decision making; which was not possible without the strong position of the housing corporation in these neighbourhoods, as owner of the majority of the houses (Aedes, 2011).

4.3 Bottom-up approach Marxloh vs. Top-down approach Klarendal
To indicate the sense in which the urban renewal of Klarendal differs from other run-down urban areas in Europe the article The power of Marxloh was a direct explanation of the state Klarendal is in right now. In here, Floor Tinga (2010), a freelance author and organizer of projects and events about public space, summarizes a symposium in Marxloh, Duisburg, where Klarendal was also part of discussion. Where many neighbourhoods in a sense were helped by initiatives of the inhabitants themselves, Klarendal is experiencing a transformation from of a top-down strategy. The project 100%Mode in Klarendal is set up by the municipality and housing corporation in order to make the place more lively, to stimulate entrepreneurship and to improve the business climate for young
fashion designers. Marloh, is one of the districts Tinga is pointing on. In this neighbourhood unemployment is high and many buildings are vacant; sometimes even a whole block of flats. At the same time, the neighbourhood is a creative centre focused on an international market; not by changing in a hip quarter with ‘cappuccino drinking yuppies’, but by the business in bride clothing. About forty shops are concentrated in one street, where Muslims from all over Northern Europe come over to ‘the most romantic street of the Ruhr area’. In 2010, Duisburg was the cultural capital of Europe, a big city marketing campaign, organized by the municipality, with the intention to become more attractive within Europe. However, it was Marxloh that gained the most attention with a picture of forty brides holding up the sign Made in Marxloh. The Duisburg’ neighbourhood is one of the examples where a bottom-up approach, work from of the inhabitants themselves, has changed the negative image of their neighbourhood into a good one.

4.4 Klarendal: an example of progressive Dutch urban renewal

During the completing of this study Klarendal was more than once in the news. When writing about the strategy of policy makers it turned out to be valuable to include the work of others. To begin with, by the beginning of April 2011, a critical report was published on the success of the Modekwartier as starting point for urban renewal. In here, researchers added useful information to this study by explaining what the physical context means for the future development of the Modekwartier. Second, an useful event was visited where all policy makers and other active people shared their ideas about ten years of urban renewal in Klarendal. Finally, the Modekwartier as a price winning project will be critically analyzed.

De nieuwe kracht van Klarendal

As a request of the Rijksbouwmeester (governmental architecture guard) and in dialog with the municipality of Arnhem, two consultants in urban renewal studied the physical implementation of the Modekwartier in Klarendal. In March 2011, the study resulted in the report De nieuwe kracht van Klarendal – mode als startpunt voor vernieuwing? (The new power of Klarendal – fashion as a trigger for urban renewal?) (Studio Scale and Stipo, 2011). Other studies have been carried out on Klarendal (Thuijs, 2009; Veldhuizen, van, 2008). But this study is different, because it is conducted by respectable consultants and formally received by the Arnhem’ alderman. At April the 6th, an event was organized where all involved parties where part of a presentation as a hand in of the report to the alderman. Here, it was clear that the consult will influence the future policy.

The report concludes with three anchor points. Most essential is that past investments are a success, but one has to be aware of future threats.

- Investments in Klarendal are useful, but only if the corporation keeps on investing in the next years, so that investments will remain strong.
- Within the short term a better relationship is possible between the Modekwartier, old inhabitants and especially migrants.
- The Modekwartier can exist independently, but only if opening times are part of smart arrangements. The cluster at the Sonsbeeksingel and the first 100 meters of Klarendalseweg can be extended, the cluster at the northern part of Klarendalseweg has also potential, but only on a standalone basis.
The consult consisted of six recommendations. What is clear is that they leave the option open, whether Klarendal should continue to invest in the Modekwartier or not. Time after time they advice to focus on the group of young families with children. They foresee a future with a healthy neighbourhood, due to the presence of children. Klarendal should remain a mixed neighbourhood with attention to all inhabitants.

- Together with St. Marten Klarendal can become ‘the Jordaan of Arnhem’, with a fine balance of old inhabitants and new purchasing power, and especially cultural capital.
- Potential future profile: affordable, organic, urban, spontaneous and historical neighbourhood for old inhabitants, for second and third generation migrants, for students and for urban oriented cultural families with children.
- To bind these groups it is important that the development of cultural historic qualities will be continued.
- A child friendly Klarendal has the abilities for extension: with more activities for children, the aggregation of houses, more attention for social safety, child friendly streets and a better connection to the surrounding parks.
- The multifunctional centre and the related neighbourhood square will become interesting if quarter and urban functions are mixed, if there are multiple motives for a visit and if the place is used double at the same time.
- The Klarendalseweg (central street of the Modekwartier) is an excellent place, depending on the future demographics, for the further development of other craft companies than fashion, independent entrepreneurs, little specialized restaurant for the neighbourhood and services such as catering and personal care. It is also an option to keep on developing the Modekwartier.

**Klarendal conference: “Klarendal 2021”**

At the 21st of April, 2011, a conference was organized in the neighbourhood to look back on ten years of urban renewal and to take a look to the future. Questions were: “Which lessons can be learned?”, and, “How can a successful urban renewal be continued while the national government is economizing so much?” (Gemeente Arnhem, 2011b). At the end of the conference, a moment of knowledge sharing was implemented. Each workshop shared their output.

The workshop *Klarendal internal* came up with the following three building blocks for the future: give inhabitants more responsibility, invest in activities and let the inhabitants decide in what to economize. The workshop *Klarendal external* delivered the following three key points: all entrepreneurs should be facilitated, create good physic connections and the neighbourhood should be promoted along with the city campaigns of fashion. An idea was to be patient: ‘slow cooking’, ‘tajin’, “the Jordaan, in Amsterdam, took also 30 years to become what it is nowadays”. The third workshop *Klarendal future* said: make use of the diversity, because it results in activity (example of the bazaar), initiatives should come from enterprises instead of the municipality (request for a bottom-up approach), the new multifunctional centre should be very lively. The final workshop focused on social media brought in the following ideas: less municipality and more community, bring in a credit card for neighbourhood contact, social media is important, because it means social safety.

A day after the conference, a newspaper article was published (De Gelderlander, 2011). In that article two men, known with the renewal in Klarendal, shared their thoughts. Former police commissioner Nieuwerth who was involved in tackling drug related nuisance in the last decade, said
that the municipality should not shape Klarendal according to their norms. Nieuwerth got to know Klarendal as a very mixed neighbourhood, varying with simple Dutchman, to Turks and Kurds, old and young. He thinks that this diversity generates dynamic and chances, Klarendal will never become a yuppie neighbourhood. In the same article, artist Arno Arts, who lives already for 35 years in Klarendal, thinks that the arrival of the *Modekwartier*, should not mean that Klarendal turns into an ‘elite neighbourhood’. They should do more with the ‘folksy’ image.

**Klarendal winner of the Gouden Feniks**

In June 7th, 2011, the *Modekwartier* turned out to be the winner of *Gulden Feniks*, in the category ‘area transformation’, a price for the best renovation and transformation projects in the Netherlands (SNRP, 2011). The jury had used the following criteria: sustainability, vitality, sublimation, dearness, professionalism, economy and innovation. On several issues, one could discuss if they were right. According to the jury, the project has found the link with the rise of the creative industry. Especially, the contribution of the bar and restaurant *Goed Proeven* is important for the success. The fact that people from all over the Netherlands, and also again people from Arnhem, start coming to Klarendal is an accomplishment. Although, a share of the native Klarendal inhabitants, experience the transition as inconvenient, and feels it as a loss of neighbourhood culture, most inhabitants think that it is beautiful. Streets are much cleaner and safer, now. Thanks to the *Modekwartier* hundred people have found a job; one could doubt if the inhabitants have made advantage, while forty of them are the designers themselves. Also, the jury claims that, because the inhabitants assess their environment better, they have confidence in the development of the *Modekwartier*. In my opinion, this grade is not sufficient enough to say if they trust the project. Finally, the jury is not sure about one issue. While real estate developers concur that there is a trend of an increase in the sale of houses and the rise of house prices, they have no proof for this. But the jury sees it as a good development (SNRP, 2011).

At June 21st, 2011, the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP), came out with an evaluation of the interventions in Dutch disadvantaged areas (Wittebrood & Permentier, 2011). The results were important, because the Dutch government and corporations are investing millions of Euros every year, since 2008. The research showed that the social-economic position of the forty *Vogelaarwijken* has hardly changed, in the period 1999 and 2008. Though, an alteration took place in the population of these neighbourhoods; the native Dutch inhabitants, moved out and were replaced by non-Western migrants of the middle class. Also, the research demonstrated that to increase the liveability and safety of a neighbourhood, one should not invest in public space and sports facilities, but one should rebuild. Especially the replacement of social housing by houses for sale improves the living conditions. Nevertheless, the study indicates that trends after 2008 have not been investigated, while since this year much work is been done in Klarendal. In 2013, SCP will publish a new report, what will say more about recent investments in *Vogelaarwijken* (Wittebrood & Permentier, 2011).

In line with this news, the national respected newspaper NRC Handelsblad, published an article about the changes Klarendal has been through. A long, long time ago, Klarendal used to be the liveliest neighbourhood of Arnhem; it was always busy. Almost all stores have disappeared in the last fifty years. The only store that is left is a horse butchery. The district has welcomed a new supermarket and many fashion shops. For the inhabitants the clothes are too expensive, however, a fashion shop is at least better than a cannabis coffee shop. While the confidence in the government is restored, the municipality knows that the Dutch government will not finance seven years more in
urban revitalization. Though, Thijs Verwer, drummer and owner of an artist agency suspects that even without governmental aid the resurrection of Klarendal will continue; house prices are rising and people like to start living here (Schreuder, 2011).

4.5 Concluding remarks
To conclude this chapter it would be good to come back to one of the sub questions for research, see 1.4; “What policy has been applied in the urban renewal of Klarendal? And how forceful was/is the policy?”.

To answer this question one could say yes, in Klarendal, policy has made the difference in the change towards a more liveable neighbourhood. Of course, thanks to the active participation of inhabitants, as volunteers and in various meetings, a more efficient refurbishment was possible, but at the end it was the local course of action with its money what has made Klarendal what it is today. In comparison to the instance of Marxloh, Duisburg, one could say that Klarendal is driven by a top down strategy; the footprint of policy and decision makers is clearly visible in the metamorphose of the neighbourhood. The domination of Volkshuisvesting Arnhem in Klarendal has had much influence. Out of the dozens of million Euros of investments in Klarendal by Volkshuisvesting Arnhem a major share was meant for the refurbishment of houses and public realm. Also, the corporation has invested 20 million Euros to establish a fashion quarter. The question “how forceful is/was the policy” is perhaps better to answer in the next chapters where the citizens share their experiences, however, apart from their thought, people think that fashion is/was a trigger for urban renewal. A report of independent consultants was critical, but confident. Also, at a conference with involved local policy makers, people were convinced that Klarendal is much better off now, although uncertainty was present about the unknown consequences of the withdraw of grants. And last but not least, winning a prize for having the best ‘area transformation project’ of the Netherlands is self explanatory.
5. **Experience of inhabitants**

5.1 **Introduction**

To understand how inhabitants of Klarendal experience the influence of the *Modekwartier* on their neighbourhood, two focus groups were organized. The earlier case study and document analysis pushed the research to the actual story of the inhabitants itself. Suppositions that circulate in the media and the scientific debate around ‘citizens and gentrification’ require a confirmation. For example, how do people get along with gentrifiers. Does their attitude change over time? Is there much difference between the gossip and the actual thought?

5.2 **The Klarendaller**

When starting off the focus group meetings, an introduction round was necessary to understand with whom people were talking with. Frequently, the only similarity between people was that they lived in the same neighbourhood. A major difference between inhabitants was the time they lived in the neighbourhood, as an argument to have more ‘say’ in the debate. For one participant to be a real inhabitant, one has to be born and raised in Klarendal. Only if this is the case one can call him or herself a *Klarendaller* (Focus group 1, personal communication, July 4th, 2011).

The *oude Klarendallers*, inhabitants who occupy the neighbourhood for generations, are becoming a minority in their own neighbourhood. In the 1970s and 1980s a big part of the neighbourhood was erased in order to redevelop the area. Most of the inhabitants moved out of Klarendal to surrounding districts or Arnhem South where new housing offered more comfort. “It was like moving from hell to heaven”. These people never came back to Klarendal (Focus group 3, personal communication, July 11th, 2011).

Most criticism towards the *Modekwartier* comes from a small share of the *oude Klarendallers*. They want to see their neighbourhood as it once was; one participant called it: “Romanticism to the old days”. It is a ‘very small club’ of people who are really dominant in the debate, they shout like: “We want our old stores back”. Participants in focus group 3 were very cynical about this particular group of people: “You should not expect too much from these low bred, pessimistic, inhabitants”, and, “It is a small group of people, who just become enthusiastic if there is a stage with Frans Bauer” (a folk singer). Focus group 1 explained that it is annoying how they influence the local atmosphere. In such a way, there arises a stereotype about the inhabitants, which is not true: “Most people are very glad with the new developments, everything is better than those ‘drug premises’”. At the same time, early in the focus group meetings, the discrepancy and character of Klarendal became obvious. An *oude Klarendaller* describes the cruel situation some parts of Klarendal were into by the end of the 20th century. Never he felt ashamed for his place of birth, but it was clear that it was hard to remain proud. He was very pleased about the recent refurbishments, the fact that inhabitants cannot afford the products would not be a problem. The moment he searched for a confirmation among participants that inhabitants do not buy in the *Modekwartier*, by saying that “they do not buy hats of four hundred euro”, it turned out that one of the participants buys expensive products in the *Modekwartier* frequently.

In the search to bridge the gap people were asked how one could become more like a *Klarendaller*. They responded that you should participate: “If you help improving your neighbourhood, f.i. as part of a project, you will feel more involved. Being in contact is essential”. The participants of the focus group were all very concerned and active in local projects. A new dweller responded that she would not move out, she feels integrated. At the same time, she connects here
situation to the one of her fellow newcomers, the fashion designers: “If the fashion shops also open their doors and set a good attitude, they will be more than welcome in Klarendal”.

However, at the same time, one can say that especially newcomers do not see a divide between the newly arrived fashion designers and inhabitants. During focus group 1, a participant questioned if it is possible to separate the fashion entrepreneurs from the inhabitants. Also, within DOCKS, the entrepreneurs association of the Modekwartier, people sometimes disagree with each other. Among the participants of the focus group, two partakers, could identify themselves in multiple ways: as Klarendaller, entrepreneur in creative business and newcomer.

5.3 The Modekwartier

After the discussion about the character of the inhabitants and their different points of view, the meetings moved further on the topic of their actual opinion about the Modekwartier; the engine of gentrification in Klarendal. The following proposition was set: “Klarendallers and fashion designers go well together!”. Older inhabitants responded immediately with no. Their response was more focused on the shops itself than the actual entrepreneurs. They are glad that the Modekwartier is there, because otherwise all shops would be vacant and depraved. According to focus group 1, the downgrading of business activities in Klarendal was due to choices of inhabitants themselves. Instead of buying their daily grocery at the shops, the people had chosen to go to the supermarket. Here, it is useful to mention that Klarendal once was the place in Arnhem where people bought their grocery. Also, the trend of going to the supermarket instead of the bakery and butcher is a process the whole world was dealing with. But pointed at the shops, focus group 1 notices:

“It is sad that, on a week base, most shops are open so little. Inhabitants do not really go to these shops, yet, it is depressing if you see customers coming from far away who stand in front of a closed door”.

Among focus group 1 there was consensus about the uncertainty of the actual opening hours. Although, inhabitants understand the reason for the little time the shops are open, entrepreneurs need to have an extra part time job, still it seems illogical that shops are open little while they need to earn more. In April 2011, consultancies published their outcomes about research on the success of the Modekwartier as trigger for urban renewal in Klarendal. Also, they found out closed shops have a bad impact on the image of the Modekwartier. They suggested to open shops, all together, only at specific times and/or in combination with arrangements with the local catering (Studio Scale and Stipo, 2011: 21).

Besides, for inhabitants sometimes it is also hard to understand what entrepreneurs are selling, what makes the step to go inside even more difficult. One participant indicated that she is not sure if the clothing behind the shop windows is for sale, or for exhibition. She is not inclined to walk in one of the shops easily. Furthermore, inhabitants simply do not have the money to afford expensive clothing:

“It is like you have brought fairly rich shops, but inhabitants will never have enough money to buy anything. They can only lurk. Before the shop windows they stand mouth watering watching the beautiful clothing”.

During focus group 1, immediately another participant took the stance of the newcomers:
“As part of urban renewal entrepreneurs were asked to establish their shop in Klarendal. So we better call them ‘guts’, because for them it is not clear if it is going to work or not”.

Only one participant in focus group 3 responded directly on the proposition. He did not believe that fashion designers per se are really a part of the neighbourhood: “Many of them had already build up their company. As far as I can see, they are very often outside Klarendal for work. Most of the shops are open only little”. Finally, he adds that he does not believe that the Modekwartier employs the inhabitants of Klarendal. Nevertheless, the Modekwartier will become more a part of Klarendal when the supplied merchandise becomes more diverse. In both focus groups participants responded content that other entrepreneurs have started who offer something else than fashion products. Again and again, the design bikes of Van Hulstijn are named as the pioneer for creative business other than fashion in Klarendal. However, if the inhabitants could decide they would like to see that random stores also get access in the development of business in Klarendal. The shopping streets in the centre of Arnhem should function as an successful example of a healthy and sustainable shopping centre where affordable fashion stores also find a place. Diversity in products and prices can generate more run up.

5.4 Integration
The focus group meetings were semi-structured, several propositions were set up to stay close to the topic, but at the same time participants were encouraged to speak freely about their experiences. For this reason, participants could freely say what was on their mind. Integration turned out to be a hot issue. Already this issue popped up in paragraph 6.2, but now, it is more focused on the two groups together, as companions in the urban renewal of Klarendal. The perfect place where both groups could come together is at neighbourhood events, such as De Wijkdag and Nacht v/d Mode, but also at some new cafes established right after the set up of the Modekwartier. So the question was: “Were you there?” and “Where do you get a drink?”. Before going to their answers, perhaps it is useful to understand the organization and contents of both events. Wijkdag, is a neighbourhood party which takes place every year at one day of June. It is a day full of activities in the heart of the neighbourhood meant for all the inhabitants of Klarendal. Nacht v/d Mode (Night of the Fashion), is a yearly show off of the fashion designers of the Modekwartier, supplemented with a wide range of activities, so that visitors have an unique night out while enjoying fashion in an informal way. Both events took place some weeks before the focus group meetings, so it was still fresh in their mind.

One of the participants of focus group 1 explained that, as being one of the organizers of De Wijkdag, one has tried to make the Modekwartier part of the schedule by organizing a guided tour. Unfortunately, no one was interested in this tour, and for that reason DOCKS decided not to organize such a tour anymore. If such ideas do not work out, you will not keep trying. “Gaps are sometimes hard to bridge, that is sad. You should consider if you make an effort every time”.

It turned out that inhabitants had much to say about Nacht v/d Mode. One of the elder inhabitants was very proud to see that his neighbourhood was visited by so much people. Although, most people were from elsewhere, ‘inbreeding’, and was visited by only a few Klarendallers, still it was good to see (Focus group 1, personal communication, July 4th, 2011). At a meeting of the association for Klarendal (Wijkplatform) there was said that this time the organization of Nacht v/d Mode attempted to involve the inhabitants some more. When asking this at the focus group an elder inhabitant responded immediately with: “Haven’t noticed”. Right after here a newcomer replied that
of course the event attracted inhabitants to come: “The doors were open, then there was this attraction, *Rad der Verbeelding* (Wheel of Imagination), an inflatable, and everywhere there was something for children”. Still this elder inhabitant had visited various shops that night, she liked it. Focus group 1 concluded the Modekwartier is more accessible when an event is organized where the doors of shops are open. In focus group 3 only one inhabitant had been at the event. His active work in the upgrading of Klarendal in the previous decade has the consequence that he always has to be critical. In his opinion, other stores in Klarendal should also open their doors at Nacht v/d Mode: “The mall should be open until nine o’clock, and it would be great if the butcher would sell his sausages as well”. Another participant agreed with him; “They have to draw broader”. A Klarendaller is not only interested in fashion merchandise, the event would be more attractive if they can do grocery, or if they can buy a donut and a beer, at the same time (Focus group 3, personal communication, July 11th, 2011).

Restaurant *Goed Proeven* plays a key role in the Modekwartier, by attracting people to come over to the Modekwartier. Also, it is the ideal place where inhabitants can meet creative entrepreneurs. It is a new, well visited bar and restaurant opened in May 2008, located in the middle of the Modekwartier, on the crossroad of Sonsbeeksingel and Klarendalseweg, see Appendix I. Of both of the focus groups most of the participants have been earlier, or are often in *Goed Proeven*. People appreciate the good food and nice, sunny, pavement bar. At the same time, participants know that most of the visitors come from outside the neighbourhood. Among the citizens of Arnhem the bar and restaurant is very popular, however, most Klarendallers think that the prices are way too high (Focus group 1, personal communication, July 4th, 2011). One could say that *Goed Proeven* is very depending on the visitors and initiators of the Modekwartier, and the other way around. Only a small share of the population contributes to the existence of *Goed Proeven*.

As mentioned before, Klarendal has got a large population of migrants among its inhabitants. Of which mostly are Turkish. During the selection procedure in finding people for focus groups it turned out very difficult to find enthusiastic migrants. Fortunately, one Turkish dweller was willing to participate. In focus group 3, there was the possibility to ask some questions about their position towards the Modekwartier. When asking him why it could be so hard to find Non-western inhabitants for this focus group it turned out that they are not interested:

“The moment I started living in Klarendal the neighbourhood looked much different. I don’t know for whom the fashion is meant. Is it only for promotion? I don’t know. It is expensive clothing, all handmade, I think. But it is only for exhibition?”

Much Turkish people do not know what the Modekwartier is making and for whom. Typical is the next quote: “I have never been in such a shop. I am not interested”.

Finally, one of the participants suggested that a new shop of the inhabitants themselves could function as a trigger for the integration of the Modekwartier within Klarendal (Focus group 1, personal communication, July 4th, 2011). She believes that a considerable share of the population sometimes also makes nice clothing, paintings, accessories, etcetera. With a fair deal the products could be displayed and be sold in a shop. It could be a platform for new entrepreneurs, but then on a local base. As a way to make fashion more interesting for the district and vice versa.
5.5 Gentrification

Finally, at the end of the focus groups, it was time to ask the participants if they experience a process of gentrification in Klarendal. And if so, in what sense? Since, gentrification is an unknown term among most people it was better not to use the word, because it could scare people off, while it does not have to be a bad development. The signs of gentrification that are visible in Klarendal, see 3.3, functioned as the basis for the setting up of the proposition and related questions to inhabitants. Several local developments had to be named in order to trigger the response of participants. During the focus groups the following proposition was used: “Klarendal will not become like Spijkerkwartier!” Since, the response of the two focus groups was fundamentally different, there is chosen to split the response of the two focus groups.

In focus group 1 the topic of gentrification was started when asking the participants if Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, the owner of most houses, is operating in a fair way (Focus group 1, personal communication, July 4th, 2011). The discussion was pointed at the housing stock of Volkshuisvesting Arnhem, what can, due to sales, turn from social rent into private owned. One of the participants suggested that sales could be an option to keep the organization financially healthy or to give more space to starters in the housing sector or a combination. What she knew is that a sufficient share of the houses for rent should remain for rent to ensure that people who are not able to buy still have the option to find housing: “The intention is that this will not become a yuppie neighbourhood”. For now, the statements are not really useful until another participant responded with: “But it’s going to become like that”. Whereas the previous participant turns out to be closely involved with the policy makers, with saying: “I’ve always understood that they will guard for it. Policy makers and program managers will take care for it. At various places they are constantly in contact with each other”.

When questioning if the developments of Spijkerkwartier could also take place in Klarendal an inhabitant, who says to know everyone in Spijkerkwartier, replies:

“I think so, because also here an association of the neighbourhood is busy with it. But in terms of housing, and how it all looks like, you know. Spijkerkwartier has got all this big, ‘Brussels housing’, you can’t simply build that here. Klarendal remains an area with its own identity. Although the Modekwartier has arisen Klarendal will keep its identity. Also the housing, the building and the structure of the neighbourhood is much different”

When first responding that it is possible, later in the discussion inhabitants say something else: “It is not a yuppie story, but a starters story”. The small size of houses would keep off the arrival of people with capital.

Here, it is unclear if inhabitants really know what yuppies are. Namely, according to Prof. Hanson Yuppism is not definable entirely by income or class: “Rather, it is a late twentieth century cultural phenomenon of self absorbed young professionals, earning good pay, enjoying the cultural attractions of sophisticated urban life and thought” (Hanson, 2010). Whether, Hanson is the right source can be discussed, however, other sources come close to the same definition (Savells, 1986; Carpini & Sigelman, 1986).

Early in the meeting of focus group 3 one of the participants responded vigorous on the introduction of one of the new inhabitants in the neighbourhood. Five years ago a participant bought a house in Klarendal, on which he responded: “But the price you have paid has increased with ten
until twelve percent, isn’t?” (Focus group 3, personal communication, July 11th, 2011). What seemed to be alright. After that he explained the developments as follows:

“Due to the existence of the Modekwartier, the fact that everything is renovated and because we are located so central, we are truly an upcoming neighbourhood. Everywhere house prices are falling, but here they are rising. We are a real urban neighbourhood with cheap houses, but these prices are increasing rapidly. I am not saying ‘daily’, than I would exaggerate, but they are really going up”

Typical is the reply of one of the other participants: “That’s good!”. The reasons behind this statement could be numerous, but at that moment it seemed to be conflicting to the viewpoint of the speaker. Too him, it feels great that the neighbourhood, he is proud of, is doing well, but at the same time he is afraid of a loss of character. The same situation returns when he mentioned that Klarendal should remain the ‘Jordaan van het oosten’ (referring to the well known working class neighbourhood in centre of Amsterdam). He thinks Klarendal should not follow the development of the Jordaan itself where the inhabitants moved out to Almere in favour of the yuppies: “The influx of all those fine looking new shops...”. “Great!”, she responded. At her turn, she said that she was very sceptical about the onset of Grandcafe Goed Proeven. With a councillor she even made up a funny story that within two years Goed Proeven would be penniless, by then they would take over the business. Now, she cannot be sceptical anymore, while the company is doing so well. One of the participants clarified the situation nicely: “If they would have told me that a hotel will be build in Klarendal, I would have said you are insane”.

When shifting to the topic of Spijkerkwartier, as comparison in urban development, participants reply furious on faults that were made. To get rid of the prostitutes the municipality bought over a vast part of the houses, then they sold them to real estate developers for a low price. Subsequently they have split the big houses in several apartments and sold them for big prices to single households. Now, parking problems arise, because streets are not made for so much households. When suggesting that Klarendal will not deal with such issues, because the houses are too small, a participant responded that Klarendal has no big houses, however, it has some big buildings, such as the Menno Coehoorn Kazerne. Here, close before the approval to build apartments inhabitants protested that the building should get a prominent function. Now, they will turn it into a multifunctional place with a school and medical centre. According to another participant in Klarendal it is obvious why the housing corporation wants to sell its property. There needs to be a healthy mix of private and rental. The crucial fact is that rent prices for houses do not rise, because they are related to legal standards, but the overall value of houses in Klarendal is increasing steadily. Now, in Klarendal, similar to Spijkerkwartier, investors are buying low priced houses, because the housing corporation opens them for the market. Then they split and renovate them, and subsequently they offer new room apartments for rent. It happened also in his street. In the Klarenbeekstraat citizens rebelled against one of the owners. Who had bought two houses and wanted to split them in eight apartments. “To solve the problem, policymakers should prohibit the splitting of houses, in order to prevent the advent of slumlords”. Splitting of houses seems to be a profitable business in Klarendal, a neighbour of a participant has got even four houses. The participant says that he is doing well: “Often I take a look how he is doing. And then I question him: How much do you ask today? Haha”

Inhabitants say that they experience the increase in house prices in various ways. To begin with, to some extent they have to pay more tax, due to a higher property value. Furthermore, Klarendal use
to have low house prices compared to other neighbourhoods who surround the city centre of Arnhem, but this is changing:

“Now, the situation is upside down. Over there house prices are falling, whereas in Klarendal house prices are rising. This correction is clearly visible. Maybe next to that Klarendal is also becoming a hip place”

5.6 Concluding remarks
In two focus groups with in total ten active inhabitants, four themes were discussed: the Klarendaller, the Modekwartier, integration and gentrification. Focus groups took approximately one hour. The formation of the participants was not a true representation of the composition of the population of Klarendal.

The first topic what focus groups discussed was the definition of a Klarendaller. Both groups found it hard to describe. Everybody felt like being an inhabitant, however, the inhabitants who occupy the neighbourhood for generations claim to be the real Klarendallers; only they are born and raised here. Critique on Modekwartier comes mainly from a very small club of oude Klarendallers. They are very dominant in the debate. Participants were not so much impressed by their opinion. Also, a few of the participants could identify themselves in multiple ways: as Klarendaller, entrepreneurs in creative business and newcomers. To gain more contact with the inhabitants of Klarendal new fashion shops should open their doors and set a good attitude.

About Modekwartier participants could understand that entrepreneurs need to have a side job, but they are disappointed that much visitors stand for a closed door. For inhabitants the products do not vary much and are far too expensive. Besides, it is sometimes hard to understand what entrepreneurs are selling what makes the step to go inside more difficult. One participant had some good reasons why the fashion designers are not really a part of the neighbourhood. Many of them had already build up their company. Moreover, they are very often outside Klarendal for work. Nevertheless, Modekwartier will be more a part of Klarendal if the supplied merchandise becomes affordable and more diverse.

Considering the integration among the two groups there have been attempts to meet each other at events, however, these were not so successful. Bridge builders will not keep on trying. Participants were very enthusiastic about Nacht v/d Mode. Although, most visitors were from elsewhere they are proud to see so much people in their neighbourhood. Even though, the event is organized only once a year, one could attract more inhabitants if also other stores, outside Modekwartier, would participate. Also, Goed Proeven, is a welcome new phenomenon in the neighbourhood, however, because of the high prices most inhabitants cannot find the money for a visit. To make Modekwartier more accessible for inhabitants the idea was suggested to set up a shop with handmade products of the inhabitants themselves. Finally, most Non-western residents in Klarendal are not interested in Modekwartier. They do not go into these shops and do not know for whom and what the fashion is meant.

Regarding the process of gentrification the two focus groups responded different. Focus group 1 said that the small size of houses would prevent an advent of yuppies, but starters in the housing market will come. Focus group 3 seemed to be more aware of the developments. House prices would have increased with over ten percent in five years, caused by the existence of Modekwartier, the renovated frontages and public realm, and advantages of centrality. Gentrification in Spijkerkwartier is visible in the splitting of houses by investors in real estate. This is
noticeable in Klarendal as well. Participants were glad that one of the bigger buildings was saved for real estate development by active involvement of inhabitants. Where house prices in surrounding neighbourhoods are falling in Klarendal they rise rapidly. Klarendal is becoming a hip place.
6. Experience of gentrifiers

6.1 Introduction
To get an idea how the group of entrepreneurs of Modekwartier thinks about the developments and processes in Klarendal, two focus groups were organized. The successful meeting with inhabitants encouraged research to make the step to newcomers as well. A lot of assumptions out of earlier meetings required verification. For example, how to name this group. How do they see themselves? As entrepreneurs? Designers? Inhabitants? Newcomers? Gentrifiers? Or a bit of everything?

6.2 The start of an enterprise
As a starting off, some background of the participants was useful. Therefore, there was chosen to ask the participants where they came from, their previous image of Klarendal and their reasons for settling. In focus group two, two participants were raised and born in Arnhem. They remembered Klarendal as the nice, traditional place for grocery in Arnhem. Over time, the neighbourhood degraded, when cycling through or along the quarter there were several spots you better did not come. There was no reason any more to go into the neighbourhood (Focus group 2, personal communication, July 7th, 2011).

When coming to the issue of settlement, the participants of focus group 2 responded that they were positively surprised that there were not only young designers, but also people of their own age. A few years before, they all had decided to quit with their jobs to start designing fashion. They found their true passion. The concept of setting up a quarter full with designer shops was very attractive. A participant tried to formulate the brilliance of the idea: “To be inspired by colleagues, thinking in the same logic and making use of the promotion...”.

Focus group 4 experienced a different start. One of the younger designers started about two years ago with her shop. For two years she was constantly struggling with new assignments, for this reason she could not make up her own collection for in the shop. Now, also she is very happy that upwards there have established more young designers, because from time to time she felt to be the only young entrepreneur. Another participant started about one year ago with some classmates after some trouble with finding an atelier. The problem was that their products did not fit in the previous concept of Modekwartier; no space was open for merchandise other than fashion. All participants agreed that more diversity in merchandise will lead to a more successful Modekwartier (Focus group 4, personal communication, September 8th, 2011).

6.3 Attitude of inhabitants
Considering the word Klarendaller in the proposition “Klarendallers and fashion designers go well together!”, designers say that you should be careful about whom you are speaking. One participant of focus group 2 described nicely the situation (Focus group 2, personal communication, July 7th, 2011):

“The new generation of inhabitants, and newcomers, are perfect to get along with. Yet, with the elder generations I have had some discussion on the street. At that moment they are all very kind, and do all agree with you, if you have the chance to explain. When questioning to a single man or woman they won’t have trouble with us, but in between they are grumbling, I think”
Another participant contributed by responding that it is hard to say how inhabitants think about designers. In her opinion inhabitants sense perhaps that fashion designers think that one is the cat’s whiskers. Especially young graduated designers, they approach everything different, there is a certain atmosphere around them, but possibly they think also the other way around. A third participant added: “A difference is that we are already settled, where young people are still searching”. On which the second participant responded: “That’s the way they are educated, but I think that the inhabitants don’t like it. They think in the same way about us”. Here, some discussion was started. Sometimes the borderline between us/them/they, was unclear, while also the group of young designers was implemented. When mentioning the topic in focus group 4 participants reply that there is no difference in passion and or ambition for Modekwartier among old and young designers. Nevertheless, young designers presume the viewpoint is different in such a manner that young people can always try, if it does not work one can do something else (Focus group 4, personal communication, September 8th, 2011).

In focus group 2 one participant mentioned that the ties with inhabitants are fine; she has got a good relationship with her neighbours. On which, another participant responded:

“Certainly at the beginning of Modekwartier there was an aversion against fashion shops. There was vandalism and stigmatization going on. Inhabitants felt: “All the money goes to them, why don’t we get anything? Why are we not helped? Why only the fashion people?” Yes, I truly think so”

The third participant negotiated in the finding the attitude of the inhabitants by saying:

“Do you know what it is? There is some gossip going on in the quarter. Now, for people it is so easy to have one’s ear to the ground. We do that all together. But if you ask people to their personal experiences than there is no reason to murmur. It is more like we are grumbling, because it is nice to grumble. They are unsatisfied about their personal situation”

Focus group 4 clearly had not experienced the first years of Modekwartier, but discussion about sceptics is still going strong (Focus group 4, personal communication, September 8th, 2011). According to this group, due to the displacement of Klarendallers in the 1960s and 1970s the neighbourhood cannot be claimed anymore by the true Klarendallers, because the composition of inhabitants in Klarendal is too diverse, today. Still, their voice is clear, a participant referred to a sign at the local tobacconist saying: “Fashion entrepreneurs: Fuck off!!” She understands the people; they have trouble make ends meet and think that they should be subsidized instead. Entrepreneurs disagree with the idea that the whole project was paid by the municipality, they have received no money. Besides, rent prices would have been artificially low, but in the meanwhile prices were comparable to the prices inhabitants had to pay themselves. Since their settlement entrepreneurs have had several conversations with angry inhabitants. At times they come into your shop for an explanation.

But fashion designers know that the situation is different, now. Namely, inhabitants see the positive side of the Modekwartier: buildings are refurbished, the streets have just a whole new appearance. In contrast to the recent article of NRC Handelsblad (Schreuder, 2011), the news articles of the local newspaper De Gelderlander about Modekwartier have always been quit distrustful. The
little faith towards the local newspaper is clearly visible in the next quote: “If you think that it will not succeed, than it is easy story telling” (Focus group 2, personal communication, July 7
th, 2011).

When asking how one should think of the construction of a Fashion Design Hotel. The first reply is that it will generate more liveliness. Of course the street view will change, because other public will come in. Another participant used again the example of the folk quarter Jordaan in Amsterdam. There, regeneration would have taken place more quickly, because in comparison to people in Arnhem, and especially Klarendal, people were more flexible and open minded. The first respondent added that this attitude of grumbling is in a sense also a culture in Klarendal. Focus group 4 replied enthusiastically that a Fashion Design Hotel is very much welcome in Modekwartier: “The more initiatives the better it is for Modekwartier” (...) “It is important that there is happening something positive which has got style and charisma”. They all agreed by the end it is crucial that new initiatives fit in the overall concept of Modekwartier.

It turned out that the elder designers were aware of the situation (Focus group 2, personal communication, July 7
th, 2011): “There is a culture of grumbling, we are outsiders, so we should accept that”. But at the same time, they also want to be accepted. According to focus group 2 it is sad that the media visualizes a split in the neighbourhood, while the reality is much different:

“The media listens to a small group of grumblers, instead they should listen to the majority. Namely, most dwellers like the Modekwartier, but simply do not say it in public”

6.4 Integration
Just like the inhabitants, the fashion designers were also asked about their position in possible events of integration, such as: Wijkdag, Nacht v/d Mode and the local catering industry. These are places where people can meet up other than entering one of the present shops.

When it comes to Wijkdag, a holiday in June where inhabitants celebrate life in Klarendal, fashion designers directly replied: “A Wijkdag this month?”, or: “Wijkdag; I didn’t know that it existed”. Both focus groups responded that it is usually, mainly organized for children. Perhaps when they have children they would have been more active. Besides, Wijkdag was organized in daytime, which means that entrepreneurs have to close their shops. In focus group 2 one of the participants responded expressively: “I have no affinity with Wijkdag. I don’t close my shop, because I have to feel more involved”. New entrepreneurs have a good argument with keeping their shop open, however, the Wijkdag is meant for everyone. When taking a look at the website with its previous schedule, Wijkdag turned out to be interesting also for local fashion designers. Especially the Klarenmarkt, which was open from 10 until 17 o’clock, would have paid their attention with a big variety of wares, artworks of ArtEZ students and the possibility to use your creative mind with the Creative Wall or Film Mill (Wijkwinkel Klarendal, 2011).

Nacht v/d Mode is an event designers had much to say about, for sure, because they organized it themselves. Focus group 4 responded enthusiastically: “It was a great day!”; a response primarily focused on their sales. Whereas the entrepreneurs usually can count the number of customers a day, which is basically what they did during a focus group session, at Nacht v/d Mode, all shops were crowded and they all had sold a lot. Also, designers believe that more inhabitants dared to enter a shop, because the event made the shops more accessible (Focus group 4, personal communication, September 8
th, 2011). Focus group 2 spoke in a more moderate manner about the presence of inhabitants during Nacht v/d Mode. For example, one participant said:
“Well, there were a number of citizens from of the Vinkstraat who came in. They were curious. I had a nice chat. Undoubtedly, there were some inhabitants who didn’t dare, but it’s the same case in the city centre”

To increase the accessibility there was asked if it would be a good idea to open the doors some more in daytime. Participants responded that they do that during daytime; if the weather is fine. An interesting quote came from one of the young female designers: “Since my scary neighbour is gone, I dare to do open my door again”.

To understand what the catering industry means for gentrifiers, the next question was raised: “Do you come over at these new bars? And do you use it as a meeting place?” Inhabitants do not go so much to the new fashionable bars (Focus group 3, personal communication, July 11th, 2011). So for this case it is less about integration, but more about social life. Focus group 2 responded that the Modekwartier was started with the establishment of Goed Proeven with above Monsteratelier for the students of ArtEZ. However, the people who sit there for a drink are not real customers of the fashion shops: “Every Friday and Saturday afternoon it is crowded there outside. They are potential customers, but by the time they have decided to visit a shop, we are already closed”. Nonetheless, focus group 2 thinks that the concept of Goed Proeven is excellent, but the same applies to Espressobar Tape and Bart’s Koffie Cafeetje. In the last example, they even meet up every week. The young designers of focus group 4 prefer going to Espressobar Tape and Sugar Hill. Sometimes they go to Goed Proeven, but it is simply too expensive. Also, there are different people there. One could say, most come from outside the neighbourhood, enjoying dinner or a drink by the end of busy week at the office.

Only in focus group 4 a small discussion was about the involvement of Non-western inhabitants with Modekwartier. According to the participants there is nearly no contact with them, it is not their target group, but sometimes they come in and say hello. During the research process, in line with the craftsmanship idea (Studio Scale & Stipo, 2011), there was said that Turkish women perhaps could assist designers with craftwork. One of the participants works part time in Monsteratelier and said that they would love to see a Turkish manufacturer coming over to repair the sewing machines. People with knowledge about the working of these machines are scarce here. And Turkish and Moroccan women who want to knit are always welcome. However, another participant countered the suggestion, by saying that these women are not present here. Subsequently, the first respondent agrees: “No one ever entered my shop by saying can I help you?”

In the previous focus groups 1 and 3 with inhabitants the topic integration was ended with the suggestion to open also a shop with craftwork of the inhabitants themselves. In focus group 4 designers replied on this idea. Among the participants there was clearly a divide. Either they thought that it is a good thing to create some more social cohesion. Or they thought that it would be threat in maintaining the supply of high quality design. As a compromise there was suggested to create some room in the Wijkwinkel or another public building. Also, people who are good with knitting may always introduce themselves.

6.5 Creating business

According to focus group 2 the start of the Modekwartier was not so easy. At the very beginning, designers at the local fashion academy, ArtEZ, were asked to set up an enterprise in Klarendal. But people responded like: “You don’t go to there!” . It was the same case for established designers. Within focus group 4 one of the participants was educated at the ArtEZ fashion academy in Arnhem.
When asking her if they had recommended her to settle in Modekwartier, she responded that they were certainly not excited about it, but their attitude has changed, because fine fashion design is better represented in Modekwartier, now. She goes on by saying that it starts to get exciting, nowadays. In Monsteratelier, an annex of ArtEZ in Modekwartier, they are busy with making The Arnhem Collection. Today, there is already a lot of collection and the establishment of Arnhem Mode Incubator, which offers professional support to upcoming fashion design talent, says that ArtEZ has confidence in the functioning of Modekwartier.

Again in focus group 2 there was raised a difference with the approach of the young entrepreneurs. As established, older designers, one has a clear idea what to start with when opening a shop in Modekwartier. While, the younger designers have a whole life in front of them. They have no idea what about ten years time. In focus group 2 there was some discussion whether the entrepreneurs who have left Modekwartier were young designers or not. And also for what reason they had left, a breakup of a relationship should not be a reason. Nevertheless, participants all agree that the process is long winded. Entrepreneurs dare to take risks in a period of crisis: “Everybody who survives, will experience better times at a certain moment, because they kept on going”. In these times, one cannot expect that young people with few money simply start their company, and fix their selves for three until five years. To the new entrepreneurs one participants repeatedly says: “Make sure that you have a small part time job besides; by the end of the week you should open you shop, from Thursday until Saturday, but make sure you have got a base, do something!”. As a response the young designers of focus group 4 said that they were not so afraid for risks. One of the entrepreneurs, at the age of twenty-nine, explained that her father bought the shop for her. If business will not run well, she can always move out and rent. Still, they explained when starting an enterprise at a young age one should have a clear vision, because it costs money and you are attached to a contract (Focus group 4, personal communication, September 8th, 2011).

According to focus group 2 doing business in Modekwartier is not everywhere the same. While one participant has here shop besides the successful restaurant Goed Proeven, another participant is settled a few hundred meters upwards the Klarendalseweg, see Appendix I. “A lot of people won’t walk upwards to my shop. On the one side, it is sad, but on the other side, I prefer customers who want to buy, in the meanwhile I can tailor. But right now, upwards, there are settling four new shops and an eatery. But it is true, the spacer has no shops; it is a ‘hard piece’”. Another participant adds: “When I send them to one of my colleagues, fifteen minutes upwards, they often come back after five minutes”. Focus group 4 agreed at most points of focus group 2. They are conscious about the (dis)advantages of settling upwards at the Klarendalseweg. However, they cannot compare the northern and southern side; they do not know if it influences their income. What they do know is that rent prices for a shop are cheaper at the northern part of Klarendalseweg.

Within focus group 4 more discussion was generated around the theme of creating successful business. Not all participants were established for so long, but already they could see that business is doing better than at the start of the enterprise. Now, the settlement of some more young designers upwards at the Klarendalsweg together with the start of cafe Sugar Hill have boosted business and atmosphere locally. Also entrepreneurs are delighted about the future art centre in the Menno Coehoorn Kazerne. The visitors are a target group for Modekwartier. To sum up, Modekwartier has more entrepreneurs and a wider ranch of merchandise in comparison to a few years ago. “It is going to become something”. One participant uses an interesting example, especially for the next paragraph:
“In cities as Berlin these places have arisen more naturally. Here, there was suddenly the Modekwartier. It is only since recently that Modekwartier starts to develop itself”

6.6 Gentrification

When it comes to the issue of gentrification fashion designers are unpretentious about their impact on the future development. Focus group 2 thinks that a part of the neighbourhood will be faced with gentrification, but the biggest share of the houses in Klarendal is not suitable for yuppies: “We should not be afraid for that”. Another participant adds that the housing perhaps does not fit young families, but it is perfect for graduates. Also, she states that in other cities there is a trend going on of graduates who buy houses in run-down suburbs. Graduates also choose Klarendal as a place to settle, because of their low budget.

Again in focus group 4 there was a slightly different response; this time to issues of gentrification. Without saying the word they are aware of their business they are bringing in the neighbourhood. For example, one participant described her creation:

“I am going to do confection and haute couture as well. I create my own collection, but I also put stuff besides that isn’t mine, but are sold more easily. On the other hand, I have got dresses in my shop, very cheap, only seventy Euros, but customers don’t buy them, because they want to see my label on clothing. They prefer design and also some more expensive. I sell dresses for about two hundred Euros”

Two years ago, this entrepreneur was started in Modekwartier, when asking her if it was not too early to settle she responded: “If I had waited I think that rent, or I mean, house prices would have increased significantly. Also, it is much more fun, now”.

When coming to the issue of house renovation and splitting in Klarendal, one of the contributors of focus group 4 responded that in Klarendal a lot of upstairs apartments are for sale, including kluswoningen for starters, houses which people have to renovate themselves. When asking them if these upstairs apartments are interesting for people of their age, about thirty years, they said that they would fit very much. According to focus group 4 Klarendal attracts much young people to start living. Also, people of the ArtEZ academy say that they would like to find a house in Klarendal. “It is a nice neighbourhood, with pleasant cafes; it is just cosy”. Still, there are certain parts where you pass by and helps remember you that it is still Klarendal, for example, when seeing dwellers in their front yard, or when seeing crazy cars passing by with loud music on. But, according to focus group 4, it is also what makes Klarendal attractive:

“It should remain a bit unpleasant.” (...) “It gives ambience, vivacity. It shouldn’t be too virtuous”

6.7 Concluding remarks

In two focus groups with in total seven entrepreneurs of Modekwartier four themes were discussed: the start of an enterprise, the attitude of inhabitants, integration, creating business and gentrification. Focus groups took approximately one hour each.

The first topic that focus groups discussed was about the start of their enterprise. Designers had, or had no, presumptions when settling in Klarendal. Several were born in Arnhem and, or had already an idea about the context the neighbourhood where they would establish a shop. The
concept of setting up a quarter full with designer shops was very attractive. In contrast to the city centre here people can inspire each other and make use of the same promotion. However, especially the new and young entrepreneurs are struggling with how to portion their work on their collection and running a shop. Also they had doubts about the functioning of the northern part of Modekwartier. Fortunately, designers who are not specialized in fashion are welcome as well, now.

When moving over to issue of the local inhabitants the entrepreneurs of Modekwartier respond that the elder inhabitants do not always understand the arrival of fashion designers in their neighbourhood. Dwellers who live in Klarendal for generations talk sometimes distrustful, but if you question them personally they have no problem with it. Designers think that among Klarendallers there is some kind of a culture of grumbling. In 2008, the first year of Modekwartier, there was much distrust versus the designers; stigmatization and vandalism took place. In the meanwhile the local media did not lend a helping hand, in contrary. Today, inhabitants feel more comfortable, they are content about the safe and clean streets and are proud of their neighbourhood again. However, it is sad that they still do not say it loudly.

To understand the integration among designers and inhabitants there was asked about several events and places to meet in Klarendal. Designers stated that they did not know that a Wijkdag (the holiday of Klarendal) existed, and if they knew they would not go to it, because they want to have their shop open and think it is only meant for children. During the Nacht v/d Mode entrepreneurs were busier with sales than inhabitants, but it is true that more citizens visited shops, because it was an event. Designers are glad with the new fashionable bars and frequent them often. Dwellers are not much present in these cafes. Yet, they selves also do not go to Goed Proeven, it is popular, but not for any citizen of Klarendal. Furthermore, the group of Non-western migrants in Klarendal is not a target group for fashion designers. They are welcome to assist in handicraft, but that does not occur. Finally, a shop with craft of the citizens themselves is a good idea, but at the end it may not affect the image of Modekwartier.

Regarding the formation of a successful business in Klarendal one of the proposed stimulators, ArtEZ, turned out to be not very helpful at the beginning. The start of Modekwartier was difficult, first it had to prove itself. Nowadays, business is running better and more and more activities show up. Still, especially young designers need to be very ambitious to start an enterprise in Modekwartier; it costs much money and it does not earn much. The entrepreneurs who have started an enterprise in the northern part of Modekwartier were isolated first, but the appearance of a new hip cafe and a future art centre is good for business. Designers know that first the situation was a bit artificial, but see that Modekwartier transforming naturally, now.

Considering the process of gentrification designers seem to be unconscious about their influence on the spatial environment. What they believe is that gentrification will not occur in Klarendal, at least not everywhere, because the houses are inappropriate. At the same time, they know that they are selling extraordinary luxurious merchandise and that house prices have risen since their arrival. At the street level they have seen that a lot of upstairs apartments are for sale, now. Among peers Klarendal is a great place to live, they would also like to move in. What the creative entrepreneurs hope is that Klarendal will remain a bit disagreeable; it gives the neighbourhood its typical atmosphere.
7. Conclusion and evaluation

7.1 Introduction
After having answered all sub questions it is time to give an answer to the central question that is formulated at the start of the investigation:

"Is a process of gentrification taking place in Klarendal (Arnhem, the Netherlands)? And if so, how is this process experienced by the inhabitants and the gentrifiers?"

The previous chapters have extensively elaborated on the in depth knowledge on gentrification and the processes going on in the case study area of Klarendal, Arnhem. Now, chapter 7 will finally link the accumulated theory with the local occurrences. Is it true that Klarendal is in a state of gentrification? And do residents experience this similar to other cases? Paragraph 7.2 will give the answer. In organizing a basis for further research, paragraph 7.3 will shortly evaluate the master thesis research. Decisive moments within the process will be elaborated. Due to a lack of limitations or resources it was not possible to study every subject within the area of interest, for that reason, other topics will be mentioned who deserve more attention in theory and policy.

7.2 Conclusions

For the reason that the research question exists out of multiple issues, the conclusion, and answer on the question will be split in three. Namely; “Does a process of gentrification take place in Klarendal?”; “And if so, how is this process experienced by the inhabitants?”; and “What is the experience of the gentrifiers?”. At the end a general conclusion will be given.

Gentrification in Klarendal?

To begin with, “Does a process of gentrification take place in Klarendal?”. The answer is always open for discussion, but there are many good arguments for saying “yes”. The search for features of gentrification in Klarendal was based on the latest definition of The Dictionary of Human Geography (Gregory et al., 2009: 273-274); “Middle class settlement in renovated or redeveloped properties in older, inner city districts formerly occupied by a lower income population”. The definition is originally more advanced describing the first discovery by Ruth Glass and explaining the wider spread today in also smaller cities worldwide, from Southern Europe to Latin America. When looking to the key words of the definition it seems to fit perfectly on the case of Klarendal. It is an older, inner city district, occupied by a lower income population, with renovated or redeveloped properties. What catches the most attention is the change from rent to private ownership, in the last few years. The local housing corporation has always been the giant proprietor of Klarendal’s houses. Since a few years, they have invested powerfully in the refurbishment of the liveability, partly by setting up a fashion quarter. In the meanwhile, they are selling a share of their property. According to the theory of Hamnett (1984: 284) it is Klarendal’s major sign of a trend towards gentrification.

There is only one issue open for discussion: “To what extent, have lower income households been displaced in favour of middle class settlement?” In comparison to the gentrified neighbourhood of Spijkerkwartier in Arnhem, Klarendal is still very much dominated by lower income households, the settlement of fashion designers consists only out of a few dozen people. Yet, the Arnhem neighbourhood monitor states that there is a trend viewable of an increase in the settlement of highly educated people in Klarendal (Gemeente Arnhem, 2010: 71). A reasonable ground for the
absence of a trend of displacement is the fact that Klarendal use to have a lot of vacant houses, a share of these houses is occupied by newcomers, now. At the same time, there are also scientists who state that gentrification does not automatically lead to the displacement of the working class. In this light, gentrification can take place in Klarendal without a radical trend of displacement. Even though displacement is inherent to the gentrification process (Atkinson, 2000; Bailey and Robertson, 1997; Glass, 1964), Doucet (2009: 300) mentioned that in a process of gentrification there are some local residents, those living in a neighbourhood before it gentrifies, who do not immediately become displaced or are able to resist displacement. Freeman even confound established assumptions by saying that lower income residents can even benefit from a trend of gentrification (Freeman & Braconi, 2004; Freeman, 2006).

Until now, displacement is not found, but the physical renovation and positioning of the Modekwartier have resulted in a neighbourhood where people of the city come to again. The settlement of young people with fresh ideas and a bright future, brings in an atmosphere what paves the way for a future of gentrification.

**Experience of the inhabitants**

Now, when being sure that Klarendal is dealing with gentrification, the next question was made up: “How do the inhabitants experience the process of gentrification?” There is much relevance for posing this question, while only few literature exist on this particular theme (Atkinson, 2000; Freeman, 2006; Sullivan, 2007; Doucet, 2009). The investigation has focused only on the case of Klarendal.

To begin with, for the people in Klarendal it is hard to put in plain words what a Klarendaller is like. Some do even see themselves also as newcomer or entrepreneur in creative business. All residents consider themselves as a dweller of Klarendal, however, the inhabitants who occupy the neighbourhood for generations claim to be the true Klarendallers. Due to their strong ties with the neighbourhood they were first critical on the plans of urban renewal. Today, most people are content about the calmness and safety the Modekwartier has brought into their neighbourhood. There is only a small group of people who remains critical on the fashion design shops, they are very dominant in the discussion. The fact that people are mostly content about the changes in their neighbourhood is an outcome that recurrently appears in the literature (Sullivan, 2007; Doucet, 2009).

There are some issues inhabitants cannot understand about the Modekwartier. For instance, customers often stand for a closed door. Besides, the products are not interesting for the residents themselves; they do not vary much and are far too expensive as well. It is this phenomenon what comes very close to the findings of Brian Doucet (2009). Also, in his study residents responded that they had no tensions with gentrifiers, because they contributed in the refurbishment of their neighbourhood. However, residents felt that the boom and new developments was both not intended for them (Doucet, 2009: 309). It is also Doucet (2007) saying that flagship urban regeneration projects do not serve the long time residents, but serve the affluent residents of outside the neighbourhood. In line with the thinking of Freeman (2006), inhabitants know that much interference in their neighbourhood is not meant especially for the inhabitants themselves, but people benefit from less crime and poverty. The advent of classy shops and bars within the neighbourhood, results in a deconcentration of poverty (Atkinson, 2002; Freeman, 2006).

To bring integration to another level, involved residents have attempted to bring the various groups together, for instance with the Turkish community and also the fashion designers. However,
both attempts were unsuccessful. *Goed Proeven*, the new restaurant, symbol of Klarendal’s refurbishment, is a welcome new phenomenon in the neighbourhood, however, because of the high prices not much inhabitants can find the money for a visit. A similar response was found by Atkinson (2000) and Doucet (2009). The big group of Non-western migrants in Klarendal is not interested in the *Modekwartier*. They do not know for whom and what the fashion is meant.

Because of the relatively small size of most houses people are unsure if the middle class is interested to move over to Klarendal. At the same time, some insiders know that where house prices in the surrounding neighbourhoods are falling, house prices in Klarendal are rising rapidly. The existence of the *Modekwartier*, the renovated frontages and public realm, and advantages of centrality are making Klarendal a hip place to go and live. Residents are glad that one of the bigger buildings was saved for real estate development by active involvement of inhabitants. Here, Klarendal proves to have a well organized and strong group of involved inhabitants, who are able to change the pursuance of policy.

**Experience of the gentrifiers**

To position the viewpoint of the residents it is useful to understand the viewpoint of the gentrifiers and vice versa. Besides, science offers more theory about gentrifiers than theory about residents in gentrifying areas, still there is also few theory about their experiences (Bridge, 2007; Butler, 2003; Butler & Robson, 2003; Hamnett, 2003; Ley, 1980, 2003; Tallon & Bromley, 2004). Now, what is interesting is to compare the outcomes of fieldwork in Klarendal with present theory. It is important to mention that not the new wealthy middle class is interviewed, because they are hardly visible, but the new creative entrepreneurs were interviewed. As David Ley once said; they are lacking economic wealth, but are willing to use their cultural capital to encourage the valorisation of ‘mundane’ and run-down areas (Hubbard, 2006: 45).

The entrepreneurs of the *Modekwartier* started doing business three years ago and some only recently. The concept of a fashion quarter was very attractive; one can inspire each other and make profit of the promotion. At the start there were some doubts about the functioning of the northern part of the *Modekwartier*, however, a few years later business is doing better and better here. At the beginning, the *Modekwartier* had to prove itself because its situation was a bit artificial, but fortunately the business has changed naturally and now offers a wide ranch of creative entrepreneurs is welcome now, each presenting their own design products and activities.

In 2008, at the start off, there was much distrust present. It was perceptible in the amount of stigmatization and vandalism that took place. Today, inhabitants feel more comfortable, they are content about the safe and clean streets and are proud of their neighbourhood again, however, it is sad that they still do not say it loudly. The experience is that indigenous inhabitants talk sometimes distrustful about the *Modekwartier*, but if you question them personally they have no problem with it. The organized neighbourhood events do not stimulate integration very much. Inhabitants are goaded to visit a shop, but only because they are curious. Designers are glad with the new fashionable bars and they frequent them often. Dwellers are not so much present in these cafes. Here, Klarendal turns out to be comparable to earlier studies (Butler, 2003; Butler & Robson, 2003). When studying the choices, attitude and habits of gentrifiers Butler finds out that every gentrifying neighbourhood can deal with another behaviour of the gentrifier; varying from a homogenized global culture to a withdraw form of enclavism. But in general, in their day-to-day lives gentrifiers tend to live quite apart from non-middle class residents. The same counts for Klarendal. Gentrifiers always
respect residents, but most of the time they do not get along with people who are not like
themselves.

Regarding the process of gentrification designers seem to be unaware about their influence
on the spatial environment. They think that gentrification will not occur in Klarendal, at least not
everywhere, because the houses are inappropriate. At the same time, they know that they are selling
extraordinary luxurious merchandise and that house prices have risen since their arrival. At the street
level they have seen that a lot of upstairs apartments are for sale, now. Among peers Klarendal is a
great place to live, they would also like to move in. What the creative entrepreneurs hope is that
Klarendal will remain a bit disagreeable; it gives the neighbourhood its typical atmosphere.

7.3 Evaluation

When evaluating the master thesis research there are various matters that deserve some attention.
The sessions of finding the right topic are a long time ago, in the meanwhile, a lot of decisions have
been made without much advice. To a certain extent it was possible to reflect together with involved
people about further research, but there was not always a possibility to do so. Albeit it was
attempted to collect as much knowledge as possible, including the best efforts to interpret them in
the right way, there is much knowledge out of a single researcher’s reach.

To start off with, at the beginning of the investigation, about March 2011, the central
research question was slightly different. The research would not be carried out on the theme of the
‘experiences of people’, but on “how it affects their lives”. However, the total lack of ethnographic
observational studies and the difficulty of ‘going native’, meant that it was chosen to go further with
the way people experience gentrification.

When linking the practice of Klarendal with the global literature about gentrification and the
experiences of people, several issues became clear. First, much people have studied cases of
gentrification, but it is only since a few years that scientists have started studying the actual involved
people (in a qualitative way). Most of the literature writes about gentrification as a process of
‘winners’ and ‘losers’, about conflicts and anti-gentrification movements, because of the frightening
prospect of being forced to displace. However, there is also a movement of scientists who claim that
gentrification does not need to have bad consequences for the local people. Second, also when
reading the work of others it seemed that they also had difficulties in identifying the true groups of
inhabitants apart from the group of gentrifiers. One could simply ask for how long they lived in the
particular neighbourhood, but that is not the only variable, every person is different; every person
chooses to have different identities in different occasions. Third, the previous finding became very
obvious when studying the experience of gentrifiers in gentrifying neighbourhoods. The present kind
of gentrifiers could vary very much, depending on the stage of gentrification, the built environment,
the location from of the city centre, etcetera. Fourth, most of the available literature focuses on
North American and British cases in big cities, compared to Arnhem, such as: London, Glasgow, New
York and Portland. These cities are not only of another size, but also have a different composition,
and do not deal with state-led gentrification, at least not to the same extent as in Arnhem and in
other cases in the Netherlands.

The fieldwork existed out of multiple methods. To prevent not being blinded by only
Klarendal and global literature, it was a good choice to connect Spijkerkwartier to the investigation.
With this neighbourhood a case was selected with very much similarities to Klarendal: Dutch,
Arnhem, one of the surrounding districts of the city centre, old structures, a past with problems,
etcetera. Still, also Spijkerkwartier was in a sense dissimilar, because it has got less social housing and
more large classy houses. When walking through the two neighbourhoods and taking pictures, a lot of the prejudices become obvious, but at the same time, a story of behind the front door is missing. For that reason, photo series are made of Klarendal, but only as an introduction to the actual story. In doing so, the situation in Klarendal becomes easier to grasp for outsiders, while the real experiences are left open for later in the thesis; the focus groups. In four discussion sessions in total seventeen people attended, of which seven were entrepreneurs of the Modekwartier. The meetings were all transcribed, resulting in almost fifty pages of discussion. Despite of the overwhelming number of examinations they are asked for, most of the participants attended, because they feel involved, especially when it comes to changes in their neighbourhoods.
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Appendix I: Map of Modekwartier

(Made in Arnhem, 2010)
### Appendix II: Development Klarendal and Spijkerkwartier

**Statistics 2006** (Gemeente Arnhem, 2006: 161,166)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Klarendal</th>
<th>Spijkerkwartier</th>
<th>Arnhem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of inhabitants</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>5,704</td>
<td>142,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-western inhabitants</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 0-14 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 15-64 years</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 years and older</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% families</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% single households</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% multiple single households</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of houses</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>64,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% rental</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% private owned</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% single family</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% multiple family</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average disposable income</td>
<td>£20,200</td>
<td>£21,300</td>
<td>£25,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low income</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% unemployed</td>
<td>16,3%</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
<td>10,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation neighbourhood rate</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation own house rate</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>7,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics 2010** (Gemeente Arnhem, 2010: 168,169,178,179)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Klarendal</th>
<th>Spijkerkwartier</th>
<th>Arnhem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of inhabitants</td>
<td>7,235 (-4%)</td>
<td>6,057 (+6%)</td>
<td>147,038 (+3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-western inhabitants</td>
<td>26% (-2%)</td>
<td>13% (+1%)</td>
<td>18% (+1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 0-14 years</td>
<td>13% (-2%)</td>
<td>7% (-1%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 15-64 years</td>
<td>79% (+1%)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 65 years and older</td>
<td>8% (+2%)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% families</td>
<td>37% (-3%)</td>
<td>19% (+1%)</td>
<td>51% (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% single households</td>
<td>34% (+4%)</td>
<td>24% (-6%)</td>
<td>17% (-8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% multiple single households</td>
<td>21% (-1%)</td>
<td>48% (+6%)</td>
<td>25% (+9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% other</td>
<td>8% (-2%)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7% (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of houses</td>
<td>3,733 (+2%)</td>
<td>2,860 (+5%)</td>
<td>67,396 (+4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% rental</td>
<td>72% (-6%)</td>
<td>64% (-4%)</td>
<td>56% (-4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% private owned</td>
<td>28% (+6%)</td>
<td>34% (+4%)</td>
<td>43% (+5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% single family</td>
<td>38% (-1%)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53% (+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% multiple family</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>81% (+1%)</td>
<td>44% (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average disposable income</td>
<td>£22,800 (+13%)</td>
<td>£22,600 (+6%)</td>
<td>£29,000 (+13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low income</td>
<td>19% (-2%)</td>
<td>21% (+2%)</td>
<td>12% (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% unemployed</td>
<td>10,8% (-5,5%)</td>
<td>8,1% (-3%)</td>
<td>7,7% (-2,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation neighbourhood rate</td>
<td>6,5 (+0,3)</td>
<td>7,4 (+1,0)</td>
<td>7,4 (+0,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation own house rate</td>
<td>6,7 (-0,4)</td>
<td>6,6 (-0,6)</td>
<td>7,3 (-0,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III: Investments in Klarendal 2000-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thema</th>
<th>Wat doen we al</th>
<th>Wat vragen we extra</th>
<th>Totaal over 4 jaar (afgerond)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gemeente</td>
<td>Corporaties</td>
<td>Incidenteel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wonen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbetering woningaanbod</td>
<td>€ 500.000</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 500.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inrichting openbare ruimte</td>
<td>€ 5.386.000</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 5.400.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beheer openbare ruimte</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 25.000</td>
<td>€ 100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milieu</td>
<td>€ 710.000</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 700.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totaal Wonen</strong></td>
<td>€ 3.000.000</td>
<td>€ 41.422.000</td>
<td>€ 6.595.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Werken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimuleren werkgelegenheid</td>
<td>€ 513.000</td>
<td>€ 258.000</td>
<td>€ 1.500.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aanpak werklozen</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 13.000</td>
<td>€ 100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totaal Werken</strong></td>
<td>€ 14.784.000</td>
<td>€ 513.000</td>
<td>€ 271.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leren &amp; Opgroei</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brede school / MFC (fysiek en programma)</td>
<td>€ 6.500.000</td>
<td>€ 903.000</td>
<td>€ 10.100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speel- en ontmoetingsplekken</td>
<td>€ 13.000</td>
<td>€ 21.000</td>
<td>€ 100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voortijdig schoolverlaten</td>
<td>€ 313.000</td>
<td>€ 31.000</td>
<td>€ 400.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totaal Leren &amp; Opgroei</strong></td>
<td>€ 13.846.000</td>
<td>€ 955.000</td>
<td>€ 10.000.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport &amp; Cultuur</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport en spel</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 274.000</td>
<td>€ 1.100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunst en cultuur</td>
<td>€ 32.000</td>
<td>€ 137.000</td>
<td>€ 600.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totaal Sport &amp; Cultuur</strong></td>
<td>€ 4.626.000</td>
<td>€ 411.000</td>
<td>€ 1.700.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integreer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inburgeren</td>
<td>€ 25.000</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontmoeten / sociale bouwstenen / burgerinitiatieven</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 268.000</td>
<td>€ 1.100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totaal Integreer</strong></td>
<td>€ 712.000</td>
<td>€ 25.000</td>
<td>€ 268.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veiligheid</td>
<td>€ 195.000</td>
<td>€ 0</td>
<td>€ 220.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achter de voordeur</td>
<td>€ 376.000</td>
<td>€ 518.000</td>
<td>€ 67.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAAL</strong></td>
<td>€ 37.344.000</td>
<td>€ 42.635.000</td>
<td>€ 14.058.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Gemeente Arnhem, 2007a:29)